

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GOOGLE TRANSLATE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS

(A Quasi-Experimental Study at Ninth Grade of Junior High School Students)

Anggun Safari Maulana Yusuf
anggunsafarimy243@gmail.com

Nenden Sri Rahayu
nendensrirahayu1212@gail.com

UNIVERSITAS BALE BANDUNG

ABSTRACT

Writing is one of the most challenging skills for junior high school students in learning English. Many students face difficulties in expressing ideas, organizing sentences, and choosing appropriate vocabulary, which often leads them to rely on word-for-word translation. To address these issues, this research investigates the use of Google Translate as a tool to improve students' writing skills, particularly in writing recount texts. The aim of this study is to examine whether the use of Google Translate significantly improves students' writing skills compared to conventional methods, and to explore students' perceptions toward learning writing with this tool. This study employed a quasi-experimental design with a two-group pretest and posttest format. The participants were 60 ninth-grade students of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay in the academic year 2024/2025, divided into an experimental group (30 students) and a control group (30 students). Data were collected through writing tests (pretest and posttest) and a questionnaire. The findings revealed a t-value of 6.25 is significantly greater than the t-table value of 2.000 ($df = 58$, $\alpha = 0.05$), indicating that Google Translate effectively enhanced students' writing skills. Furthermore, the questionnaire results indicated that most students liked being taught using Google Translate. In conclusion, the use of Google Translate is effective in improving students' writing skills and can serve as a supportive tool in teaching recount texts.

Keywords: Google translate, Writing skills, Recount text, Quasi-experimental study

INTRODUCTION

Proficiency in writing is important in English language learning at school levels, particularly in junior high school level. Writing is a kind of communication that will support for learning, because there is a relationship between writing with the memory in the brain to write (Rahayu et al., 2017). According to Makalela (2004), Writing in English is considered to be a skill included in the core academic skills and the most complex skills to master compared to reading, listening and speaking. Therefore, writing in English is a fundamental ability that students need to improve through various practices and

exercises. Besides students, teachers also employ many methods for improving students' writing abilities and capabilities.

In the learning process, writing is often taught separately or with reading in the classroom.

Writing skills must be applicable to real-life communication. For students, writing is a skill that is difficult to master because it is not always simple to learn how to write in a new language (Mundriyah & Parmawati 2016). Despite students having studied English since elementary school, writing is still their biggest challenge, particularly in putting ideas into paragraphs and translating them into English.

Based on the researcher's experience during practical field experience at SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay, the researcher found several problems in students when they wrote in English. Lack of vocabulary, lack of ideas, lack of knowledge how to put words into sentences are some problems got by students in learning writing. They tended to translate word by word from Indonesian to English in their writing, which made their sentences became strange and unnatural.

To address these problems, the researcher proposes using Google Translate, a widely used and familiar tool among students as a means to support writing instruction and enhance their learning experience. Balk et al. (2012) stated Google Translate is a free, application or web-based program with natural translation output, and it is also well known as online machine Translators with the best accuracy. So, Google Translate might be described as an automated machine translation from the source language to the target language, and Indonesian pupils are already acquainted with the application. Google Translate can be viewed as a source of input that can help students learn target language grammar and vocabulary, as well as improve their writing skills. By using Google Translate in writing instruction, educators can provide opportunities for students to engage in purposeful language output and acquire new English words, promoting their language development in writing lessons. In line with the previous research such as, Wahono & Rohmah (2024) the result shows that the use of Google Translate can be an efficient aid for teaching recount text writing to EFL students at the junior high school level, as it helps them comprehend the structure of narrative texts, enhance their vocabulary, improve grammatical accuracy, and increase their motivation and interest in learning, despite some limitations and challenges. Fajar et al., (2024) the results show that the use of Google Translate has a positive impact on increasing students' writing scores. However, pupil perceptions of the instruments' effectiveness and accuracy differ.

This study examines the employing of Google Translate to help students write paragraphs in recount text. Recount text provide a chronological record of experiences and events. Google Translate can assist students improve their writing skills, making the learning process more effective.

RESEARCH QUESTION

According to the background study, the researcher came at the following conclusion regarding the problem formulation:

1. Does the use of Google Translate as a means of teaching the writing skills have significantly better results compared to teaching writing skills without Google Translate?
2. Do the students like being taught the Writing Skills using Google Translate?

Based on the research questions stated above, the researcher intended to find out whether Google Translate could significantly influence students' writing skills and their responses toward its use in the learning process. To verify these assumptions empirically, the study formulated the following hypotheses:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the results between Google Translate and the conventional method in teaching the writing skills in Junior High School.

H_a: There is significant difference in the results between Google Translate and the conventional method in teaching the writing skills in Junior High School.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To support this study, several theoretical concepts and previous studies related to writing, recount text, and Google Translate are reviewed. This section explains the essential concepts, summarizes relevant findings, and identifies research gaps that justify the present study.

Writing skill

Writing constitutes most essential abilities in language to acquire. It involves processing words to create clear and understandable writing. Harmer (2006) states that writing is a basic skill in language skill, writing is also as important as speaking, listening, and reading. Language learning requires pupils to master writing skills, including letter writing, report writing, and electronic media use. Learning to write is crucial as it allows for comprehension of written communication. However, defining writing ability is not straightforward, as it involves multiple aspects and is interpreted differently by various aspects.

Harmer (2006) states that writing is a process that requires thinking, drafting, and revising to produce coherent and well-structured text. It is a skill that involves multiple stages, including planning, composing, editing, and finalizing a piece of writing. Meanwhile, Brown (2001) says writing is a productive skill in language learning that requires learners to express their thoughts and ideas in a structured manner. It demands mastery of grammar, vocabulary, and discourse conventions to create meaningful and effective written communication (Rahayu, 2024). Nunan in Yi (2009), writing ability is defined to initiate and evolve ideas and then use certain revising and editing practices to develop them to maturity in a given text.

Recount text

Simanjuntak (2023) states that recount text is a type of text which tells about an experience, event, or activity someone has experienced. Writing recount text is challenging for most students. It has been associated with students' mastery of grammar, particularly past tenses (Mubasiroh, 2015). Recount texts should utilize the past tense to describe prior experiences or events. Although students can use other tenses when writing about simple and past tense is most common.

A recount typically begins with an introduction that provides background information on the people involved, what happened to them, and where the incident occurred. Then follows a series of events that tell the story in chronological sequence. Reorientation is a final comment that may include an explanation. Some recount texts include a final paragraph. The writer may include a personal comment or message in the final paragraph, but this is optional.

The goal of recount text is to inform the reader of what occurred and when it occurred. As Miller (2006) cited in Simanjuntak (2023) the purposes of recount text are to help authors understand them and to help readers comprehend their own experiences and the writer. While, Adibah (2013) stated that the social role of recount text is to repeat events to inform or amuse. To accomplish this goal, recount text uses a general framework as a foundation for the writing.

According to Derewianka (1990), there are five types of recount texts, namely personal recount, factual recount, imaginative recount, procedural recount, and biographical recount. The type of the recount text used in this research is the personal recount text, which is particularly suited for learning through Google Translate as a teaching medium.

Google Translate

Google Translate is a translation application which might be utilized on every digital service. It can be accessed in two various areas: via the website and the application. Google Translate is a free service that offers fast translation. It analyzes structures throughout millions of texts to choose the best translation for users. According to Bahri & Mahadi (2016) the use of Google Translate in class is an additional tool for learning, as well as a strategy to improve student's learning experience.

Google Translate uses natural language processing technology and artificial intelligence to produce automatic translations (Och & Ney, 2003). Although Google Translate is not a direct tool for learning to write, it can serve as a helpful aid in the writing process.

Bahri & Mahadi (2016) stated that GT can help students expand vocabulary and check grammatical correctness, thus supporting the process of writing development. Similarly, Fajar et al. (2024) revealed that GT enables students to compose more accurate sentences and understand English sentence patterns better.

However, the use of GT in education is still debated. Wirantaka & Fijanah (2021) warned that excessive dependence on GT may reduce students' analytical skills in constructing sentences and understanding context. Rohmah (2024) argued that GT is effective only when used as a temporary learning aid that guides students before they gain independence in writing. Therefore, it is essential for teachers to provide clear instruction and control over its use to ensure that GT supports, rather than replaces, students' writing processes.

It is clear that Google Translate has potential benefits in assisting students' writing performance, especially in terms of vocabulary enrichment and grammatical accuracy. Yet, there remains uncertainty regarding its effectiveness in improving overall writing skills, particularly in recount text writing at the junior high school level. Moreover, few studies have combined quantitative experimental design with students' perception data to measure its pedagogical impact comprehensively.

Therefore, this study adopts a quasi-experimental design to quantitatively analyse the effectiveness of Google Translate in improving students' writing skills and to explore their perceptions of its use in English learning. The literature reviewed above serves as the theoretical foundation and rationale for selecting this research design and focus.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental design to examine the effectiveness of Google Translate in improving students' writing skills. The design involved two groups: an experimental group taught by using Google Translate and a control group taught through conventional methods. Both groups were given a pre-test and a post-test to measure their writing performance, and a questionnaire was used to identify students' perceptions toward the use of Google Translate in writing activities.

Population & sample

The population of this study consisted of the ninth-grade students of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay, which comprised four classes (9A, 9B, 9C, and 9D) with a total of 131 students. The sample was selected using the cluster sampling technique, involving two classes: Class 9D as the experimental group and Class 9A as the control group. Each class consisted of 30 students, bringing the total number of participants to 60 students.

Instruments

This study employed several instruments to measure the effectiveness of using Google Translate on students' writing skills, namely the pre-test, post-test, and questionnaire. Each instrument served a specific function in collecting data before and after the treatment, as well as capturing students' perceptions toward the use of Google Translate in writing activities.

1. Pre-test

The pre-test was administered to measure students' initial writing ability before receiving any treatment. It consisted of three types of tasks: filling in blanks, arranging jumbled sentences,

and writing a personal recount text. The results reflected their baseline writing performance prior to the implementation of the treatment.

2. Post-test

The post-test was conducted after the treatment to evaluate students' writing achievement following the use of Google Translate. It contained the same types of questions as the pre-test to ensure consistency and comparability of results. The post-test aimed to determine the extent to which Google Translate influenced students' writing improvement.

3. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was distributed to gather students' perceptions regarding the use of Google Translate in learning writing. The questionnaire consisted of 15 closed-ended items based on a four-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (4). Students indicated their responses by marking (✓) on the provided options. The questionnaire data were used to support and interpret the quantitative test results.

Data collection & analysis

To evaluate the effect of using Google Translate on students' writing skills, this study employed three main data collection instruments: the pre-test, post-test, and questionnaire. The pre-test served as a baseline measurement to determine the students' initial writing ability before the implementation of the treatment. Following the pre-test, the experimental group received instruction supported by Google Translate, while the control group was taught through conventional methods.

After the treatment, a post-test was administered to both groups to measure improvement and assess the effectiveness of Google Translate in enhancing students' writing performance. At the end of the study, a questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group to gather students' perceptions toward the use of Google Translate as a learning tool in the classroom.

The data obtained from both groups were analysed quantitatively to determine whether there was a significant difference in students' writing achievement before and after the treatment. The students' writing performance was assessed using a recount text scoring rubric adapted from Brown (2010).

Table 1.1 Recount text assessment rubric

Aspect	6 (Excellent)	5 (Very Good)	4 (Good)	3 (Fair)	2 (Poor)	1 (Very Poor)
Content	Very complete, relevant, engaging, and in-depth. Events are clearly and thoroughly described.	Complete and relevant. Events are clear and fairly detailed.	Mostly relevant and clear, but lacks depth or detail.	Incomplete and lacks clarity.	Very limited content; only partial events described.	Off-topic, too short, or illogical content.
Organization	Fully structured (orientation, events, reorientation), very	Mostly complete and logical structure, easy to follow.	Clear structure but some parts are weak or	Some disorganization, missing key parts.	Unclear structure, confusing sequence	No clear structure, sentences are random and

	coherent and logical.		underdeveloped.		of events.	incoherent.
Vocabulary	Very rich and appropriate vocabulary. Excellent use of action verbs and time connectives.	Appropriate and sufficiently varied vocabulary.	Adequate vocabulary, but somewhat limited.	Limited vocabulary with some inappropriate usage.	Often inappropriate and confusing vocabulary.	Extremely limited and mostly incorrect vocabulary.
Grammar	Excellent grammar. Correct sentence structures, consistent use of past tense, almost no errors.	Good grammar with minor errors.	Some grammatical errors, but meaning remains clear.	Many grammatical errors that affect understanding.	Numerous grammar errors, hard to understand.	Very poor sentence structure and incomprehensible grammar.
Mechanics	No errors in spelling, punctuation, or capitalization.	Few minor errors that do not hinder readability.	Noticeable errors but still understandable.	Frequent errors that begin to distract the reader.	Many mechanical errors that interfere with understanding.	Excessive errors making the text hard to read.

This rubric is based on Brown (2010) writing assessment theory, covering 5 key aspects. Each aspect is rated on a scale of 1-6, with a maximum total score of 30 points. To calculate the total correct scores of the students, the researcher used this formula.

$$\frac{\text{total of answer point}}{\text{total score point}} \times 100$$

At the end the researcher analyzed the questionnaire to get the students' perceptions. The data were interpreted based on the frequency of the students' answer. The questionnaire data were analyzed by applying the percentage formula suggested by Sudjana (2001):

$$X = \frac{y}{z} \times 100$$

Where:

X = percentage (quality of the answer)

Y = given amount (total of the respondent answer)

Z = total amount (total of respondent)

After obtaining the percentage results from the questionnaire, the researcher categorized them based on the standard validity criteria:

Table 1.2 Percentage category of questionnaire

Percentage	Categorize
1 – 25%	A small number of the students
26 – 49%	Nearly half of the students
50%	Half of the students
51 – 75%	More than half of the students
76 – 99%	Almost all of the students
100%	All of the students

Research procedures

The procedures used in conducting this research were; 1) determining the population and research of the research, 2) giving pre-test to the class, 3) teaching recount text using google translate, 4) giving posttest 5) distributing questionnaire, 6) processing pre-test & posttest 7) analyzing the questionnaire 8) interpreting the result 9) drawing findings & conclusion.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of Google Translate in improving students' writing skills. Data were collected through pre-tests, post-tests, and a questionnaire administered to the experimental and control groups.

Table 1.3 Pre-test data result

Experimental Group		Control Group	
Student	X₁	Student	X₂
Student 1	70	Student 1	34
Student 2	44	Student 2	36

Student 3	44	Student 3	32
Student 4	42	Student 4	46
Student 5	48	Student 5	30
Student 6	44	Student 6	30
Student 7	46	Student 7	30
Student 8	38	Student 8	38
Student 9	60	Student 9	52
Student 10	22	Student 10	56
Student 11	34	Student 11	44
Student 12	38	Student 12	50
Student 13	38	Student 13	38
Student 14	40	Student 14	38
Student 15	38	Student 15	60
Student 16	52	Student 16	32
Student 17	32	Student 17	50
Student 18	34	Student 18	46
Student 19	50	Student 19	56
Student 20	56	Student 20	58
Student 21	48	Student 21	34
Student 22	42	Student 22	30
Student 23	46	Student 23	30
Student 24	52	Student 24	30
Student 25	30	Student 25	40
Student 26	46	Student 26	40
Student 27	34	Student 27	48
Student 28	68	Student 28	50
Student 29	54	Student 29	38
Student 30	50	Student 30	38
ΣX_1	1.344	ΣX_2	1.234
$\bar{X}_1$	44.8	$\bar{X}_2$	41.1

The analysis of the pre-test scores revealed a calculated t-value of 1.02, which was lower than the critical t-table value of 2.000 at the significance level of $p = 0.05$ ($df = 58$). This result indicates that there was no significant difference in writing ability between the experimental and control groups prior to the implementation of Google Translate. In other words, both groups had relatively similar levels of writing proficiency before the treatment began.

After the administration of the pre-test, a series of treatments were carried out to assist students in developing their writing skills. Upon completing all treatment sessions, the students were given a post-test to assess their writing performance after being taught using Google Translate.

Table 1.4 Post-test data result

Experimental Group		Control Group	
Student	X₁	Student	X₂
Student 1	94	Student 1	44
Student 2	90	Student 2	46
Student 3	80	Student 3	34
Student 4	92	Student 4	44
Student 5	82	Student 5	46
Student 6	78	Student 6	46
Student 7	92	Student 7	42
Student 8	84	Student 8	34
Student 9	82	Student 9	44
Student 10	78	Student 10	48
Student 11	68	Student 11	46
Student 12	78	Student 12	60
Student 13	74	Student 13	62
Student 14	78	Student 14	56
Student 15	80	Student 15	64
Student 16	88	Student 16	46
Student 17	80	Student 17	58
Student 18	70	Student 18	64
Student 19	98	Student 19	62
Student 20	88	Student 20	66
Student 21	78	Student 21	46
Student 22	84	Student 22	44
Student 23	72	Student 23	42
Student 24	74	Student 24	46
Student 25	92	Student 25	64
Student 26	82	Student 26	52
Student 27	86	Student 27	54
Student 28	80	Student 28	44
Student 29	74	Student 29	56
Student 30	76	Student 30	70

ΣX_1	2.370	ΣX_2	1.530
$\bar{X}_1$	79	$\bar{X}_2$	51

The analysis of the post-test results showed that the students in the experimental group achieved higher writing scores than those in the control group. The t-test calculation yielded a value of 6.25, which exceeded the critical t-table value of 2.000 at the significance level of $p = 0.05$ ($df = 58$). This finding demonstrates a significant difference between the two groups, confirming that students taught with Google Translate performed better in writing recount texts than those taught using conventional methods.

At the end of the research, the questionnaire was distributed to discover the students' perspectives and feelings after being taught to recount text writing using Google Translate as the learning tool.

Table 1.5 Questionnaire result

No	Statements	SD	D	A	SA
1.	I enjoy learning English. (<i>Saya menyukai pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris</i>)		3 (10%)	20 (66,6%)	7 (23,3%)
2.	Learning English is fun. (<i>Belajar Bahasa Inggris itu menyenangkan</i>)		5 (16,6%)	20 (66,6%)	5 (16,6%)
3.	I like learning English writing. (<i>Saya menyukai pelajaran menulis dalam Bahasa Inggris</i>)		5 (16,6%)	21 (70%)	4 (13,3%)
4.	I feel confident when writing in English. (<i>Saya merasa percaya diri saat menulis dalam Bahasa Inggris</i>)		5 (16,6%)	25 (83,3%)	
5.	I understand what a recount text is in writing lessons. (<i>Saya mengetahui tentang apa itu Recount Text dalam pembelajaran menulis</i>)		3 (10%)	25 (83,3%)	2 (6,6%)
6.	I often use technology tools to help me write in English. (<i>Saya sering menggunakan bantuan teknologi untuk menulis Bahasa Inggris</i>)		2 (6,6%)	18 (60%)	10 (33,3%)
7.	I know what Google Translate is. (<i>Saya mengetahui apa itu Google Translate</i>)			15 (50%)	15 (50%)
8.	I know that Google Translate can help me write English texts. (<i>Saya tahu bahwa Google Translate bisa membantu dalam menulis teks Bahasa Inggris</i>)		1 (3,3%)	19 (63,3%)	10 (33,3%)
9.	I have used Google Translate to help me write in English. (<i>Saya pernah menggunakan Google Translate untuk membantu menulis dalam Bahasa Inggris</i>)			11 (36,6%)	19 (63,3%)

10.	I feel comfortable using Google Translate in writing lessons. (<i>Saya merasa nyaman ketika menggunakan Google Translate dalam pembelajaran menulis</i>)		1 (3,3%)	11 (36,6%)	18 (60%)
11.	Writing lessons are more interesting when using Google Translate. (<i>Pembelajaran menulis lebih menarik ketika menggunakan Google Translate</i>)		1 (3,3%)	20 (66,6%)	9 (30%)
12.	I understand recount text structure better after using Google Translate. (<i>Saya memahami struktur recount text lebih baik setelah menggunakan Google Translate</i>)		2 (6,6%)	20 (66,6%)	8 (26,6%)
13.	Google Translate helps me write recount texts more easily and in correct structure. (<i>Google Translate membantu saya lebih mudah menulis recount text sesuai struktur yang benar</i>)			20 (66,6%)	10 (33,3%)
14.	I enjoy learning to write recount texts using Google Translate. (<i>Saya merasa senang belajarr menulis recount text dengan bantuan Google Translate</i>)		1 (3,3%)	18 (60%)	11 (36,6%)
15.	I think using Google Translate is effective in helping me write recount text. (<i>Saya merasa penggunaan Google Translate efektif dalam membantu saya menulis recount text</i>)		1 (3,3%)	19 (63,3%)	10 (33,3%)

The result demonstrates that students consider the tool not only as useful, but also as an effective technique of assisting with their writing recount tasks. This displays a high belief in the tool's practical utility in reaching writing objectives. The students see Google Translate as a useful and supporting tool in the writing process.

Discussion

The statistical calculation of the students' pre-test scores in both the experimental and control groups was calculated using the t-test procedure. The degree of freedom (df) was calculated as $N_1 + N_2 = 30 + 30 - 2 = 58$, at $p = .05$ of two tailed, the critical value of t is 2.000. As the value of the derived t (to) is smaller than that of the critical t (t-table) $= 1.02 < 2.000$. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the two means of both experiment and control groups before the treatments were given, indicating a similar initial level of ability.

Meanwhile, the post-test showed that with $df = N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 30 + 30 - 2 = 58$, and at the significance level of $p = .05$ (two-tailed), the critical t-value is 2.000. The obtained t-value (6.25) is greater than the critical t (2.000), which leads to the rejection of the Null Hypothesis (H_0) and the acceptance of the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a). This result indicates that there is a significant difference between the group taught through the Google Translate technique and the group taught using the conventional method in learning Writing Skills on Personal Recount Text at the third grade of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay. In other words, students taught with Google Translate achieved considerably better outcomes than those taught conventionally, confirming that this technique is effective in improving students' writing skills.

From the 15 questionnaire items completed by 30 students, the overall distribution of responses demonstrates a significant trend toward beneficial evaluations, notably in the "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" categories. Across the questionnaire, the average percentage of students who Agree (A) was approximately 65% (More than half of the students), and those who Strongly Agree (SA) was around 28% (Nearly half of the students), while Disagree (D) replies averaged only about 6% (A small number of the students), and Strongly Disagree (SD) was consistently 0% on all topics. This shows that almost all of the students 93% consistently agreed with each statement, demonstrating great support for using Google Translate and learning to write, it means most of them given positive response toward the use of Google Translate in learning writing.

Taken together, the test scores and questionnaire findings show that Google Translate not only increased students' writing skills but was also liked by the students, indicating its efficiency as a teaching aid.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that the use of Google Translate significantly improves students' writing skills, particularly in writing recount texts. The statistical analysis revealed a substantial difference between the experimental and control groups, indicating that students who were taught using Google Translate achieved better writing performance than those taught through conventional methods.

In addition to improving writing achievement, the questionnaire results showed that most students held positive perceptions toward the use of Google Translate. They reported that the tool helped them expand their vocabulary, enhance grammatical accuracy, and increase confidence in composing English texts.

Overall, Google Translate can be considered an effective supplementary tool in teaching writing. However, teachers should guide students to use it critically and responsibly to avoid overdependence. Future research may further explore its effectiveness in other language skills and contexts to maximize its pedagogical potential.

REFERENCES

- Adibah. (2013). Bank soal bahasa inggris SMA kelas X, XI dan XII. *Pustaka Edukasi*. Buku Kita. <https://bukukita.com/Buku-Sekolah/Penunjang-Pelajaran/148377-Bank-Soal-Bahasa-Inggris-SMA-Kelas-X,-XI,-dan-XII.html>
- Bahri, H., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2016). Google Translate as a supplementary tool for learning Malay: A case study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(3), 161–167.
- Balk, E. M., Chung, M., Hadar, N., Patel, K., Yu, W. W., Trikalinos, T. A., & Chang, L. K. W. (2012). *Accuracy of data extraction of non-English language trials with Google Translate*.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. *Addition Wesley Longman*.
- Brown, H. D. (2010). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). Exploring how texts work. *Primary English Teaching Association*. <https://lccn.loc.gov/92191755>
- Fajar, M., Perdana, A., & Rochmah, N. (2024). The Impact of Google Translate on High School Students' Writing Ability. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.30587/jetlal.v4i1>
- Harmer, J. (2006). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Education India.
- Makalela, L. (2004). Differential Error Types in Second-Language Students' Written and Spoken Texts. *Written Communication*, 21(4), 368–385. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088304270026>
- Mubasiroh, A. (2015). A Correlation Between Students' Mastery of Past Tenses and Their Ability In Writing Recount Text. *Padang: English Department STKIP PGRI Sumbar*.
- Mundriyah, M., & Parmawati, A. (2016). Using Think-Pair-Share (TPS) To Improve Students' Writing Creativity (A Classroom Action Research in the Second Semester Students of STKIP Siliwangi Bandung). *P2M STKIP Siliwangi*, 3(2), 84. <https://doi.org/10.22460/p2m.v3i2p84-91.630>
- Och, F. J., & Ney, H. (2003). A Systematic Comparison of Various Statistical Alignment Models. *Computational Linguistics*, 29(1), 19–51. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089120103321337421>
- Rahayu, N.S. (2024) *English Language and Cultural Identity*. In: Language and Culture : Understanding English in a Global Context. Cet. 1 ed. Get Press Indonesia, Padang, pp. 21-40
- Rohmah, S. A. (2024). The Use of Google Translate to Teach Writing Paragraph of Recount Text at The Efl Students of The Second Grade Mts At-Thohiriyah Jember Thesis.
- Sapto Wahono, S., & Afifatur Rohmah, S. (2024). Google Translate: A Tool for Teaching Recount Paragraph Writing to Efl Students. *P-TELL-US Journal*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2024.v10i4.8872>
- Simanjuntak, A. Z. (2023). The Correlation Between Students' Knowledge of Simple Past Tense and Students' Ability in Writing Recount Text.
- Sudjana, D. (2001). Metode dan teknik pembelajaran partisipatif. Falah Production. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id>
- Wirantaka, A., & Fijanah, M. S. (2021). *Effective Use of Google Translate in Writing*.
- Yi, J.-Y. (2009). Defining Writing Ability for Classroom Writing Assessment in High Schools. In *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 13, Issue 1).