Lire Journal (Journal of Linguistics and Literature)
https://lirejournal.ubb.ac.id/index.php/LRJ/index
P-ISSN: 2598-1803 E-ISSN: 2581-2130
Volume 9 Number 3 2025

EFL STUDENTS' ACCEPTANCE OF DEEPL TRANSLATION: A TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL STUDY

Reihayyu Dwi Cahyani[1], Syamdianita[2], Aridah[3],Weningtyas Parama Iswari[4], & Ichi Ahada[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]*English Education Department, Mulawarman University*

Corresponding Author: Reihayyu Dwi Cahyani, E-mail: reihayyudwi@gmail,com

ARTICLE INFO
Received: 22-09-2025
Revised:13-10-2025
Accepted:04-11-2025
Published: 11-11-2025
Volume: 9
Issue: 3
DOI:
https://doi.org/10.33019/lire.v9i3.535

KEYWORDS

DeepL, English as Foreign Language, Machine Translation, Technology Acceptance Model, User experience, Qualitative Research, University Students.

ABSTRACT

This study applied the Technology Acceptance Modes (TAM)framework to investigates university EFL students' acceptance of DeepL machine translation tool, focusing on how frequency of use influences their perceptions. A descriptive qualitative approach was used involving purposive sampling of four students in semi-structured interviews. A short questionnaire was administered beforehand to classify participants into two categories, two frequent and two infrequent DeepL users. of the machine translation tool DeepL in the context of learning English as Foreign Language (EFL), involving four participants (two frequent users and two infrequent users). The results showed that frequent users found DeepL valuable for vocabulary acquisition, translation accuracy, and academic writing support, whereas infrequent users highlighted limitations such as the lack of a paraphrasing feature and issues with formality. These differences suggest that usage frequency significantly impacts perceived usefulness and ease of use of the tool. This study is among the first to extend the TAM framework to a machine translation tool like DeepL, addressing a gap in MT research by examining the role of usage frequency. The findings offer both theoretical and practical significance, providing insights into how MT tools can be more effectively integrated into EFL learning.

1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed various domains of human activity, including education (Russell & Norvig, 2020). In the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning, AI integration has enabled students to overcome challenges in understanding and producing the target language, fostering more efficient learning processes. One of the most influential AI powered tools in this context is Machine Translation (MT).

MT tools, such as Google Translate and Microsoft Translator, have become popular due to their ability to enhance vocabulary learning, improve writing, and aid in reading comprehension (Zuhairo & Kembaren, 2024). In the context of EFL learning, MT offers several benefits for students. Students being able to understand class material, improve performance, and develop specialized skills such as vocabulary and grammar (Utimadini, 2023).

There are many studies that show students' increased appreciation of this tool. Prayoga (2022) highlighted the value of instant translation and ease of use, while (Safitri, Dewi, & Ramadhan, 2024) found that DeepL was preferred over Google Translate or ChatGPT because of its editing features. (O'Neill, 2012, as cited in Tsai, 2019) says that users produce fewer

grammatical errors, and studies by (Wang & Ke, 2022) confirm that DeepL improves writing quality, reduces errors, and supports the revision process in academic contexts.

Despite these findings, most previous studies have focused on the quality of MT output or comparisons between translation tools, rather than how students' frequency of use affects their perceptions and acceptance of these technologies. This aspect is crucial because frequent users tend to develop greater familiarity, trust, and reliance on the tool compared to those who only use it sometimes. To analyze these differences, this study employs the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989), which examines technology adoption based on two primary factors: Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU).

Therefore, this study aims to explore EFL students' acceptance of DeepL by analysing how frequent and infrequent users of the service perceive its usefulness and ease of use within the TAM framework. This focus on frequency of use and TAM provides a clearer understanding of how patterns shape attitudes toward machine translation tools, addressing a gap in previous research that has rarely considered this aspect.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Machine Translation (MT) refers to the use of computer software to convert text from a source language into a target language. Machine translation is defined as an automated system that translates between natural languages (Hutchins & Somers, 1992; Arnold et al., 1994, as cited in Sipayung, 2021), including with or without human involvement (Andriola, 2024). Machine translation (MT) technology has undergone significant improvements, resulting in more advanced and accurate translation tools.

Unlike previous MT systems that use word-by-word translation, Neural Machine Translation (NMT) processes entire sentences, resulting in more accurate and natural-sounding translations (Hutchins & Somers, 1992) and one tool that utilizes this technology is DeepL. (Deguchi, Tamura, & Ninomiya, 2019) developed a translation model that considers the relationship between words in the source and target sentences to produce more accurate translations. Kamaluddin, Rasyid, Abqoriyyah, & Saehu, 2024 confirmed that DeepL shows superior performance compared to other MT tools, especially in terms of fluency and context accuracy, while Bunga and Katemba (2024) found that DeepL is more effective than Google Translate. Asmara and Kembaren (2024) highlighted that DeepL helps maintain coherence between source and translated texts, making it highly beneficial for academic writing. Similarly, Raben et al. (2024) reported that students found DeepL helpful in translating academic texts from Indonesian to English, improving overall translation quality

This research uses the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as the framework to investigate students' acceptance of DeepL, a model proposed by Davis (1989) a key determinant that influences user acceptance of a technology. This framework can be used to analyze student usage behavior when using DeepL with two primary factors influence a student's acceptance of a new technology, Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU). Kamaluddin et al. (2024) revealed that attitudes towards this application were influenced by the frequency of using that application and perceived academic utility of that application. The general users are also likely to have more trust in its accuracy and usability while occasional users are more conservative in their opinions. This was also supported by Asmara & Kembaren (2024) who

demonstrated that the positive user perceptions were significantly affected by the users' prior experience with DeepL in an academic context.

Previous studies on DeepL have mostly focused on evaluating the quality of translation output, including lexical and grammatical accuracy, or comparing DeepL with other machine translation tools such as Google Translate. Few studies have examined how EFL learners' frequency of use shapes their acceptance and experiences through TAM. Therefore, the contribution of this study lies in addressing two specific gaps: (1) the lack of investigation into user perceptions based on frequency of use, and (2) the limited theoretical foundation in previous studies on DeepL perceptions.

In line with these objectives, this study generates the following research questions:

(1) How do frequent and infrequent student users perceive the usefulness and ease of use of DeepL in English translation?

(2) What challenges and future usage intentions do students have when using DeepL, based on their frequency of use?

Hence, the main purpose of this study is to explore university students' perceptions of DeepL in terms of its practicality and usefulness in translation tasks, as well as to examine how frequency of use affects their experiences and expectations. The novelty of this study lies in its focus on DeepL with frequency of use and the underlying TAM theory to provide a better understanding of how students interact with machine translation technology

3. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a descriptive qualitative research approach to investigate students' opinions on the use of DeepL Translator in English translation assignments. The focus was on gaining an in-depth understanding of participants' experiences, attitudes, and perceived challenges. Although a short questionnaire was administered, the study remained qualitative in nature because the questionnaire was used solely for descriptive purposes, specifically to categorize participants as frequent or infrequent users and to provide contextual background for the interviews. No statistical hypothesis testing or inferential analysis was conducted, and the primary data source was the semi-structured interviews. This approach aligns with recommendations in qualitative research that allow the use of supplementary instruments, such as surveys, for participant profiling and triangulation without changing the core qualitative orientation (Creswell, 2013).

The research participants were four undergraduate students in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) program, aged between 21 and 22, all of them studying English Education at Mulawarman University. Purposive sampling was used to select students who had experience using DeepL for academic translation. The small sample size was chosen to allow a deeper, case-focused exploration of each participant's experiences and how they make meaning, consistent with Creswell's (2013) guidance that qualitative inquiry emphasizes depth over breadth. In qualitative studies, a small, information-rich sample is considered sufficient when it achieves data adequacy and thematic saturation rather than statistical representation (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006; Hennink & Kaiser, 2022).

Two main instruments were used to collect data: semi-structured interviews and a short questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of five questions. After completing the questionnaire to determine frequency of use, students were interviewed to explore their experiences with

DeepL in greater depth. Participants were divided into frequent and infrequent users based on the questionnaire results. Frequent users were defined as those who used DeepL more than three times per week, while infrequent users were those who used it less than twice a week. The semi-structured interviews provided rich narrative data about students' perceptions. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), created by Davis in 1989, is the foundation for this study. It places a strong emphasis on Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), or the perceived advantages and simplicity of utilizing the technology. Along with these two elements, this study also examined the difficulties students encountered (Challenges) and their Behavioral Intention (BI) to keep using DeepL.

The acquired data was examined using a combination of theme analysis to uncover interview data and descriptive statistics to describe frequency and usage patterns from the questionnaire. The interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis following the six-phase framework proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006): (1) familiarization with data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the report. Coding was conducted manually by two independent researchers to ensure analytic reliability. Differences in coding were discussed and resolved collaboratively until full agreement was reached. Descriptive information from the questionnaire was used to support participant classification and contextual interpretation of themes. This method made it possible to fully comprehend how students felt about using DeepL in an academic EFL setting.

Ethical considerations were addressed by obtaining informed consent from all participants before data collection. Participants were assured of confidentiality, anonymity through pseudonyms, and voluntary participation. Data collection took place between March 2025 and May 2025

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Perceived Usefulness (PU)

Within the TAM framework, *Perceived Usefulness (PU)* reflects how much users believe that a technology enhances their performance or productivity. In this study, students consistently described DeepL as a tool that improves their translation outcomes and supports their English learning process. Three major themes emerged: vocabulary learning support, translation accuracy, and academic utility.

a. Vocabulary Learning Support

One of the main benefits of DeepL recognized by the students was its ability to support vocabulary learning. Frequent users emphasized that DeepL helps them expand vocabulary knowledge during translation tasks. As one participant stated, *"Kayak nyari tahu vocab aja... kalau nemu vocab yang nggak tahu, aku bakal ke DeepL"* [I usually check DeepL when I find new vocabulary] (P1, R6). Another added, *"Pas aku cari di DeepL, artinya 'tempat untuk berbaring,' jadi aku tahu 'bed-ridden' dari situ"* [When I checked in DeepL, I found out that 'bed-ridden' means 'a place to lie down'] (P1, R20). Participant 1 showing that students rely on DeepL for immediate vocabulary discovery and showing how DeepL contributes to vocabulary acquisition incidentally. These statements show that DeepL not only helps students understand the meaning of texts, but also indirectly helps them enrich their vocabulary.

b. Translation Accuracy

Both frequent and infrequent users agreed that DeepL produces more contextually appropriate and accurate translations than other MT tools. Participant 2 noted, *"DeepL lebih akurat... bisa dipilih sesuai konteks"* [DeepL is more accurate and can be adjusted based on context] (P2, R23), while Participant 3 emphasized that *"Hasil terjemahannya akurat dan mudah dimengerti"* [The translation is accurate and easy to understand] (P3, R9). In addition to supporting vocabulary learning, students also considered the advantages in terms of translation accuracy, especially compared to other translators. All four participants mentioned translation accuracy (2 frequent & 2 infrequent), but frequent users highlighted contextual fit, while infrequent users highlighted clarity and comprehensibility. This shows how DeepL provides grammatically correct translations that are easily understood by users.

c. Academic Utility

DeepL is also useful for academic writing when students need to use formal language and be more structured. Participant 2 mentioned, *"DeepL untuk keperluan akademik seperti menerjemahkan ke dalam bahasa Inggris atau bahasa Inggris yang sulit saya pahami seperti di artikel atau di jurnal"* [I use DeepL for academic purposes such as translating articles or difficult journal texts] (P2, R2). Similarly, Participant 4 explained, *"If I want to be more formal, like in academic writing, maybe I use DeepL"* (P4, R9). This indicates that DeepL can producing structured, formal, and academic style texts. Two participants from frequent and infrequent users referred to this academic benefit, showing it is valued across both user types.

In summary, participants viewed DeepL as a useful tool that enhances their learning outcomes, translation accuracy, and academic efficiency. This aligns with the core construct of *Perceived Usefulness* in TAM (Davis, 1989), emphasizing the degree to which technology contributes to improved task performance.

4.2 Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)

In the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), *Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)* refers to the degree to which a person believes that using a technology requires minimal effort (Davis, 1989). Across interviews, both frequent and infrequent users' appreciation for the user-friendly interface, and its uncomplicated components that enhance the speed and convenience of translation is highlighted. Two dominant themes emerged: speed and accessibility, and customization features. The following extract indicates how students evaluated the simple use of DeepL in their daily practice.

a. Speed and Accessibility

Students highlighted DeepL's straightforward design and fast response as factors that make it easy to use in daily academic tasks. Participant 4 noted, *"DeepL salah satu yang tercepat untuk dibuka"* [DeepL is one of the fastest to open] (P4, R3), while Participant 3 added, *"Tinggal tempel teks, langsung diterjemahkan"* [Just paste the text and it translates immediately] (P3, R17). These statements from both infrequent users highlighted speed and accessibility DeepL's interface and processing speed minimize the technical barriers to use. In the context of TAM, such perceptions reinforce *ease of use* by reducing cognitive and procedural effort

b. Customization Features

In addition to easy access and speed, participants appreciate the flexibility that DeepL in allowing users to adjust translations according to their specific needs. This aligns with TAM's

notion that ease of use is enhanced when users feel they have control over the technology. Participant 2 stated, "Kosa katanya bisa diatur sesuai kalimat yang diinginkan" [The vocabulary can be adjusted according to the desired sentence] (P2, R12), indicating that students appreciate having agency over their translation outputs rather than being limited to a single automated result. Similarly, Participant 1 added, "Bisa paraphrase dengan menekan satu kata" [Can paraphrase by pressing one word] (P1, R28). These customization features were emphasized by both frequent users, suggesting that the ability to refine translations directly within the interface contributes significantly to their perception of ease of use. In TAM terms, such features reduce the effort needed to achieve desired outcomes, thereby strengthening PEOU and encouraging continued adoption.

4.3 Challenges

Despite the many benefits perceived by frequent and infrequent users of DeepL, some participants also mentioned many limitations to its use. Some of the challenges relate to functional limitations, translation styles that are not always contextually appropriate, and the efficiency of its use for certain tasks. These challenges were more strongly expressed by infrequent users, suggesting that unfulfilled expectations may contribute to lower adoption rates. Three main themes emerged from the interviews: feature gaps, formality issues, and efficiency barriers.

a. Feature Gaps

One of the challenges faced by participants was the no automatic paraphrasing feature. DeepL offers a selection of synonyms for a particular word, but some participants felt this feature is not enough to reorganize an entire sentence. Participant 4 expressed, "DeepL enggak punya fitur paraphrase" [DeepL doesn't have a paraphrase feature] (P4, R23), indicating frustration with the tool's limited functionality for academic writing tasks that demand varied expression. This concern was echoed by Participant 3, who noted, "Harus mengubah kata per kata untuk paraphrase" [Have to change word by word to paraphrase] (P3, R20), suggesting that the paraphrasing process is still manual and inefficient to use when rewriting longer texts. Both participants were infrequent users, highlighting that the lack of comprehensive paraphrasing capability is a critical barrier for those seeking more versatile features. From a TAM perspective, this feature gap diminishes perceived usefulness, as the tool does not fully meet users' academic needs, potentially discouraging continued use among students who require diverse writing support.

b. Formality Issues

In addition to feature limitations, some students complained about the linguistic style of the deep translation being too formal for certain contexts, especially when used in daily conversation and non-academic writing. "DeepL masih terlalu formal untuk saya" [DeepL is still too formal for me] (P4, R5), indicating that the tool's default register may not be suitable for casual or conversational writing. Showing that style mismatches are more problematic for casual use than for academic purpose. This perception reflects a mismatch between the tool's output and user expectations in different contexts. Although DeepL's formal tone has advantages for academic writing, as mentioned earlier, it becomes a limitation when users need a more flexible or informal style. This concern was expressed by an infrequent user. In TAM terms, this

represents a limitation on perceived usefulness, as the tool's inability to adapt can reduce its feasibility in various writing tasks. As Kamaluddin et al. (2024) noted, machine translation tools still face difficulties with texts requiring nuanced cultural or stylistic understanding, and this example reinforces the need for greater linguistic flexibility in DeepL's translation outputs.

c. Efficiency Barriers

Participant 3 expressed, "Tidak ingin membuka tab baru untuk DeepL" [Don't want to open a new tab for DeepL] (P3, R5), suggesting that the need to navigate away from the primary workspace creates friction in the user experience. This sentiment was reinforced when the same participant compared DeepL unfavorably to alternatives: "Jadi, di chat GPT itu lebih instan daripada di DeepL" [So, in ChatGPT it's more instant than in DeepL] (P3, R20), indicating that integrated, multifunctional platforms are perceived as more efficient. For this infrequent user, the additional step of switching between tools disrupts workflow continuity and reduces the overall appeal of DeepL. From a TAM perspective, such efficiency barriers weaken perceived ease of use (PEOU), as the tool requires extra effort to access and operate compared to more seamlessly integrated alternatives. This finding suggest convenience as a key factor in choosing a tool.

4.4 Behavioral Intention (BI)

Behavioral Intention (BI) in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) refers to a user's willingness to continue using a technology in the future, which is influenced by their perceptions of usefulness and ease of use (Davis, 1989). In this study, participants expressed varying degrees of commitment to continued DeepL use, some students expressed their desire to continue using DeepL, while others considered using other applications that suited their needs. Three distinct patterns emerged: continued use, conditional use, and preference for alternatives.

a. Continued Use

Some students have shown strong intentions to continue using it in depth. Participant 1 confidently stated, "Aku bakal gunain DeepL terus" [I will continue to use DeepL] (P1, R33), reflecting a firm commitment based on positive experiences with the tool's vocabulary support and translation accuracy. Similarly, Participant 2 affirmed, "Akan tetap pakai DeepL sampai ada yang lebih akurat" [Will keep using DeepL until there is a more accurate one] (P2, R21), indicating that continued use is contingent on DeepL maintaining its competitive advantage in accuracy. Both participants were frequent users, and their statements suggest that sustained engagement with the tool has fostered trust and reliance on its capabilities. In TAM terms, high perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU) have translated into strong behavioral intention (BI). These findings align with Davis's (1989) proposition that when users perceive a technology as both useful and easy to use, they are more likely to adopt it consistently over time.

b. Conditional Use

Not all participants expressed unconditional commitment to DeepL. Some indicated that their future use would depend on the tool's evolution and improvement. Participant 4 stated, "Kalau ada fitur tambahan, kenapa tidak?" [If there are additional features, why not?] (P4, R33). This indicates a desire to continue using DeepL, especially if improvements are made. This participant was an infrequent user, and the conditional nature of their intention highlights that for some users, perceived gaps in functionality weaken behavioral intention even when ease of use is

appreciated. And the finding is in line with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) framework (Davis, 1989), which states that satisfaction and expectations are fundamental and perceived usefulness and ease of use influence intention to use.

c. Preference for Alternatives

Deepl was considered accurate and beneficial by many students, but some participants indicated other translation tools that were considered more flexible and efficient. Participant 3 stated, "DeepL bukan yang utama... ChatGPT lebih efektif" [DeepL is not the main one... ChatGPT is more effective] (P3, R33), shows that the appeal of other platforms surpasses DeepL's specialized translation capabilities. For infrequent users, the ease and flexibility of tools such as ChatGPT, which can handle translation along with other tasks such as summarizing, summarizing, and answering questions, makes it more attractive for everyday academic use. This suggests that the intention to continue using DeepL may influence the development of other technologies that provide more comprehensive services on the platform.

The findings of this study show various aspects of students' experiences with DeepL in academic translation. Each section has been identified and is outlined below in relation to the existing literature and theoretical perspectives. Using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) theoretical framework developed by Davis (1989), this study adds to the understanding of how the relationship between of how perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEOU), and behavioral intention (BI) in the context of learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia, especially among university students.

The students recognized various benefits of DeepL that contributed to their academic tasks. One of the main benefits was its role in supporting vocabulary learning. Frequent users, such as Participant 1, stated, “It's like finding out vocab... if I find a vocab that I don't know, I will go to DeepL.” This experience shows how students use DeepL to build their understanding with new vocabulary. The results show that for frequent users, DeepL has become part of their daily or weekly academic routine. This strengthens the perception of usefulness (PU) because it consistently improves vocabulary mastery and the use of contextually appropriate expressions, which in turn encourages their intention to continue using DeepL. This finding supports Laksana and Komara's (2024) conclusion that DeepL helps EFL students acquire vocabulary by providing a variety of options.

DeepL is also recognized for its translation accuracy. An infrequent user expressed by an infrequent user, admitting, “The translation is accurate and easy to understand” These statements reflect confidence in DeepL's ability to produce accurate and easy to understand translations. Kamaluddin et al. (2024) also found that DeepL produced more natural translations and fewer errors compared to other tools. In an academic setting, even users who use DeepL less frequently see the value of DeepL in producing formal and structured writing. This is in line with the findings of Asmara and Kembaren (2024) who found that students rely on DeepL when working on academic assignments such as theses or journals. However, for infrequent users, high PEOU (Perceived Ease of Use) and accuracy alone are not enough to keep BI, indicating that feature completeness may be more influential than ease of use.

Most students found DeepL to be fast, accessible, and user-friendly. Infrequent user noted that it is “one of the fastest to open” and frequent uses valued DeepL’s customizable

translation feature. This statement shows that the speed and ease of use of DeepL is the main thing. Laksana and Komara (2024) also found that EFL students appreciated the ease of DeepL because it helped them save time in doing academic work. Students liked DeepL's translation customization feature, which allowed them to adjust the choice of words in sentences. For frequent users, these features strengthen the relationship between PEOU and PU, which directly influences continued use.

There are also some limitations to this platform in terms of translation. Infrequent users indicate that although DeepL provides various suggestions on words, it does not have paraphrases on whole sentences, making it less efficient for revision tasks. Kirana et al. (2024) emphasize that such limitations reflect the broader need for innovation in educational technology. And one of infrequent user highlighted DeepL's tendency to be too formal, which aligns with Kamaluddin et al. (2024) who note that DeepL still struggles in tasks that require cultural nuances or stylistic variations. In the context of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia, the use of formal language is often considered an added value and supports academic needs. However, this tendency can also be a limitation when faced with tasks that require creativity or a more casual style of language.

Infrequent users also find DeepL less efficient than other platforms that are much more efficient. These comments suggest that infrequent users could use a multifunctional tool that combines features into one accessible interface, which DeepL currently lacks. Participants also showed varying intentions to continue using DeepL. Frequent users showed strong satisfaction and commitment. Frequent users showed a high level of trust in DeepL's capabilities, especially in producing accurate translations for academic needs. This aligns with TAM's proposition that high PU and PEOU correlate to stronger BI. But our findings show that for some infrequent users or lower BI shows that adoption can be external factors such as tool versatility can disrupt.

In contrast, infrequent users expressed conditional or hesitant intentions. Participant 4 said, "If there are additional features, why not?" This conditional openness reflects the importance of continuous development in technology to meet evolving expectations. As outlined in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989), satisfaction, perceived usefulness, and ease of use shape continued usage behavior. So some users who rarely use them prefer alternative tools. Participant 3 stated, "DeepL is not the main one... ChatGPT is more effective." This preference suggests that infrequent users may switch to a more multifunctional tool if DeepL does not evolve to meet broader academic and usability needs. Kirana et al. (2024) also observed that DeepL's limitations in handling specialized vocabulary may reduce its long-term appeal in academic contexts.

5. CONCLUSION

This study sought to find out how University students perceive DeepL in learning English as a foreign language (EFL). The findings reveal that both frequent and infrequent users of this translation tool experience different patterns of usability and acceptance, shaped by their usage frequency and needs. By applying TAM as a theoretical framework, this research is not limited to traditional information systems but also extends to the field of machine translation (MT). This theoretical extension contributes to a deeper understanding of technology acceptance in the context of learning English as a foreign language (EFL), where machine translation (MT) tools

such as DeepL serve as learning tools and language intermediaries. The findings of this study indicate that in addition to PU and PEOU, which generally influence BI, contextual factors such as task relevance and feature adequacy also play an important role, expanding the scope of TAM explanations in the field of educational technology.

The results of this study show significant differences in how frequent and infrequent users of DeepL perceive the usefulness and ease of use of this application in English translation. Frequent users (participants 1 and 2) consistently reported that DeepL as an academically supportive tool that aids vocabulary learning, improves translatation accuracy, and assisting informal academic writing. In contrast infrequent users (participants 3 and 4) still recognize these benefits, but use appreciated DeepL for its practicality only in specific contexts. A structured comparison between these groups shows is not merely a function of TAM's PU and PEOU constructs, but also depends on individual learning habits and situational demands. This finding highlights the adaptability of TAM in learning technology contexts, suggesting that EFL students' technology acceptance varies with context rather than remaining consistent across users.

The study acknowledges its limitations, including the small and homogeneous sample size (n = 4), which may not fully represent the diverse experience of all EFL learners, and the focus on one university in Indonesia. Nonetheless, its theoretical value lies in demonstrating how the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) can be effectively adapted to examine MT acceptance, particularly in understanding behavioural intentions in language learning. These findings opens new directions for future TAM-based research on educational artificial intelligence (AI) tools, demonstrating that this framework remains relevant and flexible for analyzing developing language technologies such as DeepL, Google Translate, or ChatGPT.

Based on these results, it is recommended that further research be conducted with a larger and more diverse sample of EFL learners to validate the results. Future studies should also consider using a mixed-methods approach to measure the strength of the relationship between TAM constructs and explore the moderating role of feature richness and cultural expectations. This study also highlights important pedagogical implications. Educators can guide students toward responsible use of DeepL and other MT tools by encouraging critical evaluation of translations, raising awareness of contextual language use, and incorporating MT assisted tasks in writing instruction. These practices promote translation technology as a learning aid rather than a dependency, supporting autonomous and reflective language learning. Moreover, MT developers should integrate user feedback to enhance usability and better meet evolving educational needs This would not only improve the user experience, but also ensure that the tool helps the growing needs of EFL learners in various academic contexts.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR(S)

The corresponding author is an English education student at Mulawarman University. This is not the first time she has written an article, as the author previously participated in a PKM activity organized by the Kemendikbudristek and made it to the funding and presentation stage in front of the judges. Although it did not advance to the next stage, the article can be accessed on ResearchGate, and there are other articles with the same author's name.

REFERENCES

Alhaisoni, E., & Alhaysony, M. (2017). An Investigation of Saudi EFL University Students' Attitudes towards the Use of Google Translate. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *5*(1), 72. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v5i1.10696

Asmara, D. S. M., & Kembaren, F. R. B. (2024). Student's perception towards the use of DEEPL Translator in writing thesis or journal for English education students. *IJLECR - INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND CULTURE REVIEW*, *10*(1), 117–126. https://doi.org/10.21009/ijlecr.v10i1.47937

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bunga, E. L. M., & Katemba, C. V. (2024). COMPARING TRANSLATION QUALITY: GOOGLE TRANSLATE VS DEEPL FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TO ENGLISH. *EDUSAINTEK JURNAL PENDIDIKAN SAINS DAN TEKNOLOGI*, *11*(3), 1147–1171. https://doi.org/10.47668/edusaintek.v11i3.1264

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.). Sage Publications

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, *13*(3), 319. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Deguchi, H., Tamura, A., & Ninomiya, T. (2019). *Dependency-Based Self-Attention for Transformer NMT*. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing (RANLP 2019) (pp. 239–246). INCOMA Ltd. https://doi.org/10.26615/978-954-452-056-4_028

Hennink, M. M., & Kaiser, B. N. (2022). Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. *Social Science & Medicine, 292,* 114523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523

Hutchins, W. J. (1986). Machine Translation: Past, Present, Future. Ellis Horwood.

Hutchins, W. J., & Somers, H. L. (1992). An Introduction to Machine Translation. Academic Press.

Kamaluddin, M. I., Rasyid, M. W. K., Abqoriyyah, F. H., & Saehu, A. (2024). Accuracy analysis of DeepL: Breakthroughs in machine Translation technology. *Journal of English Education Forum (JEEF)*, *4*(2), 122–126. https://doi.org/10.29303/jeef.v4i2.681

Laksana, N. K. N., & Komara, N. C. (2024). Indonesian EFL Students' Perceptions of DEEPL Machine Translation Tool: Utilization, Advantages, and Disadvantages. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, *4*(2), 256–276. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i2.1931

Munawwarah, M., & Martriwati, ; (2024). *STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF USING DEEPL AS MACHINE TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH LEARNING*. *5*(2), 284–295. https://doi.org/10.22236/ellter.v5i2.15813.g4779

Prayoga, G. B. (2022). *Students' perception of using machine translation tools in the EFL classroom*. UICELL Conference Proceedings, (6). https://journal.uhamka.ac.id/uicell/article/view/11049

Raben, S. K., Sirande, N., Arrang, J. R. T., & Ilham, M. (2024). A comparative analysis of the accuracy of machine translation in translating English to Indonesian. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Overseas Journal*, 3(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.47178/t0gw3271

Rustika, P. (2024). Students' perceptions of the Use of deepL translator in translating academic text from Indonesian into English: A Case Study at State Islamic University of Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung - Digital Library UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/102629/

Safitri, B., Dewi, U., & Ramadhan, A. (2024). EFL Students' Preferences of Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Writing. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora Dan Seni*, *3*(1), 702–705. https://doi.org/10.62379/jishs.v3i1.2008

Tsai, S. (2019). Using google translate in EFL drafts: a preliminary investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *32*(5–6), 510–526. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1527361

Utimadini, N. J. (2023, December 30). Exploring perceptions of machine translation as a tool for EFL learning. Retrieved from https://journal.ikippgriptk.ac.id/index.php/bahasa/article/view/7128

Wang, J., & Ke, X. (2022). Integrating Machine Translation into EFL writing instruction: process, product and perception. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *13*(1), 125–137. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1301.15

Zuhairo, Z., & Kembaren, F. R. W. (2024). Intermediate Students' perceptions of the transformation of online translation Engine. *IJLECR - INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND CULTURE REVIEW*, *10*(1), 12–20. https://doi.org/10.21009/ijlecr.v10i1.45004