

Problems Using Electronic Dictionaries to Translate Thai Written Essays into English

Atipat Boonmoh
Wareesiri Singhasiri
Jonathan Hull

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Abstract

This article describes problems that Thai students have when they use electronic dictionaries to translate Thai written essays into English. The subjects were six first-year undergraduate students studying at the Faculty of Engineering of a Thai university. The research instruments were questionnaires, written essays, verbal reports (think aloud), retrospective semi-structured interviews and observation check sheets. The subjects wrote an English essay by writing a draft in Thai and then translating it into English. Their electronic dictionaries were the only technical support they were allowed to use while they were producing these essays. The results reveal that there were six identified problems when the subjects used electronic dictionaries to translate Thai written essays into English. Furthermore, the observation, the think aloud and the interview reveal the subjects' problems using the electronic dictionaries and some problems with the electronic dictionaries themselves.

Introduction

Writing English assignments tends to be a serious problem for many students. From our teaching experience, we have observed that great numbers of undergraduates have difficulties in writing. Many of them compose English assignments by writing in Thai first and then translating into English. The quality of their written assignments, however, is quite poor partly because they contain many poor word choices as well as grammatical mistakes. In order for students to translate, one very important language tool is dictionaries, especially electronic dictionaries. The first writer observed that a number of students use electronic dictionaries in the classroom. Since these dictionaries might be one cause of students' mistakes, it seemed interesting to study the problems they have when using electronic dictionaries to translate in essay writing.

Research questions

The purpose of this study is to find the answers to the following research questions:

- How do Thai students use electronic dictionaries to conduct word searches?
- What problems do they have while using electronic dictionaries to translate Thai written essays into English?

Literature review

Approaches to writing in a second language

Cohen et al. (2000, pp. 4-12) describe three approaches to second-language (L2) writing. The first approach is to write directly in L2; the second is to use mental translation or think about ideas and concepts in the first language (L1) and then translate them into L2; and the third approach, which is the focus of this study, is to write a draft in L1 and then translate the draft into L2. Writing directly in L2 seems to be quite a

difficult task for low proficiency learners. Cohen et al.'s second approach of initially using L1 may be of greater help for some L2 writers than initially using L2 when writing a particular topic. However, a study by Lay (1982, cited in Friedlander, 1990, pp. 110-111) of four Chinese students learning English reveals that they tended to use their L1 when writing about a topic familiar to them in their L1 background and then translated into L2. Thus, it seems, many learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) do not follow Cohen et al.'s first two approaches to writing mentioned above; instead, they follow the third approach (writing everything down in L1 and then translating into L2). A study by Cumming (1987, cited in Friedlander, 1990, p. 111) found that inexpert French ESL writers used their L1 to generate content, regardless of whether the topic was familiar to them in their L1 or L2.

Atkinson (1993, p. 95) states that, if learners' language ability is restricted by lack of vocabulary and unfamiliarity with English-speaking culture, translation is the simplest solution. Lewis (1997, p. 60) suggests that, if students cannot express themselves in L2, they naturally resort to their L1 and then translate into L2. For this study, the researchers were interested in students who employed this approach.

Types of electronic dictionaries

As already mentioned, dictionaries are important tools that students might use when they have writing problems. Dictionaries can be categorized using diverse criteria; one of the most widely known ways is by number of languages, usually monolingual and bilingual. Generally, when students begin their study of a foreign language, they tend to start with bilingual dictionaries and then, as language proficiency develops, they make increasing use of monolingual dictionaries (MacFarquhar & Richards, 1983, p. 111). However, Nesi (1998) suggests another way of classifying dictionaries: paper-based and computer-based (or electronic) dictionaries; for the latter category, she mentions three types: hand-held electronic dictionaries, dictionaries on CD-ROM and dictionaries on the Internet.

Nesi mentions that hand-held dictionaries are the least widely-known of all the different types of electronic dictionaries; however, she notes that they are particularly popular in South-East Asia. Interestingly, although there is an indication that hand-held electronic dictionaries have gained popularity with users, they are largely ignored by lexicographers and reviewers because:

“... these dictionaries appeal to users who may find paper-based learners' dictionaries inaccessible, but unfortunately it is difficult for teachers and academics to check on their accuracy, coverage and treatment of words. For one thing, they are sold in electronic goods stores rather than bookshops, and are advertised in terms of their technological rather than lexicographical features.” (Nesi, 1998, p. 4)

One of the biggest difficulties in reviewing or assessing these types of dictionaries is that there are many hand-held devices on the market: older versions are continually being replaced and the costs of reviewing them are likely to be higher than assessing hard-copy or paper-based dictionaries.

However, although hand-held dictionaries have limitations, many students still prefer to use them. A survey of 495 students in Hong Kong by Taylor & Chan (1994, cited in Nesi, p. 4) shows that most of them preferred hand-held dictionaries to dictionaries in

book form because of the ease and speed of electronic look-up even though they also believed that paper-based dictionaries were more detailed and accurate. This evidently shows that educationalists and lexicographers, who support the development of collocation and pragmatic information in paper-based learners' dictionaries, seem to have no influence over the design, marketing and purchase of hand-held devices. In short, it can be said that students impose the use of hand-held dictionaries on themselves although they may know that these dictionaries are, in some respects, inferior to paper-based dictionaries; in other words, many students put convenience before content.

Methodology

This section describes the subjects, instruments, procedures and data analysis.

Subjects

The researchers had the following two criteria in selecting the subjects, both of which were ascertained in the questionnaire used in this study. First, the students reported that they possessed and normally used the following electronic dictionaries, which are popularly used by students: 'Super Smart' (1983/2001) and 'Super King' (1996/2002). In an analysis of the use and functions of these two dictionaries conducted by the first writer, it was found that there were no differences between them except that 'Super King' versions contained an English-Chinese section and more games. The second selection criterion was that the students reported that, when given any written assignment from their English language teacher, they normally began by writing their ideas in Thai and then translated them into English. The questionnaires identified six first-year students whose responses indicated that they met the criteria above: all were male and studied in the Faculty of Engineering.

Instruments

The instruments were a questionnaire, written essays, verbal reports (think aloud), observation check sheets, and retrospective interviews.

1. *Questionnaire*: This was a 'Survey on the Dictionary Use of Thai University Students' (see appendix). It was used to obtain demographic information on the students' age, gender, scores on the English language university entrance examination, types of dictionaries they used, and their writing behaviour when they wrote an essay. As already mentioned, the information helped determine who should be selected as the subjects of the study.

2. *Written essays*: The subjects (N=6) were asked to write an essay on the following topic: 'Studying in a university is different from studying in a high school. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?' They could use reasons and specific examples to support their opinions. The suggested length was 100-150 words.

3. *Verbal reports (Think aloud)*: The introspective verbal reports were required to see how the subjects used dictionaries when they were translating.

4. *Observation check sheets*: These were used to note every word the subjects looked up in the dictionary and its meaning(s). These check sheets were used to ask the subjects some specific questions during the retrospective interview (e.g. why they looked up a particular word, why they gave up searching for a particular word).

5. *Retrospective semi-structured interviews*: These interviews were used to elicit the subjects' problems with their electronic dictionaries and/or translation and reasons for using or not using particular words in their translation after consulting the dictionaries. The researcher asked each subject to clarify any unclear points while they were using

the dictionaries. In order to make it easier for the subjects to give accurate answers, the medium of the interview was Thai.

Procedures

The questionnaire was distributed to a group of 110 first-year students, from which six were selected as subjects. Then each of the subjects was asked to produce an English essay on the topic assigned. Specifically, they were asked to write the essay according to what they reported in the questionnaire they normally do when given written assignments from their English teachers (i.e. write a draft in Thai first and then translate it into English). They were also asked to think aloud as they were writing. An audiotape recorder was used to record what they thought aloud. One of the researchers (the first writer) sat near the subjects to observe which words they sought in their dictionaries and to remind them to keep talking if they were silent. Finally, the retrospective semi-structured interviews were recorded.

Data analysis

First, the verbal reports and interview tapes were transcribed. Then, the observation check sheets were checked for which words the subjects looked up in their dictionaries. To decide whether or not the subjects had had problems translating their essays into English, the transcriptions of both the verbal reports and interviews were analyzed; the problems were categorized by using a coding list. The analysis and coding list were then checked by an external coder in order to check for reliability.

Findings

The findings are presented in terms of how the subjects conducted word searches (RQ1) and the problems they encountered when they used electronic dictionaries to translate their essays from Thai into English (RQ2).

How subjects conducted word searches

The four identified stages in the process of finding target words from electronic dictionaries indicate how each subject started a word search, any problems he had, and how he tried to solve them. These stages are explained and shown in the figure and below.

Stage One: Did the subjects consult their dictionaries?

If so (Yes), a stage two was analyzed; on the other hand, if not (No), since dictionary use is the focus of this study, the target words were ignored.

Stage Two: Did the subjects find the target word in their dictionaries?

If they found the target word in their dictionaries in the first place (Yes), a third stage was then analyzed. In contrast, if they did not find the target word (No), three reasons were identified: first, they could not find the target word in their dictionary entry; second, they could not retrieve the word from their memory; finally, they were unable to spell the target word.

The subjects used four possible routes to try and solve the problem of not finding target words. Firstly, they might try to find a synonym or antonym of the target word. For example, when the subjects could not find the words /kan rian/ (kan = n., rian = v. learn, kan rian = n. ; studying, learning), they used the synonym /kan sueksa/ (kan = n., sueksa = v. learn, kan sueksa = n.; studying, learning) as the target word. Secondly,

they might change the part of speech of the target word; for instance, from the noun /kan sueksa/ to the verb /sueksa/. Thirdly, they might skip the target word and start a new, related word search; for instance, changing the target word from /a-chip/ (= n.; job, occupation) to /wichachip/ (= n.; profession). Finally, the subjects might simply give up searching. If they chose the first possible route, they would start stage two again while they would have to return to stage one if they chose the second or third routes. Words they gave up searching for in the fourth route were not analyzed.

Stage Three: Did the subjects use word(s) found in their dictionaries?

If the subjects used the word found immediately (Yes), the final stage was analyzed; alternatively, if they did not use the word found in their essays (No), there were three reasons why they did not select it. First, they were not familiar with the words; second, they were not sure which words in the dictionary entry to choose; and finally, the translation of the target word provided in the dictionaries did not match the subjects' existing knowledge. However, the subjects tried to solve these three problems by using one of the following five routes: checking other words in the same entry to see if these might match or be more appropriate in the context, checking part of speech, skipping the target word and starting a new related word search, using a word not found in the dictionary, and giving up seeking the target word. In the second and the third cases, they had to start at stage one again.

Stage Four: Why did the subjects select the particular word found?

Derived from the data from the subjects' verbal reports, the researcher's observation and the retrospective interviews, seven main reasons were found why the subjects selected words found: 1) the dictionary provided the right meaning; 2) the dictionary activated the subjects' memory of the provided words; 3) the subjects were familiar with the words found; 4) they simply chose the first word provided in the dictionary; 5) the word found matched the part of speech they were looking for; 6) it matched the subjects' spelling; and 7) there was only one word found in the dictionary.

Problems encountered

As previously mentioned, after the subjects finished writing their Thai essays, they were asked to translate them into English. In the 'translation' stage, they were allowed to use their electronic dictionaries as technical support; however, when translating, all six subjects encountered problems using their dictionaries, as revealed in the table.

Table: Frequencies of problems using electronic dictionaries

Problems encountered (by Subjects A-F)	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total	(%)
Could not find words	10	11	1	5	9	7	43	39.45
Not sure word to choose	-	15	3	3	2	6	29	26.61
Translation did not match	5	8	1	-	-	1	15	13.76
Not familiar with words	2	4	1	-	1	1	9	8.26
Unable to spell words	2	-	1	1	-	5	9	8.26
Could not retrieve words	2	-	-	-	-	2	4	3.67
Total	21	38	7	9	12	22	109	100

From the table, we may see that the three most frequent problems encountered were: the subjects could not find words, they were not sure which words to choose, and the

translation did not match their preconceptions. The relatively high frequencies of these three reported problems are now discussed.

Subjects could not find words

The most frequent problem encountered when using electronic dictionaries was that the subjects could not find words (39.45%). According to the table, the subjects could not find 43 words. Data analysis revealed some interesting patterns, which might provide evidence on why these subjects were unable to find these words. These patterns involved nouns, phrases and connectors, and negative words.

Nouns: It was found that 13 of the 43 words (30.23%) the subjects could not find were nouns. A careful search for these nouns in the electronic dictionaries revealed that none of them were listed; however, when these nouns were changed into verbs, all them could be found. This indicates that, if the subjects had changed these nouns into verbs, they would have found them and, having found their meanings, they could then have changed the verbs into nouns again. Some examples of nouns which the subjects could not find are /kan sueksa/ (kan = n., sueksa = v. learn, study, kan sueksa = n.; learning, studying), /kan sob/ (kan = n., sob = v. to test) and /kam pueksa/ (kam = n., pueksa = v. advise, consult, kam pueksa = n.; advice).

Phrases and connectors: The second most common groups of words that the subjects were unable to find were phrases and connectors. There were 7 phrases and connectors altogether. The subjects tried to look for these items in Thai; they did not try to paraphrase any word if it could not be found. In Thai, there might be a single word combining with one or more other words to make another, longer word. For example, the Thai word /doi-chapo-yang-ying/ is equivalent to the English word ‘especially’; however, it can be broken down into four different words: /doi/, /chapo/, /yang/, and /ying/. The fact that many Thai words can combine to make other, longer words might be the reason why the subjects were unable to find some meanings. Some examples where the subjects could not find words are /kuen-u-kab/ (= according to, depend on), and /yang-ngai-kor-tam/ (= however).

Negative words: The last main factor is negative words. Although only Subject A did this, it is worth presenting. He tried to look up a word which starts with a negative unit. For example, instead of looking up the word /aojaisai/ (= v. to pay attention to), he looked for /mai-aojaisai/ (mai = no, mai-aojaisai = not to pay attention to), but he was unable to find it.

Subjects were not sure which words to choose

Although this is the second most frequent problem (26.61%), it occurred mostly with Subject B (15 out of 29 times) and it did not occur with Subject A at all. From the think-aloud and the retrospective interview data, it was found that there were two main circumstances connected with this problem.

When at least two words were known: The subjects knew or were familiar with at least two words provided in the dictionary entry but could not decide which word should be chosen (e.g. ‘different’ and ‘difference’).

When all words were unknown: When the subjects looked for a word in their dictionaries and found that none of the meanings provided were at all familiar, they would have a higher degree of difficulty compared to when they found words with

which they were somewhat familiar. Some examples of words the subjects were not familiar with are /dam noen/ (= v.; to proceed, to carry out a task), /noi long/ (= v.; to lessen, to decrease), /doi/ (= adv.; through, by means of), and /rabpidchob/ (= v.; to undertake, to afford [an expense], to be responsible for).

Translation did not match subjects' preconceptions

This is the third most frequent problem (13.76%), and two reasons for it were identified. The first reason is that the word provided did not match what the subjects were looking for in terms of meaning. This might imply that they had some possible words to choose in their minds but, when they saw the words which did not match their anticipations, they did not use any word provided and tried to use other strategies to solve the problem. For example, Subject A wanted to find the meaning of the word /hen doi/ (= v. to agree) but he could not find it. He then changed this word to /hen kuan/ (= v. to approve), and his electronic dictionary provided the following meanings: 'v. to be worth, to deem it proper'. After that, he checked the word 'worth' in his dictionary and finally the dictionary provided the Thai meanings of this word as 'kumka, meeka, meemulka', which did not match what Subject A was looking for. He, therefore, gave up searching for this word and, for his essay, used another word, 'sure', which was not provided in the dictionary entry.

The second reason is that the word provided did not match what the subjects were looking for in terms of part of speech. This reason occurred less than the former reason and it occurred mostly with Subject A. When the electronic dictionary provided the meaning of the word the subjects were searching for, they did not select that word right away but tried to change its part of speech by themselves or search for its part of speech in the dictionary. For example, when Subject A could not find the word /kan sueksa/ (kan = n., sueksa = v. learn, study), he changed its part of speech to /sueksa/.

Discussion and implications

The following factors were found to hinder these subjects in writing their Thai written essays and translating them into English: users' insufficient knowledge of electronic dictionaries and inherent problems with the electronic dictionaries used in this study.

Users' insufficient knowledge of electronic dictionaries

It was found that the subjects did not use, probably because they did not know how, many functions provided in the electronic dictionaries (e.g. searching for synonyms or antonyms). This suggests that there was lack of training in how to use electronic dictionaries. However, before instituting such training, teachers need to know the nature or characteristics of electronic dictionaries as well as what and how they are going to train their students.

As mentioned earlier, Nesi (1998, p. 1) classifies dictionaries into two: paper-based and computer-based or electronic dictionaries. These two types of dictionaries, however, are different in many ways (e.g. ways of searching for target words, ways the words are presented). These differences must be taken into account in order that teachers will know how they have to train their students to use electronic dictionaries. Koren (1997, p. 10) states that "the electronic dictionary requires different skills or habits than those required by the printed dictionary. These skills resemble 'computer skills,' which usually do not take long to master". This explicitly shows that, rather than needing 'dictionary skills', using an electronic dictionary, to a certain extent, requires students to

have computer skills (such as being able to type, use space command, shift buttons, drag information, or click a lot of buttons). In contrast, using a printed dictionary requires reading skills (e.g. skimming or scanning) that are essential for students when they use encyclopedias, telephone books, indexes of textbooks, and various kinds of guides. Therefore, teachers must be aware that training students to use electronic dictionaries should differ, at least in certain respects, from training them to use printed dictionaries.

Users' lack of effective strategies in using electronic dictionaries (and probably conventional dictionaries, too) suggests the need for teachers to provide further training in dictionary use. Here are some recommendations.

- a. Teachers should train their students to try to change the part of speech if the target word cannot be found. For example, if the target word is a noun, its verb form could be sought or vice versa.
- b. It is important for teachers to raise awareness about the differences between L1 (Thai) and L2 (English) in terms of derivations. The stem of a Thai word is changed to other derivatives by adding a prefix, e.g. /sueksa/ (= v.; educate), /kan sueksa/ (= n.; education), /nak kan sueksa/ (= n.; educator); on the other hand, the stem of an English word is usually changed to other derivatives by adding a suffix, e.g. educate, education, or educator.
- c. For phrases or connectors, teachers may have to suggest students start by using a formal word as a headword and not to use colloquial words since these might not appear in the electronic dictionary. For example, instead of using /yang ngai kotam/ (a colloquial form of 'however'), teachers might tell students to use /yang rai kotam/, which is more formal.
- d. If the target word is long and the students cannot find its meaning, teachers should make sure that they know how to break it down into smaller units that still contain the sense or the meaning of that target word. For example, the target word /doi-chapo-yang-ying/ (= adv.; especially) could be broken down into four smaller units: /doi/, /chapoh/, /yang/, and /ying/. However, none of these smaller units has the same meaning as the target word; therefore, students should know that the first two smaller units can have the same sense as the target word, and they should use these two units to search for the English equivalent.
- e. Teachers should train their students to avoid starting a headword with a negative unit, e.g. instead of using /mai mi kuamsuk/ (mai = no., mi kuamsuk = adj.; unhappy) as a headword, using /mi kuamsuk/ (= adj.; happy).
- f. Teachers should raise students' awareness of the potential of utilizing synonyms in their first language when they cannot find the target word.
- g. Teachers may train their students how to 'check other words in the same entry', i.e. by writing the words they find on a piece of paper and checking all of them to see which one is the most appropriate to use in the context. To achieve this, teachers might have to train their students to make use of monolingual dictionaries. Students may also have to use the 'back translation' strategy (Shoebottom, 2001, pp. 2-3) that is, checking all the words found in their electronic dictionary in a monolingual dictionary. By doing this,

students will be able to see all kinds of useful information (provided that the monolingual dictionary is a good one), facilitating their selection and use of words from dictionaries in their writing.

h. Students need to know how to use the space command as in a computer. It was found that some subjects in the study were unable to find the target word because they did not put a space between units (e.g. 'bytheway', or 'ontime'). These two examples should be typed in electronic dictionaries as 'by the way' and 'on time' in order for them to provide their meanings.

Inherent problems with the electronic dictionaries used

Several types of problems with the subjects' electronic dictionaries were found. The dictionaries provided: wrong words; insufficient information about words given; only one equivalent meaning; and more than one possible word but failed to differentiate them. These problems are now discussed in detail.

The first problem was the electronic dictionaries provided the wrong word for the noun form of 'learn'; it should have been spelled 'learning' but it was spelled 'lear'. In another case, *hehind was found; it should have been 'behind'. Next, one of the words found, 'a precedent', was not equivalent to the meaning of the headword /tuayang/ or 'example'. For the fourth word, the dictionary provided the meaning of /sukasueksa/ as 'n. hygiene', which was not exactly the same meaning as the headword.

For the second type of problem, the dictionary provided insufficient information about words; several difficulties were observed. For instance, Subject A wanted to find the English word for the Thai headword /bot/ (= n. chapter or unit); however, none of the words he had expected appeared in his dictionary. The dictionary provided the words as 'n.; a foot; a stanza of verse; the words of a song or a play'. As a result, he gave up searching for a translation of this word and used a word not provided in the dictionary.

The third type of problem is the dictionary provided only one equivalent meaning. For example, the Thai headword /nueaha/ (= n. body, content, core, etc.) is given the meaning 'n. body' in English; and /a-cheap/ is only given the meaning 'n. occupation' whereas other possible meanings are 'career, profession or job'.

For the last type of problem, the dictionary provided more than one word but failed to differentiate them. From the dictionary analysis, a number of examples which fall into this type of problem were found. The subjects might not have known how each particular word can be used in a particular context and they might have believed that all of the provided words have the same meaning. For example, the meaning of a Thai headword /fuek/ is translated as 'v.; to train, to practice, to exercise, to drill'.

The problems found here will be valuable feedback for dictionary compilers to evaluate or improve their products in the future. Firstly, the electronic dictionaries used in this study were not user-friendly since they failed to provide many words; consequently, compilers should increase their vocabulary storage in order to satisfy their users' needs. Furthermore, it is suggested that compilers should check whether or not all words are spelled correctly and also whether the meanings of the headwords are accurate. Moreover, they should provide examples (e.g. how a particular word is used in a particular context) as this might prevent learners from using inappropriate words. Apart

from these recommendations, the compilers should also avoid reinforcing the belief in a one-to-one relation at word level, and provide full semantic, grammatical and stylistic information as well as usage notes that are not available in traditional bilingual dictionaries (Thompson, 1987, p. 285).

Conclusion

In this study, the subjects' most common problem using electronic dictionaries was the inability to find words, a problem exacerbated by their evident lack of compensatory strategies. Thus, teachers should be aware of the need for dictionary training, which should include essential strategies for all kinds of dictionaries as well as the computer skills needed to use electronic dictionaries effectively. Another finding was that there were several inherent problems with the electronic dictionaries used in this study, which should be considered by electronic dictionary compilers. If they improve dictionaries to achieve or even exceed users' expectations, students and teachers will definitely be among the main beneficiaries.

Note: The research reported in this paper was part of the study the first writer conducted for his MA thesis.

References

Atkinson, D. (1993) *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. London: Longman.

Cohen, A., Brooks-Carson, A. & Jacobs-Cassuto, M. (2000) Direct vs. translated writing: what students do and the strategies they use. *Research Report Submitted to the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing (CISW) and to the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA)*, University of Minnesota.

Cumming, A. (1987) Decision making and text presentation in ESL writing performance. *Paper presented at the 21st TESOL Convention*, Miami Beach, FL, April.

Friedlander, A. (1990) Composing in English: effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, pp. 109-125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koren, S. (1997) Quality versus convenience: comparison of modern dictionaries from the researcher's, teacher's and learner's point of view. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 2 (3), Available online at <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ejo7/a2.html>, 5-10 [accessed 27th June 2003].

Lay, N. (1982) Composing processes of adult ESL learners: a case study. *TESOL Quarterly* 16: 406.

Lewis, M. (1997) *Implementing the Lexical Approach: Putting Theory into Practice*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

MacFarquhar P. & Richards J. (1983) On dictionaries and definitions. *RELC Journal* 14 (1) 111-124.

Nesi, H. (1998) *Dictionaries on Computer: How Different Markets Have Created Different Products*. Centre for English Language Teacher Education, University of Warwick. Available online at <http://www.tuchemnitz.de/phil/ebnglish/chairs/lihquist/real/independent/lle/Conference1998/Papers/Nesi.htm>, 1-4 [accessed 27th June 2003].

Shoebottom, P. (2003) *Using a Dictionary*. Available online at <http://www.fis.edu/eslweb/index.htm>, pp. 2-3 [accessed 24th October 2003].

Super King Talking-Dict. (1996/2002) *Oxford Compact English Dictionary* (1st edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Super Smart Talking-Dict. (1983/2001) *Concise American Heritage*, based on the Second College Edition: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Taylor, A. & Chan, A. (1994) Pocket electronic dictionaries and their use. In Martin, W., Meijs, W., Moerland, M., ten Pas, E., van Sterkenburg, P. & Vossen, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th Euralex International Congress*, pp. 598-605. Amsterdam: Euralex.

Thompson, G. (1987) Using bilingual dictionaries. *ELT Journal* 41 (4) 282-286.

Atipat Boonmoh teaches at the School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. He is currently pursuing a PhD in English Language Teaching at the University of Warwick, UK.

Wareesiri Singhasiri teaches a variety of courses to undergraduate and graduate ELT students at the Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, KMUTT, Thailand.

Jonathan Hull is a teacher and teacher trainer at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. His professional interests include L2 course and material design as well as researching and teaching the four skills.

Appendix: Survey on the Dictionary Use of Thai University Students

I am Mr Atipat Boonmoh, a second year MA participant in Applied Linguistics conducting a research thesis on the topic of Problems Using Electronic Dictionaries in Writing Essays. I would like to know what problems you have when using dictionaries, particularly Thai-English dictionaries. I assure you that all of the information you give will be kept confidential.

Please answer the following questions by (/) ticking the appropriate spaces provided or answering in the spaces given.

(Personal information)

Gender Male Female

Age: _____

Faculty of study: _____ **Major of Study:** _____

National university entrance scores in English subject: _____

(General use of dictionaries)

1. Were you trained how to use dictionaries when you studied in high school?
 Yes No
2. Do you have any problems in using dictionaries?
 Yes No
3. Do you have a dictionary? (including traditional, electronic dictionary, a dictionary in a computer)
 Yes (**please answer questions 4-15**)
 No (**please answer questions 12-15**)
4. Which of these dictionaries do you have? (You can tick more than one item.)
 Thai-English dictionary how many?
 English-Thai dictionary how many?
 English-English dictionary how many?
 Thai-Thai dictionary how many?
 Other(s), please specify language(s) how many?

(Specific use of Thai-English dictionaries)

5. Do you ever use **Thai-English dictionaries**?

Yes. **If yes, please continue.**

No. **If no, please go to question number 12.**

6. What type of Thai-English dictionary do you have?

traditional dictionary
 pocket dictionary
 dictionary in a computer
 electronic dictionary, please specify brand name of your dictionary.
 Cal-Comp Electronics (Thailand) Co. , LTD
 CyberDict (Besta) by CyberDict Technology LTD
 Talking-Dict by Group Sense LTD.
 VTech by VTeach Electronics LTD.
 others, please specify

7. If you answer that you do not have electronic dictionary, **please answer question 8.**

If you answer that you have electronic dictionary in question 6, what were your criteria in buying your electronic dictionary?

price convenient to carry famous author widely used
 self-study enough content provide illustration
 provide part of speech calculator provide organizer
 other(s)

8. When do you normally use a **Thai-English dictionary?**

9. What do you usually do when you are given any written assignment from your English language teacher(s)? **You may tick more than one item.**

think about the ideas in Thai and then translate in English (before starting writing)
 write ideas down on a piece of paper in Thai first and then translate into written English
 think and write in English (without thinking or writing in Thai)
 other(s)

10. **For class work**, how often do you normally use a **Thai-English dictionary** to translate your work when you study LNG 101?

always (81-100%) usually (61-80%) often (41-60%)
 sometimes (21-40%) rarely (1-20%) never (0%)

11. **For homework**, how often do you normally use a **Thai-English dictionary** to translate your work when you study LNG 101?

always (81-100%) usually (61-80%) often (41-60%)
 sometimes (21-40%) rarely (1-20%) never (0%)

(Buying a dictionary)

12. If you do not have a dictionary or if you plan to buy a new dictionary, which of these dictionaries would you like to buy?

Thai-English dictionary Why? ..
 English-Thai dictionary Why? ..
 English-English dictionary Why? ..
 Thai-Thai dictionary Why? ..
 Other(s) Why? ..

13. And what type of dictionary would you like to buy?

traditional dictionary Why? ..
 pocket dictionary Why? ..
 electronic dictionary Why? ..
 other(s)

14. What are your criteria in buying a dictionary? (You may tick more than one item.)

price convenient to carry famous author
 widely used self-study enough content
 provide illustration provide part of speech calculator
 provide organizer other(s)

(Suggestions)

15. Do you have any suggestions about the dictionary use?

Thank you for your cooperation.