

THE FINE LINE BETWEEN DIGITAL LITERACY AND ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN ONLINE WORLD LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Errol M. O'Neill

Introduction

Technology represents both an opportunity and a challenge for world language instruction (WLI). Digital tools that show increasing potential are sometimes prohibited or only begrudgingly tolerated by educators; nonetheless, they represent a fundamental component of both on-ground and online world language (WL) classes. While an informed and responsible use of digital tools can support learners on their language learning journey, such resources can also serve as a facile, and possibly unethical, way for learners to delegate the work of understanding and producing target language (TL) text to a machine. This chapter discusses digital literacy and academic dishonesty, with a focus on two technologies at the center of concerns related to academic integrity for WLI: online machine translators (OMTs) and artificial intelligence (AI) chatbots.

What Constitutes Academic Dishonesty in the Digital Age?

For the purposes of this discussion, digital literacy represents the abilities necessary to “engage with the communication devices [that learners] will need professionally and personally for their future” (Russell & Murphy-Judy, p. 7). Digital literacy for WLI, in particular, includes a working knowledge of common tools—applications, websites, and services—used on these devices for acquiring, understanding, and expressing oneself in one’s TLs. This chapter will focus specifically on digital literacy as it relates to two of the most currently discussed online tools, OMTs and AI chatbots.

Academic dishonesty encompasses cheating, plagiarism, the fabrication or invention of false information, and facilitating the breach of ethical principles by others, according to Pavela (1997). Some researchers have a more expansive view of academic dishonesty that includes concepts such as patchwork (Goh, 2013) and automatic paraphrasing (Yan, 2023). There are wide-ranging statements on academic integrity that are communicated to students by instructors or institutions. Some examples of infractions related to academic integrity that might be committed by a student taking a WL session online or on-ground include the following:

- using a tool, such as an OMT or AI chatbot, to complete graded assessments when course policies prohibit it (cheating);
- finding a prewritten composition online and handing it in as if it were one's own work (plagiarism);
- adding a non-existent resource to one's list of references on an essay (fabrication);
- providing another student with the answer key to a graded exam (facilitation);
- taking exact phrases or sentences from several websites and pasting them into a PowerPoint without citation (patchwork);
- turning in a composition that systematically rewords sentences from a textbook's cultural reading instead of creating a new, original work (automatic paraphrasing).

Online Machine Translators and WLI

OMTs allow the user to input a word, phrase, or entire paragraphs in a textbox and receive the corresponding translation into another language in seconds. Less than a year after the launch of Babel Fish, the first OMT, reports (e.g., Yang & Lange, 1998) that described students using Babel Fish for WL classes began appearing. One issue that was initially raised in the literature related to online translation was the lack of accuracy. Translations obtained from early OMTs were often riddled with errors because they largely relied on rule-based machine translation, which involved programming hundreds of thousands of individual grammatical and lexical features in one language and attempting to match them up to equivalent features in another language (Kenny, 2022). Modern OMTs, such as Google Translate and DeepL, use neural machine translation, a form of AI that is trained on massive sets of existing parallel data—billions of actual translations that already exist—to detect patterns and predict what the best translation will be for the text entered by the user. In many cases, OMTs now produce output that contains no or few flaws, making it difficult to demonstrate with certainty that an online translator was used by a student (Loock & Léchauguette, 2021).

The risk of academic dishonesty represented another concern related to OMTs shortly after their introduction (e.g., Luton, 2003; McCarthy, 2004) as students were handing in work completed in whole or in part with the aid of an unauthorized tool. Just as the technology behind OMTs has evolved, so have attitudes toward them. Jolley and Maimone (2015) found that instructors viewed OMT as ethical depending on the amount of text translated, with only 10.26% of instructors finding it “completely” or “somewhat unethical” to verify hunches about, or translate, individual words, whereas 87.18% postulated the same for translating entire texts. The same study found that 82.05% of instructors had used an OMT themselves for professional or personal reasons. The question is not whether using online machine translation is inherently unethical, but rather to what extent or in which circumstances it should be used.

AI-Powered Chatbots and WLI

A chatbot can be described as a “dialogue software program that can interact with users and process their inputs using natural language” (Huang, Hew, & Fryer, 2022), as an “artificially intelligent conversational system,” or more simply, as a “conversation buddy” (Ghafar et al., 2023). While many types of chatbots exist, this chapter focuses on those such as OpenAI's ChatGPT, Microsoft's Copilot, and Google's Gemini, which offer text-based conversation. The first chatbot, ELIZA, was released in 1966 and was still used for language learning research through the 2010s (e.g., Goda et al., 2014). Before the launch of ChatGPT in 2022, chatbots

had been developed for several purposes related to education, such as teaching and reviewing vocabulary, writing and revising thesis statements for compositions, and supporting language learners as a conversation partner (Huang et al., 2022). Similarly to OMTs, chatbots have evolved from following a preprogrammed set of rules—in this case, scripted conversational turns—to complex neural networks called Large Language Models that are trained on billions of datapoints to generate responses based on predictions of the likely best output for a given prompt (Kasneci et al, 2023; Rahman & Watanobe, 2023). The process has been described as similar to, but more complex than, autocompleting on cellphones (MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI, 2023). Unlike previous generations of chatbots, which frequently had difficulties with prompts beyond a phrase or an individual sentence, GPT 3.5 and GPT 4—the AI engines released by OpenAI in 2022 and 2023, respectively—are now able to reply to longer, complex input from users “smartly, rapidly, and multilingually” (Lin, 2023, p. 4).

The appearance of more capable chatbots has led to concerns about academic dishonesty. Lin, Chung, Chung, and Lan (2023) found that out of 47 academic articles in various fields, 43 mentioned apprehensions about the use of ChatGPT in education, including “ethical concerns, cheating, academic misconduct, and incorrect information” (p. 39). Another area of discussion has been whether the use of AI chatbots can be detected by instructors. In a study involving 83 students and 82 faculty members, only 29% of participants were able to correctly identify which of the four essays was written by ChatGPT, only slightly better than chance (Hostetter et al., 2023). Purported detectors of AI writing can often be thwarted by changing only a few, or sometimes even one, words in the chatbot’s output (Cotton, Cotton, & Shipway, 2023; Tlili et al., 2023), with some free tools designed to edit AI-produced text to help avoid detection. As with OMTs, many instructors themselves are using chatbots, with Wang and Demszky (2023) citing a survey that found 51% of K-12 teachers already report using ChatGPT for instructional purposes—such as planning lessons and creating new materials to reinforce students’ prior knowledge—as well as 64% of teachers who intended to use ChatGPT in their future instruction.

Why Is This Important Research?

The adoption of new digital tools has wide-reaching implications for the ways learners interact with their instructor and the world around them. Instead of avoiding technology, instructors can familiarize students with digital tools that assist in both learning and using their TL, while still being mindful of the potential limitations and risks of unethical use of technology in an academic setting.

The Central Role of Digital Literacy

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages recognizes digital literacy in its description of the five Cs of language learning: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities (ACTFL, 2015, p. 77). ACTFL stresses the importance of educators fostering language learning through the strategic use of digital tools, while insisting on the critical role of technology to accompany, but not replace, human instruction and interactions. Benefits of using digital tools include communicating in the TL, learning about cultures, and acquiring skills to assist them in their future academic, professional, and personal lives (ACTFL, 2017). Pellet and Myers (2022) describe a now-existing triangular relationship between instructor, student, and computer, which, based on the authors’ input, instructors should embrace.

The importance of familiarizing students with online machine translation has been emphasized by numerous authors (e.g. Ducar & Schocket, 2018; Fredholm 2019; Lee, 2020; Mershell & Munné, 2022), with Alonso (2022) mentioning the ability to use OMTs as being an integral part to digital literacy. OMTs can allow students, particularly in beginning proficiency levels, to learn from authentic cultural texts in the TL that might otherwise be difficult or impossible for them to understand. Several studies have considered the effects of using online machine translation on student learning and writing performance. O’Neill (2019b) found that intermediate-level French and Spanish students who used Google Translate to aid in their writing scored higher overall in composition tasks than those did not use it. How well students perform when writing with the aid of OMTs may depend, in part, on the level. Mujtaba, Parkash, and Reynolds (2022) found that high proficiency learners using Google Translate demonstrated increased syntactic complexity, lexical complexity, as well as fluency in their writing, while low proficiency learners demonstrated improvement primarily on grammatical and lexical accuracy. Lo (2023) found that high proficiency learners showed evidence of expanded vocabulary, as gauged by measures of immediate and delayed vocabulary retention, whereas low proficiency learners demonstrated immediate vocabulary retention but not increased permanent retention of lexical forms overall. Multiple studies (e.g., Niño, 2008, 2009; García & Pena, 2011; Correa, 2014; Fredholm, 2019; Lee, 2020) have highlighted the role played by post-editing of online machine translation output in promoting linguistic awareness, such as differences between students’ L1 and L2, or how languages work more generally, and developing a more informed use of this technology.

Digital literacy is also a crucial component of dealing with AI chatbots. The Modern Language Association (MLA) and Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) state that “critical AI literacy is now part of digital literacy” (p. 11). Although recognizing that AI can play a beneficial role in language education, they call on instructors and institutions to prepare students for the risks involved in using AI chatbots. Potential problems include an overreliance on technology, the use of AI as a shortcut to learning, and missed opportunities to gain knowledge and skills through the processes of writing and reflection. Since many AI chatbots are trained primarily on English-language data, there are issues that instructors and learners should be aware of, such as potential cultural biases and more limited access to the benefits of AI technology for speakers and learners of other languages (Ji, Han, & Ko, 2022). In Lin et al.’s (2023) meta-analysis of articles on ChatGPT, whether information from the chatbot is incorrect or fabricated (commonly referred to as hallucinations), a loss of originality in student writing, diminished learner autonomy, a lack of critical thinking skills, and risks to privacy through possible data collection of the inputted text are chief concerns.

Beneficial use cases of AI chatbots are mentioned by several researchers (e.g., Huang et al., 2022; Ji et al., 2022; MLA & CCCC, 2023), such as providing explanations of vocabulary and linguistic structures, serving as a virtual language tutor, fostering independent learning, checking students’ grammar, and being a conversation partner who is available at all times. Huang et al. (2022) identified three aspects of chatbots that their meta-analysis of 25 studies found to be advantageous for learning: timeliness of receiving language input and assistance, ease of use to obtain language support and practice, and personalization of responses that are based on student level and the topics that the student has chosen to include in their prompts. Some benefits of chatbot usage by students, as found in experimental studies, have included improved performance on grammar assessments (Kim et al., 2019), better outlines in preparation for essay writing (Lin & Chang, 2020), higher self-confidence in using the TL to communicate with professors (Ayedoun, Hayashi, & Seta, 2015), and an increased perception that learning a language is a useful endeavor (Tegos et al., 2015).

The Issue of Academic Dishonesty

Despite policies by many instructors prohibiting the use of online machine translation, studies (e.g., Clifford, Merschel, & Munné, 2013; O’Neill, 2019a) have found that roughly nine out of 10 students use online machine translation despite instructor or institutional bans on OMTs. Jolley and Maimone (2022) found that instructors were only able to identify correctly 73% of the time if an OMT was used on a given task. Although this percentage may seem high at first glance, in a real-world scenario where OMTs were banned for graded work, an instructor would be wrong nearly three times out of 10 on average, either falsely sanctioning a student who had not used an OMT or not catching another who did in fact use one. The high rate of OMT usage, an inability of instructors to identify their use consistently, and possible advantages of using online machine translation have led several authors to propose changes in the way instructors approach OMTs.

AI chatbots can also be used by language students in manners that are inconsistent with academic integrity. Learners who are particularly crafty can tell the chatbot to produce text that simulates a specific proficiency level (Frances and Zimotti, 2023), even instructing it to make mistakes typical of a language learner at that level, to avoid detection by their instructor. This technique may be particularly challenging for online instructors to identify since they may be less familiar with language skills of online students as compared to students in offline courses. Since it is difficult, if not impossible, to establish whether a student has used OMTs or AI chatbots, instructors and institutions might reconsider their approach to assessing academic dishonesty by minimizing the number of opportunities for the abuse of such technology and by guiding students in responsible technology use that supports, instead of replaces, learning.

How Can This Research Be Implemented in Practice?

Teachers play a pivotal role in setting the groundwork for how students approach the process of learning with digital tools. Instead of creating an atmosphere of mistrust between the learner and instructor (MLA & CCCC, 2023), teachers can utilize technology as an opportunity to empower students to make decisions that further their learning, while creating an open dialogue between instructor and student. In addition to developing syllabus statements and policies explicitly laying out what acceptable uses of technology are (e.g. O’Neill, 2019a; Jolley & Maimone, 2022; Alonso, 2022), instructors can introduce students to OMTs and AI chatbots to enhance their digital literacy.

Training Students in How (Not) to Use OMTs

Developing assessments that account for potential use of online machine translation is one possible solution. Henshaw (2020) proposes redesigning courses to offer different assessment types: low stakes (e.g., discussion forum posts) worth less of the overall course grade for which a student might use an OMT; medium stakes (e.g., oral presentations) where a student might use online machine translation for preparation, but not for the final product; and higher-stake summative assignments (e.g., synchronous oral interviews) worth a larger portion of the grade for which OMT use is impossible. Other approaches include survey and reflection (Merschel & Munné, 2021); Guided Use of Machine Translation, or GUMT (Ryu et al. 2022); and Amend, Discuss, Assess, Practice, and Train, or ADAPT (Knowles, 2022). Such approaches often involve adjusting activity types or rubrics to account for OMT use, while training students in how to use online machine translation in a thoughtful, informed manner. Students can be guided as they develop the skills needed to deal with digital tools, in particular

OMTs (Urlaub & Dessein, 2022). As Ducar and Schocket (2018) state, “The issue then is not whether instructors can prevent learners from consulting such technologies, but rather how to help learners understand that positive progress toward greater proficiency and ethical use of technologies are critical 21st-century skills” (p. 15).

Conclusion

Working with, and not against, Chatbots

Despite calls by some instructors to ban ChatGPT, various strategies have been proposed to take advantage of modern chatbots like ChatGPT for preparing instructional materials or evaluating student work (e.g. Haristiani, 2019; Lin et al., 2023; Frances & Zimotti, 2023; MLA & CCCC, 2023). In a short amount of time, an instructor can generate comprehension questions for a text, write a vocabulary list as scaffolding for a text students are about to read, craft lesson plans, write models to highlight specific structures, create study guides, and more. Tlili, Shehata, Adarkwah, Bozkurt, Hickey, Huang, and Agyemang (2023) encourage widespread adoption of AI chatbots, stating that educators should “facilitate the adoption of ChatGPT in schools and universities” (p. 19).

Application: Pedagogical Activity

Five-Step Approach to OMTs

The following is an adapted version of a five-step online training module (O’Neill, 2016, 2019b) used to prepare students for responsible, informed usage of OMTs for their course-work and beyond.

Five-step online machine translator training

- 1 Introduction to the tool
- 2 Demonstration of how the tool works
- 3 Testing of the tool through examples
- 4 Review of the tool’s strengths and weaknesses
- 5 Explanation of the instructor’s policy on the tool.

This type of activity can be followed with a more in-depth look at advanced OMT features or a discussion to raise awareness of linguistic features of the TL or how languages work more broadly. A similar approach could be used for other digital tools, e.g. AI chatbots. It is recommended for instructors to do any translation training activities themselves shortly before using them with students since the interface and output from digital tools often change.

Introduction: Bonjour! This self-guided training lesson will introduce you to some basics related to online translation and Google Translate. Whether you have used Google Translate or not before, please complete all activities to receive credit.

- 1 What is Google Translate, and what does it do?

Google Translate is an online translator. Online translators are web-based tools that allow the user to instantly translate text (a word, a phrase, a sentence, or a paragraph) from one language to another.

The Fine Line between Digital Literacy and Academic Dishonesty

A What are some advantages of online translators?

- 1 They are free of charge and available to everyone.
- 2 You just enter a word, phrase, sentence, paragraph in one language...and it gives you an instant translation in the other language.
- 3 Sometimes—but not always—they can produce translations that are correct or close enough to be understood.
- 4 Online translators—unlike dictionaries—try to choose the right words for you and do the grammar (conjugation, gender, etc.) for you.
- 5 Recently, many online translators (including Google Translate) offer some choices of translations to pick from or additional info to help you edit the translation you get.

B Which of these advantages seems the most important to you? (Select one or more answers)

- Online translators are free
- Possible to get instant translation of texts
- Sometimes correct or at least understandable
- Tries to do grammar for me
- Choices and info to help edit the translation
- Other (please specify): _____

C What are some *disadvantages* of online translators?

- 1 Online translators are often unable to detect context, so the translation you get might not be appropriate to that situation.
- 2 They automatically translate text, which means some people do not think about the meaning or accuracy of the words that come out.
- 3 Sometimes—but not always—they can make mistakes in choosing the right words or grammar. This can make the text hard or even impossible to understand.
- 4 Online translators—unlike a good dictionary—often do not have enough detailed information or sample sentences to help you choose the right words or forms.
- 5 Many instructors consider using a translator to be cheating because you are not doing the work by yourself, because of the mistakes translators can make, or for other reasons.

D Which of these disadvantages seems the most important to you? (Select one or more answers)

- Online translators can have troubles knowing the right context
- People do not always think about what comes out of the translator
- They can make mistakes with vocab or grammar
- They often have less information or examples than a good dictionary
- It is often considered to be cheating
- Other (please specify): _____

E Based on the information above, which one of these answers is true about online translators?

- Translators are always perfect, so I should always trust what comes out of them
- Translators are always wrong, so I should never trust them
- Translators are exactly the same as dictionaries: it is just a bunch of words after all
- Translators are sometimes right, sometimes partially right, and sometimes wrong

2 How to use Google Translate — the basics

Now we are going to try out a few examples in Google Translate just so you get an idea of what sorts of things Google Translate does well and what it does poorly.

- 1 In your web browser, go to <http://translate.google.com>. You will see two big text boxes.
- 2 Above the box on the left, click on the word “English” / “Anglais”.
- 3 Above the box on the right, click on the word “French” / “Français”. If French is not there, click on the ∨ button and choose “French” / “Français” from the list.
- 4 Type in any text you want to translate in the box on the left.
- 5 Your results will pop up automatically on the right as you type. That’s it! We will talk about some more advanced features in a future activity.

A To practice, type or paste these sentences into Google Translate in the box on the left EXACTLY as they appear and then type or paste the translation that appears in the box on the right of Google Translate.

- 1 What time is it?

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

- 2 the bill

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

- 3 Where are you from?

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

- 4 Its Friday, so we are going to sea thier parents. [Make sure to include the misspellings]

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

5 I like my new friend. She is nice.

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

6 She ghosted him.

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

7 He woke up at 5 a.m.

How do you think the translator did?

- The output is correct for all situations.
- It could be correct, but maybe not—it really depends on the context.
- It is partly correct, but there is a mistake or two.
- It is mostly or completely incorrect due to a major error(s).

B Answers and discussion—Here is what Google got right or wrong:

- 1 Google Translate gave a translation that should work in all typical situations. CORRECT.
- 2 The translator gave one possible translation, for a legislative bill in Parliament, but the word “bill” can mean other things depending on the context (the bill at a restaurant = l’addition, etc.). DEPENDS ON THE CONTEXT.
- 3 The translator gave a translation for a formal situation (“D’où venez-vous?”), but “Tu viens d’où?” would be more appropriate in an informal setting. DEPENDS ON THE CONTEXT.
- 4 Google Translate often recognizes and correctly translates misspellings, including in this sentence. CORRECT.
- 5 “J’aime mon nouvel ami. Elle est gentille” is PARTLY CORRECT. In the first sentence, Google Translate assumes a male friend, but in the second, it switches to feminine forms.
- 6 “Elle l’a fantôme” is not correct: fantôme is not a verb, and even if it were, this would not be the correct form (a past participle would be needed). MOSTLY OR COMPLETELY INCORRECT.
- 7 Google Translate gave a translation that should work in all typical situations. CORRECT.

C Summary

Google Translate got some of the sample sentences completely right, but other times gave a wrong answer or an answer that may only be right in some contexts. In many

cases, it may be easier or better if you use your own French knowledge. If you do use an online translator, it is important to be aware of potential errors and use it intelligently: instead of taking the output as is, you should think about the forms, vocabulary, and meaning of the translated text for a given situation in French and be ready to change or reject Google Translate's output using your own knowledge or other authorized resources, such as an online dictionary.

D Now, try out something on your own to say in French.

Think a complex or difficult phrase/sentence in English, and type it into Google Translate. Then, using your knowledge of French and the help that Google Translate gives you, come up with what you think is the best way to say it in French.

1 What was your original phrase/sentence in English?

2 What was Google Translate's output in French for this phrase/sentence?

3 Using Google's translation and your own knowledge, what would be your best translation of the phrase/sentence in French?

4 Which of these did you use to help you get your translation? Choose all the options that apply.

Google's translation in the box on the right side of the page

Other information on Google Translate

A English–French/French–English dictionary

A French–French dictionary

My textbook

My own knowledge of French

Other (please specify): _____

5 How do you think you and Google Translate did? Choose the answer that is closest to what your experience was.

I think Google's translation was already right, so I did not change anything

I think it was close, so I just changed it a little

I think it was pretty far off, so I changed it a lot

I think it was completely wrong, so I put something completely different

I am really not sure if it was right, so I just left it as it was

I am really not sure if it was right, so I put something different

3 What strengths and weaknesses does Google Translate have?

Based on what we just saw, online translators can have mixed results. If you know what translators generally are good at doing or what they are bad at doing, it can help you to use them more responsibly and effectively in a given situation.

A What online translators can do well often (but not always)?

1 Translate words in isolation that have only one meaning.

2 Translate words in context that have a small number of common, clear/distinct meanings.

- 3 Translate many common expressions correctly or with the right general idea.
- 4 Make basic grammatical agreement between nouns and nearby adjectives and verbs in the same sentence.
- 5 Translate common verb tenses correctly, especially when the same tense is used for that situation in French and English.
- 6 Give at least a general idea or “gist” of the meaning of a sentence or longer passage.

B Which one of the strengths do you think is most important for students to remember? Please answer briefly (1–2 sentences)

C What online translators cannot do or often have problems doing.

- 1 Translate words in isolation that have many meanings or uses.
- 2 Translate words, sometimes even in context, that have many meanings.
- 3 Translate less common or more recent expressions correctly.
- 4 Make grammatical agreement between nouns, verbs, and adjectives that are not close to each other, such as in a different sentence.
- 5 Translate tenses reliably that are different between French and English.
- 6 Give a fool-proof translation that does not need to be reviewed or edited.

D Which one of the weaknesses do you think is most important for students to remember? Please answer briefly (1–2 sentences).

4 What is my instructor’s policy on if/when to use this tool?

A **IN GENERAL:** You should always try on your own first. Using what you already know is the best way to practice and learn things at this level.

B **ONE WORD:** If it is a complicated word that you do not know yet, instead of using a translator:

- 1 try a simpler word you know or rewording.

gorgeous => beautiful => (très) belle;
a plethora of => a lot of => beaucoup de; etc.

- 2 look in your textbook in the current or previous units, or in the glossary at the end.
- 3 use WordReference (<http://wordreference.com>), looking carefully at the examples and usage notes to make sure you are picking the right word(s). Do not forget to put any word(s) in the right form for what you are saying (masculine/feminine, verb conjugations, etc.)

C **A PHRASE OR PART OF A SENTENCE**

If it is a longer, complicated thought:

- 1 try simpler words you know or rewording using words or expressions you already know.

He has an expansive knowledge. => Il est intelligent, etc.

- 2 look in your textbook in the current or previous units or in the index or glossary at the end to find words, structures, or expressions that can help.

- 3 use WordReference (<http://wordreference.com>), looking carefully at the examples and usage notes to make sure you are picking the right word(s). Do not forget to put any word(s) in the right form for what you are saying (masculine/feminine, verb conjugations, etc.)

D If you use Google Translate, you must cite it as a source and follow these guidelines:

- 1 You should use it sparingly to translate just one expression or one full sentence at a time.
- 2 If you need Google Translate for more than an occasional phrase or sentence, that means you should make things much simpler to help you practice with language you are already learning or that is more helpful for your current level of French.
- 3 Your work should be understandable by you and by other students at your current level of French. If you do not know what Google is saying, or it is using advanced vocabulary or structures that we have never used in class, you should not include it in your work.
- 4 On certain assessments, including quizzes and exams, Google Translate is not allowed. The instructions for those assignments will clearly state this, and you will be reminded before you start the assessment.
- 5 If you are ever unsure about what tools are or are not allowed, or how to use them, you should contact your instructor immediately before using them on any graded work.

E Just two more items for this training!

- 1 I have completed the training and understand basic information on how online translators work and how best to use (or not use) them.
 Yes, I'm good to go!
 No, I'm going to go back and review.
- 2 True or False: If you ever have questions on what you can or can't do on an assignment, or how to do it, you should ask your instructor for guidance BEFORE doing it.
 True
 False

By submitting this assignment, you agree to this class's policy on online translators.

Questions for Further Reflection and Discussion

The use of digital tools has implications for language students and their instructors. The following questions can lead to reflection and discussion of the nature of digital tools for WLI and the implications for academic integrity.

- 1 Why do some experts consider digital literacy to be an integral part of language learning in the 21st century?
- 2 In what ways do digital tools such as online machine translators and AI chatbots represent a new challenge for academic integrity?
- 3 What are some areas in which OMTs represent an opportunity for language learners and instructors? What are some risks of using this technology?
- 4 How can AI chatbots be used by learners to support their learning? What are some ways that educators might use AI chatbots to enhance instruction?
- 5 What approach would you take to foster students' digital literacy, while being mindful to avoid potential risks to academic integrity and to learning?

References

- Alonso, A. N. (2022). Online translators in online language assessments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(3), 115–135.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2015). *World-readiness standards for learning languages*. ACTFL.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2017). *Position statement: The role of technology in language learning*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/news/the-role-of-technology-in-language-learning>
- Ayedoun, E., Hayashi, Y., & Seta, K. (2015). A conversational agent to encourage willingness to communicate in the context of English as a foreign language. *Procedia Computer Science*, 60, 1433–1442.
- Clifford, J., Merschel, L., & Munné, J. (2013). Surveying the landscape: What is the role of machine translation in language learning? @ *tic. revista d'innovació educativa*, 10, 108–121.
- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61, 228–239.
- Correa, M. (2014). Leaving the “peer” out of peer-editing: Online translators as a pedagogical tool in the Spanish as a second language classroom. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning (LACLIL)*, 7(1), 1–20.
- 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.
- Faber, A., & Turrero Garcia, M. (2020). Online translators as a pedagogical tool. *The FLTMAG*. Retrieved from <https://fltmag.com/online-translators-as-a-pedagogical-tool/>
- Frances, C., & Zimotti, G. (2023). Robots vs. humans: Does ChatGPT pose a challenge to second language writing? *The FLTMAG*. Retrieved from <https://fltmag.com/chatgpt-second-language-writing/>
- Fredholm, K. (2019). Effects of Google translate on lexical diversity: Vocabulary development among learners of Spanish as a foreign language. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de las Lenguas*, 13(26), 98–117.
- Garcia, I. & Pena, M. I. (2011). Machine translation-assisted language learning: Writing for beginners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(5), 471–487.
- Ghafar, Z. N., Salh, H. F., Abdulrahim, M. A., Farxha, S. S., Arf, S. F., & Rahim, R. I. (2023). The role of artificial intelligence technology on English language learning: A literature review. *Canadian Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 3(2), 17–31.
- Goh, E. (2013). Plagiarism behavior among undergraduate students in hospitality and tourism education. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 13(4), 307–322.
- Haristiani, N. (2019). Artificial Intelligence (AI) chatbot as language learning medium: An inquiry. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1387(1), 012020.
- Henshaw, F. (2020). Online translators in language classes: Pedagogical and practical considerations. *The FLTMAG*. <https://www.doi.org/10.69732/SFBF9402>
- Hostetter, A., Call, N., Frazier, G., James, T., Linnertz, C., Nestle, E., & Tucci, M. (2023). Student and faculty perceptions of artificial intelligence in student writing. *Teaching of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/7dnk9>.
- Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2022). Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(1), 237–257.
- Ji, H., Han, L., & Ko, Y. (2022). A systematic review of conversational ai in language education: Focusing on the collaboration with human teachers. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 55(1), 48–63.
- Jolley, J. R., & Maimone, L. (2015). Free online machine translation: Use and perceptions by Spanish students and instructors. In A.J. Moeller (Ed.), *Learn Languages, Explore Cultures, Transform Lives* (pp. 181–200). Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Jolley, J. R., & Maimone, L. (2022). Thirty years of machine translation in language teaching and learning: A review of the literature. *L2 Journal*, 14(1), 26–44.
- Kasneji, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., & Kasneji, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
- Kenny, D. (Ed.) (2022). *Machine translation for everyone: Empowering users in the age of artificial intelligence*. Language Science Press.
- Kim, N.-Y., Cha, Y., & Kim, H.-S. (2019). Future English learning: Chatbots and artificial intelligence. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 22(3), 32–53.

- Knowles, C. L. (2022). Using an ADAPT approach to integrate Google Translate into the second language classroom. *L2 Journal*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/L214151690>
- Kochmar, E., Burstein, J., Horbach, A., Laarmann-Quante, R., Madnani, N., Tack, A., Wang, R. E., & Demszky, D. (2023). Is ChatGPT a good teacher coach? Measuring zero-shot performance for scoring and providing actionable insights on classroom instruction. In *Proceedings of the 18th workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications (BEA 2023)*.
- Lee, S. M. (2020). The impact of using machine translation on EFL students' writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 157–175.
- Lee, S. M. (2023). The effectiveness of machine translation in foreign language education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(1–2), 103–125.
- Lin, M. P.-C., & Chang, D. (2020). Enhancing post-secondary writers' writing skills with a chatbot. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 23(1), 78–92.
- Lin, S. M., Chung, H. H., Chung, F. L., & Lan, Y. J. (2023). Concerns About Using ChatGPT in Education. In *International Conference on Innovative Technologies and Learning* (pp. 37–49). Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Loock, R., & Léchauguette, S. (2021). Machine translation literacy and undergraduate students in applied languages: Report on an exploratory study. *Revista Tradumàtica: tecnologies de la traducció*, 19, 204–225.
- Luton, L. (2003). If the computer did my homework, how come I didn't get an "A"? *The French Review*, 76(4), 766–770.
- McCarthy, B. (2004). Does online machine translation spell the end of take-home translation assignments? *CALL-EJ Online*, 6(1), 26–39.
- Merschel, L., & Munné, J. (2022). Perceptions and practices of machine translation among 6th-12th grade world language teachers. *L2 Journal*, 14(1), 60–76.
- Mujtaba, S. M., Parkash R., & Reynolds, B. L. (2022). The effects of language proficiency and online translator training on second language writing complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexical complexity. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ)*, 23(1), 150–167.
- MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI. (2023). MLA-CCCC joint task force on writing and AI working paper: Overview of the issues, statement of principles, and recommendations. Retrieved from <https://aiandwriting.hcommons.org/working-paper-1>
- Niño, A. (2008). Evaluating the use of machine translation post-editing in the foreign language class. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(1), 29–49
- Niño, A. (2009). Machine Translation in foreign language learning: language learners' perceptions and tutors' perceptions of its advantages and disadvantages. *ReCALL Journal* 21(2), 241–258.
- Niño, A. (2020). Exploring the use of online machine translation for independent language learning. *Research in Learning Technology*, 28, 280.
- O'Brien, S. (2022). How to deal with errors in machine translation: Post-editing. *Machine Translation for Everyone: Empowering Users in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, 18, 105.
- O'Neill, E. M. (2016). Measuring the impact of online translation on FL writing scores. *IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 46(2), 1–39.
- O'Neill, E. M. (2019a). Online translator, dictionary, and search engine use among L2 students. *CALL-EJ: Computer-Assisted Language Learning–Electronic Journal*, 20(1), 154–177.
- O'Neill, E. M. (2019b). Training students to use online translators and dictionaries: The impact on second language writing scores. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 8(2), 47–65.
- Pavela, G. (1997). Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. *JC & UL*, 24, 97.
- Rahman, M. M., & Watanobe, Y. (2023). ChatGPT for education and research: Opportunities, threats, and strategies. *Applied Sciences*, 13(9), 5783.
- Ryu, J., Kim, Y., Park, S., Eum, S., Chun, S., & Yang, S. (2022). Exploring foreign language students' perceptions of the guided use of machine translation (GUMT) model for Korean writing. *L2 Journal*, 14(1), 136–165.
- Tegos, S., Demetriadis, S., & Karakostas, A. (2015). Promoting academically productive talk with conversational agent interventions in collaborative learning settings. *Computers & Education*, 87, 309–325.

The Fine Line between Digital Literacy and Academic Dishonesty

- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(1), 15.
- Urlaub, P., & Desein, E. (2022). From disrupted classrooms to human-machine collaboration? The Pocket Calculator, Google Translate, and the future of language education. *L2 Journal*, 14(1), 45–59.
- Yan, D. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 13943–13967.
- Yang, J., & Lange, E. D. (1998). SYSTRAN on Alta Vista: A user study on real-time machine translation on the Internet. In D. Farwell et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the association for machine translation in the Americas* (pp. 275–285). Springer Verlag.