

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY**  
**ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF WEB 2.0 TECHNOLOGIES ON  
TEACHING AND LEARNING**

**THESIS BY**  
**Metin ÖZCAN**

**Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ (Çukurova University)**  
**Member of Jury : Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU**  
**Member of Jury : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülден TÜM (Çukurova University)**

**MASTER OF ARTS**

**MERSİN / MAY 2020**

**APPROVAL****REPUBLIC OF TURKEY  
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY  
DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

We **certify** that this thesis under the title of “**Efl Teachers’ Perception of Web 2.0 Technologies on Teaching and Learning**” which was prepared by our student Metin ÖZCAN with number 20188035 is satisfactory **consensus** for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Education**.

(The Original Copy Hold in The Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. Outside- Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ  
(Çukurova University)

(The Original Copy Hold in The Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. Inside- Member of Examining Committee: Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU

(The Original Copy Hold in The Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. Outside- Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM  
(Çukurova University)

**I confirm that the signatures above belong to the academics mentioned.**

(The Original Copy Hold in The Institute Directorate is Signed.)

04/05/2020

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ

Acting Director of Institute of Social Sciences

**Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures, photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted from other sources, is subject to the law of Works of Art and Thought No: 5846.**

**DEDICATION**

*To my mother, Vehibe, who I physically lost in 2005 but I always feel she is with me.*

*To my father, İsmail, who always supports me and always trusts me in my life.*

*To my elder sister, Fatma, who always supports me in all circumstances in my whole  
life.*

*To my elder brother, Mesut, who always encourages me in my education life.*

*To my wife Sibel, my strongest supporter, who always accompanies me, supports me  
on my long journeys from Batman to Mersin and will become a mother just after a few  
months.*

**ETHICS DECLARATION**

**Student's**  
**Name & Surname** : Metin ÖZCAN  
**Number** : 20188035  
**Department** : English Language Education.  
**Program** : Master Thesis (x) Ph.D. Thesis ()  
**Thesis Title** :EFL Teachers' Perception of WEB 2.0 Technologies on  
Teaching  
And Learning

I hereby declare that;

I prepared this master thesis in accordance with Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,

I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,

I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,

I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis. The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (In case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

04/05/2020  
Metin ÖZCAN

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my great and sincere appreciation to my advisor, Prof.Dr.Yasemin KIRKGÖZ, who has the substance of a genius.She convincingly guided and encouraged me to be professional and do the right thing even when the road got tough. The goal of this thesis would not have been realized without her persistent help.

I owe thanks to my teachers Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ, Dr. Seden TUYAN and Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU as they provided very valuable guidance and feedback for me through my face-to-face education.I also owe thanks to the thesis committee member Assoc. Professor Dr. Gülden TÜM for her priceless comments.

I would like to thank Mrs. Beril YÜCEL, The Director of TED Foreign Languages Directorate, Mrs. Dirayet ULUK, The Coordinator of English Teachers of TED Foreign Language Directorate, Mr .Hasan ERDAL, The General Manager of TED Batman College, Mr.Celal DEMİR, The Vice-Manager of TED Batman College and Mr. Bilal BEDİR, The Coordinator of English Department of TED Batman College as they have helped me undertake this thesis and many thanks for their contribution to data collection.

I would like to thank my high-school teacher, Mr.İhsan PİLATİN, lecturer at Batman University in English Department nowadays, for helping me prepare The WEB 2.0 Application Questionnaire.

I wish to acknowledge the great support of my close friends Ufuk TANRISEVEN, Nermin HOCAOĞLU and Faris HOCAOĞLU. They always kept me going on just when I lost my motivation and this work would not have been possible without their input and great support. Many thanks for their support.

Thanks also to my wife Sibel, I could not forget of her support, encouragement and patience throughout of this long academic journey.

**ABSTRACT****EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF WEB 2.0 TECHNOLOGIES ON  
TEACHING AND LEARNING****Metin ÖZCAN****Master of Arts, Department of English Language Education****Supervisor: Prof.Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ****May 2020, 83 pages**

In recent years, ICT has started to be used to help students think critically, become creative and obtain more successful learning outcomes. Web 2.0 applications such as wikis, blogs, podcasts, social networking such as MySpace, Facebook, YouTube and Instagram constitute important sources for ICT in foreign language classrooms. Studies clearly demonstrate that using Web 2.0 applications yield several benefits: they are easy to use; they can be obtained easily and in many cases freely; and they allow interaction and communication in the classroom environment between teacher and student as well as student to student interaction.

The present study aims to investigate the types of Web 2.0 technologies used by English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers, EFL teachers' perspectives of such tools, and the effect of variables such as gender, teaching experience, daily Internet use, and the computer use on teachers' decision to apply Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. A mixed-method research design has been adopted in the current study. In other words, in order to collect research data, two research instruments have been used; The Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire developed for this study and written interviews. Data was conducted from 56 English teachers working in different TED (Turkish Education Association, Türk Eğitim Derneği) colleges. Participants of this study were 56 English teachers who completed the questionnaire, and 12 teachers volunteered to contribute to interviews.

Data analysis was conducted in two stages. Descriptive statistics was used to analyse the data from the 15 Likert-Scale items on the Questionnaire, including demographic information of the participants. Furthermore, Mann Whitney U Test was employed to analyse the influence of "gender" variable, and Kruskal Wallis Test was

used to analyse the effects of “use of computer for teaching”, “year of teaching experience” and “the daily Internet use” on teachers’ applying Web 2.0 applications for teaching purposes. Qualitative data from the written open-ended interview questions were analysed through content analysis. The findings seem to suggest that teachers participating in this study are well aware of most Web 2.0 tools and the potential uses of ICT technology, and they are inclined to incorporate various Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. It has also been found that no statistically significant difference exist between these variables and the teachers’ applying Web 2.0 tools in their classes.

**Key words:** Web 2.0 application, technology integration, teacher perspective, English teachers

**ÖZET****İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETEN ÖĞRETMENLERİN WEB  
2.0 TEKNOLOJİLERİNİN ÖĞRETİM VE ÖĞRENME KONUSUNDAKİ  
ALGISI****Metin ÖZCAN****Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı****Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ****Mayıs 2020, 83 sayfa**

Son yıllarda, bilgi ve iletişim teknolojisinin (BİT) kullanımında hızlı gelişmeler meydana gelmiştir. Yapılan araştırmalar, teknolojiyi sınıf içinde ve dışında kullanmanın avantajlarını ortaya koymaktadır. BİT uygulaması için önemli kaynaklardan biri olan Web 2.0'nin örnekleri arasında wiki, blog, podcast, MySpace ve Facebook, YouTube ve Instagram gibi sosyal ağlardan bahsedilebilir. Araştırmalar, Web 2.0 uygulamalarının kullanımlarının kolay ve esnek olmaları, etkileşime ve iletişime izin vermeleri gibi avantajlarının olduğunu vurgulamaktadır. Bu nedenle, bu uygulamaların sadece öğretmenler için faydalı kaynaklar olmadığı, aynı zamanda sınıfta daha yaratıcı öğrenme uygulamalarına imkân verdiği de düşünülmektedir.

Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretmenlerin (EFL) İngilizce derslerinde ne tür Web 2.0 uygulamaları kullandıklarını, bu uygulamalara yönelik algılarını ve cinsiyet, meslek, öğretme deneyimi, günlük internet kullanımı ve bilgisayar kullanma sıklıkları gibi değişkenlerin, öğretmenlerin Web 2.0 kullanımına etkisi olup olmadığını incelemektedir.

Çalışmada karma yöntemli bir araştırma deseni benimsenmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak anket ve görüşmelerden yararlanılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, araştırmaya özel olarak geliştirilen Web. 2.0 Uygulama Anketi ve yazılı olarak uygulanan görüşme soruları kullanılmıştır. Araştırma örneklemini çeşitli illerdeki TED (Türk Eğitim Derneği) okullarında çalışmakta olan İngilizce öğretmenleri oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın katılımcılarını ankete yanıt veren 56 İngilizce öğretmeni ve anketin uygulanmasının ardından gönüllü olarak görüşmeye katkı sağlayan 12 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır.



Veri analizi iki aşamada değerlendirilmiştir. İlk aşamada, 15 maddeden oluşan Likert ölçekli anketin ve katılımcıların demografik bilgilerinin değerlendirilmesi amacıyla betimsel istatistik uygulanmıştır. Buna ilaveten, cinsiyet değişkeninin etkisini ölçmek amacıyla, Mann Whitney U testi ve meslekte deneyim, günlük internet kullanımı ve bilgisayar kullanma sıklıkları değişkenlerinin etkisini belirlemek amacıyla da Kruskal Wallis testi uygulanmıştır. Veri analizinin ikinci aşamasında ise, içerik analizi yönteminden yararlanılmıştır. Bulgular, araştırmaya katılan öğretmenlerin birçok Web 2.0 araçlarını yakından tanıdıklarını ve bu araçları İngilizce öğretimini desteklemek amacıyla kullandıklarını göstermektedir. Aynı zamanda, bulgular cinsiyet, meslekte deneyim, günlük internet kullanımı ve bilgisayar kullanma sıklıkları gibi değişkenlerinin öğretmenlerin bu araçları kullanımı üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Web 2.0 uygulamaları, teknoloji entegrasyonu, öğretmen algıları, İngilizce öğretmenleri

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>COVER</b> .....	i
<b>APPROVAL</b> .....	ii
<b>DEDICATION</b> .....	iii
<b>ETHICS DECLARATION</b> .....	iv
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	v
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	vi
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	viii
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	x
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	xiii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	xiv
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b> .....	xv

### CHAPTER I

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study .....	2
1.4. Research Questions .....	3
1.5. Significance of the Study .....	3

### CHAPTER II

#### 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction.....	5
2.2. Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC).....	5
2.3. History of Web 2.0 Tools.....	5
2.4. Types of Web 2.0 Tools.....	6
2.4.1. Wikis .....	7
2.4.2. Blogs .....	7
2.4.3. Social Networking.....	8

2.4.4. Podcasting .....	8
2.4.5. YouTube.....	8
2.5. Benefits of Web 2.0 Tools .....	9
2.6. Studies on the Use of Web 2.0 Technology .....	10
2.6.1. Global Studies on Web 2.0 Tools .....	10
2.6.2. Local Studies on Web 2.0 Tools .....	12
2.7. Summary .....	14

## **CHAPTER III**

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

3.1. Introduction .....	15
3.2. Research Design.....	15
3.3. The Context of the Study .....	17
3.4. Participants.....	17
3.5. Data Collection Instruments.....	17
3.5.1. The Questionnaire .....	18
3.5.2. Interviews .....	18
3.6. Data Collection Procedures .....	19
3.7. Data Analysis .....	20
3.7.1. Analysis of Descriptive Statistics.....	20
3.7.2. Analysis of the Qualitative Data .....	20

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

4.1. Analyses of the Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire .....	22
4.1.1. Background of Participants .....	22
4.1.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Questionnaire .....	25
4.1.3. Inferential Statistics of the Questionnaire .....	30
4.2. Analysis of the Interview Administrated to Teachers.....	32
4.2.1. Types of Web 2.0 Tools Used by the Teachers.....	33
4.2.2. Benefits Offered by the Use of Web 2.0 Tools to Students .....	34
4.2.3. Challenges posed by the Web 2.0 tools.....	38

**CHAPTER V****5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

5.1. Introduction .....	40
5.2. Summary of the Study .....	40
5.3. Discussion of the Findings with Reference to Research Questions .....	41
5.3.1. Research Question .....	41
5.3.2. Research Question .....	41
5.3.3. Research Question .....	44
5.4. Implications .....	45
5.5. Suggestions for Further Research .....	46
5.6. Limitations of the Study .....	46
<b>6. REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<b>7. APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>53</b>

**ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>CALL</b>	: Computer Assisted Language Learning
<b>EFL</b>	: English as a Foreign Language
<b>ELT</b>	: English Language Teaching
<b>ICT</b>	: Information and Communication Technology
<b>SPSS</b>	: Statistical Package for Social Sciences
<b>TED</b>	: Turkish Education Association, Türk Eğitim Derneği
<b>WBLTs</b>	: Web-based learning tools

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>Table 1.</b> Summary of Research Questions, Methodological Approaches and Data Sources .....	16
<b>Table 2.</b> Demographic Information about Participants .....	23
<b>Table 3.</b> Descriptive Statistics of the Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire .....	25
<b>Table 4.</b> Mann Whitney U Test Results for Gender Variable .....	30
<b>Table 5.</b> Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Year of Experience Variable.....	31
<b>Table 6.</b> Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Hours in Internet Variable .....	31
<b>Table 7.</b> Kruskal Wallis Test Results for the Use of Computer for Teaching Variable .....	32

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>Appendix A.</b> Ethics Committee Permit Document.....	53
<b>Appendix B.</b> Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire .....	56
<b>Appendix C.</b> Interview Question .....	58
<b>Appendix D.</b> Consent Form .....	59
<b>Appendix E.</b> Approval from Çağ University .....	60
<b>Appendix F.</b> Permissions from eight TED Schools.....	61



## CHAPTER I

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The present study investigates the types of Web.2 technologies used by English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers, teachers' perspectives of using such tools, and whether there is any significant effect of such variables as gender, teaching experience, daily Internet use, and the computer use on teachers' decision to apply Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. The first part of this chapter provides a general background to the research. It also explains the statement of the problem and introduces the research questions and significance of the study.

#### 1.1. Background of the Study

During the last decades, rapid advancements have taken place in using information and communication technology (ICT). Studies reveal the benefits of infusing technology for educational purposes. It has been found that incorporating ICT into lessons enhances students' thinking skills, and creates better and enhanced teaching and learning opportunities. Using technology effectively leads students to be more creative and keep them more engaged on classroom activities. In addition, using ICT supports teachers in their ability to differentiate their instructional practices in accordance with students' specific requirements (Hubbard, 2008).

“Web 2.0 application is one of the significant components of ICT implementation in education. Coyle (2011) provides the description of the term Web 2.0 as “a variety of websites and applications that allow anyone to create, share, collaborate, edit and distribute online information or content” (p. 8). Examples of Web 2.0 applications are wikis, blogs, podcasts, social networking such as Myspace, Facebook, YouTube and Instagram. Web 2.0 applications provide several benefits; it is easy to use them, they facilitate communication and interaction, and they are easily available (Drent & Meelissen, 2008; Hubbard, 2008). Moreover, they enable interactive sharing of information as well as promoting autonomous learning opportunities for students. Due to such benefits, such Web 2.0 applications and items as collaborative wiki spaces and blogs have been found not only useful resources for teachers but also they have resulted in more creative learning practices in the classroom (Dudeney & Hockly, 2012)”.



In the present century, many institutions are employing technology with the aim of maintaining their competitiveness. Schools cannot be considered an exception. Barnatt (2008) points out that in a growing number of schools traditional classrooms are equipped with technology to create more effective educational settings. Several applications of technology have started to be applied for language teaching purposes. As highlighted by Dudeney and Hockly (2012), in this digital age, if schools are to remain competitive, integrating technology into school curriculum becomes essential. As technology is advancing rapidly, the Internet and other technological tools are being used by many schools, and incorporating technology is becoming a requirement for most teachers. To attain effective use of Web 2.0 technologies for instructional purposes is given great importance; and consequently, a growing number of schools are incorporating Web 2.0 technology into their programs.

### **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

A review of the literature has revealed that there is an increasing body of research which puts an emphasis on the necessity of using technology in foreign language classes from primary to high school with a view to enhancing the technological skills of the students and to support and enhance foreign language learning opportunities (See Alexander, 2008; Almekhlafi, Ain & Abulibdeh, 2018; Kırkgöz, 2013). However, very little research is available on the infusion of Web 2.0 technologies in education in Turkey. Research investigating the use of technological tools from the teachers' perspectives also seems to be lacking. As schools continue to incorporate new technologies into their curriculum, more investigation into Web 2.0 tools may contribute to improving teaching and learning in foreign language classes.

### **1.3. Purpose of the Study**

With the advancements of Web 2.0 technologies, teachers are required to revise their teaching approaches. The infusion of Web 2.0 technology into the EFL classroom offers language learners with unique opportunities to interact and collaborate with their peers as well as teachers to help them become autonomous learners. Priority is given to achieve the effective use of Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. Thus, schools around the world are integrating Web 2.0 technologies into their programs.

The use of Web 2.0 tools in education remains an under-researched area in Turkey. This situation requires the present research to be initiated in an attempt to explore teachers' perspectives on Web 2.0 applications for instructional purposes. Therefore, the current study is intended to complete a gap in the literature on Web 2.0 use in schools by exploring Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of these tools for teaching and learning purposes.

#### **1.4. Research Questions**

The present study aims to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the application of Web 2.0 tools in English classes. It also examines the influence of certain variables on teachers' decisions to use such tools.

In line with these points, the study aims to answer the research questions given below:

1. What types of Web 2.0 tools are used by EFL teachers in their classes?
2. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives on using Web 2.0 applications in terms of their benefits and potential challenges?
3. Do gender, teaching experience, daily Internet use, and the computer use for teaching have a significant effect on EFL teachers' decision to use Web 2.0 applications for instructional purposes?

#### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The present study has significance for a number of reasons. First, investigating the Web 2.0 applications is important because of the advantages both students and teachers gain as a result of using them. Furthermore, the advantages of Web 2.0 applications is well-known by teachers in global contexts, which may not particularly apply for Turkish teachers of EFL, as they may not be well aware of the potential educational uses of such technological tools.

It is important to find out the teachers' perspectives on Web 2.0 tools in terms of the benefits and possible challenges teachers may experience in using such tools. English teachers' positive beliefs about the use of various Web 2.0 tools may encourage syllabus designers, materials developers and other teachers at every level of education to consider incorporating such tools for instructional purposes.

A further significance of this study is that the results obtained from this study may help English teachers gain a deeper understanding into the benefits of Web 2.0 technology. All these reasons make it inevitable to initiate the current study to make a contribution to English Language Teaching (ELT) field.



## CHAPTER II

### 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a review of relevant literature under three main subheadings: computer-mediated communication, history of Web 2.0 tools, and types of Web 2.0 tools used for educational purposes. Finally, a review of the relevant studies conducted globally and locally is given.

#### 2.2. Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC)

Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) is a newly developed aspect of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). In one of his research, Herring (1996) defines CMC as “the communication that takes place between human beings via the instrumentality of computer” (p.20). CALL depends on interaction between computer and person while CMC is similar and is linked to telecommunication technologies, chatting online, having conferences on the web and forums (Chen, Pedersen & Murphy, 2011). It can be stated that before the developments in technology, computers functioned as tutors. After the developments in technology, computers became to be used “tools”. As pointed out by Brandl (2012), CMC has now become a part of everyday life through emails, forums, blogs, wikis, online chatting, video-sharing and social media. Using CMC in the classroom can be seen as overcoming the boundaries of the classroom (Dawley, 2007; Kırkgöz, 2013).

#### 2.3. History of Web 2.0 Tools

The term World Wide Web was first used by Tim Berners-Lee in 1989. The introduction of the Internet in language education started with Web 1.0 tools, gradually progressed to Web 2.0 tools, and five years later, Dale Dougherty coined the term Web 2.0 (O'Reilly, 2007).

Web 1.0 refers to static web pages with hyperlinks to other pages and resources. As Web 1.0 sites are static, personal and not interactive, they are known as the readable web, which does not allow the readers' to make spoken or written additions. Among Web 1.0 tools, personal web sites and online encyclopaedias can be given as the most

popularly used examples around the world. Web 1.0 tools had limitations because of their passivity in communication (Motteram & Sharma, 2009). Some of the Web 1.0 websites had a “Guest Book” where the visitors could leave their ideas about the website. Unlike Web 1.0 tools, Web 2.0 tools allow the users to create and share information. Additionally, Web 2.0 tools offer learning opportunities that are real and collaborative by facilitating socialization, collaboration, creativity, authenticity and sharing.

Web 2.0 tools can be considered as an innovative technology, because before Web 2.0 tools the Internet was the main technology that was used as one-way communication. In other words, only the writers of a certain site could edit the content inside the web page and the readers would access the site and just read what has been written. In addition, visitors of a site were passive. After the improvements in technology, Web 2.0 tools are now viewed as “user-generated content”. Users from all over the world are able to go online and write their thoughts, ideas and share their knowledge. Therefore, not only can users collaborate with each other through a virtual community, they can also interact with each other as well. Because of these facilities, users can access to real and rich materials, they can create their own materials and share it with others.

To summarize, Web 1.0 applications can be distinguished from Web 2.0 applications in several ways: First, Web 2.0 websites enable users to create, share and communicate information. Second, the users do not need any publishing skills to share something on a Web 2.0 website, whereas Web 1.0 did not allow this to happen. In the days of Web 1.0 some of the abilities of Web 2.0 were possible to use but they were not that effective in sharing with others.

#### **2.4. Types of Web 2.0 Tools**

Web 2.0 tools are available in many different forms. Some of the Web 2.0 tools are online, which means that users; teachers and students need only the Internet access to create a document or a presentation. On the other hand, other Web 2.0 tools are programs that can be operated from a class computer or a mobile device. Web 2.0 is “a service built using the building blocks of the technologies and open standards that underpin the Internet and the web” (Anderson, 2007, p. 7). These services range wikis, and browsers with plugging, social networking, multimedia sharing, content

syndication, podcasting and content tagging services. In the following section, examples of types of Web 2.0 applications and their uses are discussed.

#### **2.4.1. Wikis**

Wikis are a “type of Web site that makes it easy for users to contribute and edit text content and graphics without any knowledge of Web page development or programming techniques” (Laudon & Laudon, 2009, p. 66). Wikipedia is one of the best (and biggest) examples of a Wiki. Wikis promote communication and collaboration through knowledge sharing and storing. The most distinctive characteristics of wikis is that people can create their own content, share and store data with the intention of having open access for later retrieval, promote collaboration that build synergy coming from many members instead of an individual, and allows open editing. Thus, unless they are not restricted to, anyone can add any information. The fact that wikis are easy to use does not require much expertise from its users. They are also evolving, which shows that they display greater opportunities for future use. Wikipedia is considered to be the most common wiki worldwide with more than 14 million entries (Lai & Turban, 2008; Li, 2012).

#### **2.4.2. Blogs**

Blogs are weblogs that give information about a particular event or a topic. There are also personal blogs giving information about a person similar to a diary. The main distinction between a wiki and a blog is that only the owner of the blog can write entries whereas in a wiki everyone can write entries. In addition, visitors can leave comments and respond to other visitors’ comments as well.

As in the case of an online diary, blog is a webpage “consisting of brief paragraphs of opinion, information, personal diary entries, or links, called posts, arranged chronologically with the most recent first, in the style of an online journal” (Anderson, 2007, p. 7). Alexander (2008) reports that blogs are the “centrepiece” to the organization of Web 2.0 because “the simplicity of creating and updating blogs empowers readers to write, evoking the phrase read/write Web” (p. 152). As Dawley (2007) remarks

“Blogs and wikis are being used by many instructors to support the writing process, assist reflection in learning, provide student empowerment and to promote the idea of students as experts in their own learning process” (p. 208).

“Another benefit of using blogs in language classes is that students can use written texts, graphics, audio files and videos linked to this platform (Hernández-Ramos, 2004). In this way, they can improve different language skills including writing, reading and listening”.

### **2.4.3. Social Networking**

Social networking is based on a person setting up an account for themselves and sharing their profiles with people that have similar interests, friends and family. Most of the time users have an option of private or public profile. Users can post images and videos. Social Networking includes Myspace and Facebook, YouTube and Instagram (Coyle, 2011).

### **2.4.4. Podcasting**

“Podcasts are usually audio files that can be either downloaded or listened to online. Some of the Podcasts may include images or even videos. A Podcast is an audio or video file created for use on mp3 players or on a computer (Baker et al., 2010). Podcasts are useful tools in improving listening skills. Kavaliauskiene and Anusiene (2009) point out that students can listen to a podcast and read its script simultaneously, and later they can record a response to the topic and submit it to their teacher. The teacher, then, can listen to the recording and give feedback. Using podcasts as a multi-purpose learning platform, helps improve students’ fluency in listening, reading, speaking, pronunciation and vocabulary making. When students are involved in an open interactive dialogue, all language skills are practiced at the same time. Thus, such Web 2.0 tools as blogs and podcasts can be applied in integrating language skills in order to develop and enhance real communication”.

### **2.4.5. YouTube**

YouTube provides its users a free platform for sharing and recruiting videos (Fuller, 2011). YouTube can be considered as the standard for video streaming on the Internet (Lee, 2010). Teachers can incorporate YouTube as a useful resource for

students to upload the videos as part of their assignments. Video streaming is also available via Facebook, and both can effectively be done using smart phones.

## **2.5. Benefits of Web 2.0 Tools**

“Recent research suggests that Web 2.0 applications offer great potential to enhance students’ learning (Ferdig, 2006). A review of research studies carried out on Web 2.0 technologies has demonstrated that incorporating Web 2.0 technology into the classroom offers numerous benefits. The effective use of Web 2.0 applications helps develop students’ critical thinking, achieve course objectives and provides more effective learning environment (Dudeney & Hockly, 2012). Also, using technology effectively helps the students to develop their creativity and keep them motivated. Therefore, schools turn into global learning environments. Students can utilize Web 2.0 platforms to interact, reflect, exchange ideas, and increase their knowledge. Furthermore, they can write questions they encounter related to school subjects, and receive response from teachers or peers (Harris & Rea, 2009)”.

“The emergence of Web 2.0 tools has given teachers the ability to improve their teaching process and differentiate their teaching approaches in accordance with the students’ needs. Web 2.0 tools are available at any time and any place. They are easy to have access to so that teachers can employ them without making much effort. These tools offer a variety of media ranging from images, videos and sounds. In addition to that they are really easy to use. They are available in various communication forms; hence, teachers can choose the most relevant tools for educational purposes (Glassman & Kang, 2011). Every student can act as the author and the editor. In addition, it is possible to track every edit that has been made. This facility helps the teachers to keep track of what the students are performing. Web 2.0 has the potential to create more interactive and powerful learning environments in which learners can create knowledge, produce and edit texts (Richardson, 2009). Finally, Web 2.0 technology helps build a community spirit, increase interaction and communication among the instructor, students, and other people, and enable sharing resources”.

As can be seen from the above discussion, Web 2.0 tools provide valuable resources and opportunities for both students and teachers mainly due to their communicative potentials. Web 2.0 tools not only provide authenticity and collaboration but they also contribute to the development of language skills as they give



students to have a control over their learning. A teacher who is using various Web 2.0 tools and products creates an engaging and collaborative teaching and learning environment for his/her students.

In addition to various benefits teachers can gain from using Web 2.0 tools in their language classes, the use of different Web 2.0 tools contributes to the development of students' technological literacy skills, and they are better prepared for their future professions. Students can receive most updated information and they can create concrete products using Web 2.0 tools (O'Reilly, 2007). In addition, with web 2.0 tools students have the chance to work flexible work hours both inside and outside the classroom; and in this way as noted by Prashnig (2006) students' different learning styles are supported. While working with Web 2.0 tools, students are mostly encouraged to work cooperatively with their peers, which help them share their experiences and ideas. As a result of working in groups students can improve their social and communicative skills (O'Reilly, 2007). Finally, Web 2.0 tools can advance students one step further from the routine textbook-related studies to giving the students an opportunity to produce content, and the task of producing or manipulating the content enhances students' self-efficacy.

## **2.6. Studies on the Use of Web 2.0 Technology**

The use of Web 2.0 technology has been investigated in various ESL/EFL teaching contexts; both globally and locally. This section provides the pertinent studies conducted abroad and in Turkish context.

### **2.6.1. Global Studies on Web 2.0 Tools**

“Between the years 2005 and 2009, Wang and Vasquez (2012) explored seven databases to present the current state of research on Web 2.0 tools and their roles in second language learning. The review has revealed that the integration of Web 2.0 tools in the classroom enhances learners' confidence in writing, helps them with their writing strategies and contributes greatly to the overall writing development of students. The review also demonstrates that the infusion of Web 2.0 technologies in the classroom offers numerous benefits to learners. These technologies create more comfortable, collaboration focussed social learning contexts, in which students tend to engage in

more interaction and collaboration with their peers. As a result, they become more productive and motivated”.

Research investigating the influence of Web 2.0 technologies on EFL learning and teaching has clearly demonstrated that “such tools have favourable influences on the students’ motivations in learning the target language and that they facilitate the learning of EFL (Balçıkanlı, 2012; Crook, 2008; Grant, 2016). Zelick (2013) examined teachers’ perception of Web 2.0 technologies, comparing it to traditional teaching techniques in the United States. The study revealed a positive effect between the teachers’ opinions of teaching lessons via Web 2.0 technologies compared to a traditional classroom”.

In the Iranian context, Shahrokni (2008) aimed to find out Iranian familiarity with Web 2.0 technologies; teachers’ perceptions towards effectiveness of such technologies in teaching English and how frequent they employed these tools in their lessons. A survey containing close- and open-ended statements and following interviews were used to collect data from the 53 participants. Most teachers were found to have low levels of familiarity with the technologies. Only a small number of the participants were using these Technologies in their lessons; the type of technological tools employed included dictionaries, web search engines and emails. The study revealed that the potential use of Web 2.0 technologies have not yet been achieved in Iranian language classes. This finding was due to such external factors as lack of CALL (Computer Assisted language learning) training in teacher education, challenges in the Internet services, and unavailability of computer for students.

A number of studies have investigated “teachers’ beliefs, attitudes as well as their confidence in implementing online digital tools for teaching and learning purposes. It has been revealed that teachers who hold positive attitudes and their level of confidence is high have a tendency to employ computer technologies more in their classrooms (e.g. Atkins & Vasu, 2000; Kessler & Plakans, 2008; Kim, 2002). On the other hand, some studies (Park & Son, 2009) reported that teachers were highly motivated; yet they mentioned inability in applying online tools in the classroom due to some factors; for example, time constraints, insufficient computers which was found to have an unfavourable effect on their use online technologies in the classroom) identified”.

Studies investigating teachers’ opinions of Web 2.0 use have consistently shown that teachers held positive beliefs that Web 2.0 applications should be incorporated into

lessons. Kay, Knaack and Petrarca (2009) examined 33 middle and secondary school teachers' perceptions of web-based learning tools (WBLTs) in Canada using the Learning Object Scale for teachers. Most teachers reported that WBLTs are user-friendly and engaging for students, and contributing towards successful learning. On the other hand, some teachers found WBLTs time consuming in terms of searching for appropriate tools and lessons- preparation. Teachers' reported some technological problems mainly related to Internet speed.

In another study Rahimi and Yadollahi (2011) investigated the connection between computer anxiety and ICT use of Iranian teachers in English classes. Participants were 254 Iranian EFL teachers. The study revealed computer anxiety had a direct relationship with ICT integration. In other words, "the level of computer anxiety was higher among the older EFL teachers who applied relatively fewer ICT tools in their instruction compared to younger teachers".

The study conducted by Cahyani and Cahyono (2012) attempted to find out what types of technology were used by the teachers. It was found that "teachers mostly used notebooks/computers, tape recorders, multimedia and websites. As for the teachers' attitudes towards technology use, teachers were found to hold positive opinions with regard to using technology in the classroom".

Almekhlafi, Ain and Abulibdeh (2018) conducted a large scale investigation to find out " 56 pre-service and in-service school teachers' perceptions of Web 2.0 applications and their u"se in the United Arab Emirates. The data collected via a five-point Likert scale questionnaire was subjected to quantitative analysis. The results indicated that teachers had high perception toward Web 2.0 tools; however, they were found to use Web 2.0 applications at a moderate level. Findings were mainly attributed to teachers' lack of professional training on using Web 2.0. Furthermore, no significant differences were observed in teachers' perceptions to Web 2.0 tools related to gender or experience in using computers and the Internet".

### **2.6.2. Local Studies on Web 2.0 Tools**

Çakır and Top (2015) examined teachers' perceptions of the use of Web 2.0 technologies as well as the frequency of using them in their lessons. Participants of the study were 516 pre-service and 317 in-service teachers in primary schools. A survey was employed to collect data. The study revealed that both groups of teachers had

highly positive perceptions about Web 2.0 technologies in education. Web 2.0 tools were used far more frequently by pre-service teachers in comparison to in-service teachers. The most frequently applied ICT tools were the grade book, the Internet software used for repetitive practice, processing text, interactive exercises and PowerPoint presentations.

Using a questionnaire, Özel and Arıkan (2015) investigated how frequently Turkish EFL instructors use the Internet and Web 2.0 tools; EFL instructors' level of proficiency in computer and the Internet use, and their perceptions of these tools for teaching objectives. About 112 EFL instructors at different universities responded to an on-line questionnaire, which was developed by the researchers. The results showed that although EFL instructors expressed positive beliefs in relation to using the Internet and Web 2.0 tools. They agreed that Web 2.0 tools, such as blogs, podcasts, wikis and social networking sites should be employed for purposes of language teaching as the use of these tools makes teaching more interesting, increase student motivation, and enhances cooperation among students. On the other hand, instructors reported that they were not applying these tools sufficiently in their teaching. Teachers expressed their concerns that they were not provided with enough opportunity to learn about the effective use of technology for instructional purposes.

In order to draw a picture of the extent of technology used by university level EFL learners, a large scale study was conducted by Şahin-Kızıl (2011) in one University context in Turkey. The findings obtained from the questionnaire showed that while technologies such as social networks are very popular among EFL learners used mainly to search for information, newer technologies including self-publishing and content creation tools are employed by a smaller number of the students. Findings show that EFL learners are digital learners at a moderate level and the types of technology tools used for daily and instructional purposes. The study suggest that EFL practitioners should aim to have a better understanding of the current EFL learners and provide them with more effective technology-integrated instruction.

Solmaz and Bekleyen (2011) researched “the websites used by high school EFL teachers in one province in Turkey. Data was collected from the forty-five English teachers working at private and Anatolian high schools they found that teachers mostly employed resources from websites, forums and social networks, dictionaries, magazines and blogs”.

In a similar study conducted by Kartal and Arikan (2011) with prospective teachers, “social networking, online music, and e-mails were found to be the most widely used tools by prospective teachers. On the other hand podcasts and blogs were found to be the least used tools. It is suggested that the Internet and Web 2.0 tools offer not only resources but also opportunities for students and teachers due to their communicative potentials”.

Cephe and Balçıkanlı (2012) investigated the prospective teachers’ perceptions of the use of Web 2.0 tools and the study showed that prospective teachers were mostly positive about the use of Web 2.0 tools. Another study was conducted by Kavandı (2012) to find out the potential effects of blogs on students’ English writing skills. The study revealed that students’ writing skills have been improved in relation to generating ideas, word choices, sentence fluency and presentation skills. It has also been found that the use of Web 2.0 tools helps teachers to promote on-line collaboration, cooperation and communication for students contributing to their personal, social and professional life (Balçıkanlı, 2012).

## **2.7. Summary**

This section has presented an overview of the main studies carried out in different educational contexts with regards to the use of Web 2.0 technology. As understood from the above review of the literature, with rapid technological developments Web 2.0 tools are utilized quite extensively in education to enhance students’ academic success. The next chapter presents methodology of the study.

## CHAPTER III

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents information about the research design and context and participants of the study. In addition, data collection instruments, data collection procedure, and analyses of data are described in this chapter.

#### 3.2. Research Design

The present study adopts mixed-method research design to investigate teachers' use of Web 2.0 technologies and their perspectives on the benefits and potential challenges posed by such technologies. It also examines whether variables such as gender, teaching experience, daily Internet use, and the computer use for teaching have a significant effect on teachers' decision to use the Web 2.0 applications. As noted by Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner (2007), mixed methods research refers to an approach that benefits from the use a combination of methods from quantitative and qualitative approaches. In addition, as maintained by Kemper, Stringfield and Teddlie (2003), "the nature of most research conducted in the social sciences lends itself to using mixed methods research procedures" (p. 273). In the present study, mixed methods research is also employed to relate the quantitative findings from the questionnaire with qualitative data from the interviews in order to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of the research topic under investigation (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007). Also, "mixed method research design helps the researcher to overcome any drawbacks to be obtained from using one source of data that is, questionnaire or interviews".

Table 1, which is presented below, illustrates a summary of the research questions and methodological approaches followed in the current study.

Table 1.

*Summary of Research Questions, Methodological Approaches and Data Sources*

<b>Research Questions</b>	<b>Methodological Approaches</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>
1. What types of Web 2.0 tools are used by EFL teachers in their classes?	Quantitative Approach	Questionnaire
2. What is the EFL teachers' perspective on using Web 2.0 applications in terms of their benefits and potential challenges?	Qualitative Approach Quantitative Approach	Interview Questionnaire
3. Do gender, teaching experience, daily Internet use, and the computer use for teaching have a significant effect on EFL teachers' decision to use Web 2.0 applications for instructional purposes?	Quantitative Approach	Questionnaire

As demonstrated in Table 1, the present research aimed to seek answers to three questions, using a mixed method research design. Each research question had a specific aim related to the objectives of the study. The research benefited from both qualitative and quantitative approaches in order to relate quantitative findings with those of qualitative data in a systematic way. Overall, quantitative data were collected through the questionnaire while qualitative data were obtained via open-ended questions in the interviews in order to investigate the teachers' perspectives of Web.2.0 technologies from multiple directions.

### **3.3. The Context of the Study**

The present study was conducted with TED (Türk Eğitim Derneği) Colleges, located in various provinces in Turkey, as its context for research. TED Colleges are highly prestigious schools with a long history. Following the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, TED Ankara College was founded in 1930, as the first private Turkish school to offer instruction in English, which is used as the medium of language. Throughout the years, the college was expanded to establish its primary, middle and high school. TED colleges are well-equipped with technology, have efficient internet access, and good teaching and learning facilities. Teachers working in TED colleges are required to use Web 2.0 technology in their classes to enhance the quality of teaching.

### **3.4. Participants**

English teachers (n:56) working in TED colleges in various provinces in Turkey were the participants of the study. Data were collected from 56 teachers working in these schools using a questionnaire, and interviews were also held with teachers who volunteered. The schools were chosen using purposeful sampling technique (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000) for two reasons: First, it was really necessary to find out whether the participants have some experience about using Web 2.0 items in their lessons. Second, participants consisted of males and female teachers, which was necessary for the present research to collect data from both gender in order to answer the third research question. As a result, purposive sampling enabled the researcher to “select information-rich cases strategically and purposefully” (Patton 2002, p. 243). Detailed information about participants of the study is presented in Chapter IV.

### **3.5. Data Collection Instruments**

In the present study, “two data collection instruments were used: The Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire and interviews. The rationale for employing a questionnaire as a research instrument is that a questionnaire is widely used to gather quantitative data. It can also be applied to a large research population simultaneously; therefore, the researcher can obtain data fairly easily and in a short period of time (Cohen, et al., 2000). The questionnaire (See Appendix 2 ) was developed by the researcher after a comprehensive literature review and in line with the research questions.”



### **3.5.1. The Questionnaire**

The questionnaire includes two sections. The first section aims to gather demographic data including gender, age, the daily Internet use, and participants' working experience. The second section, on the other hand, contains 15 statements related to teachers' perspectives of Web 2.0 tools, and the influence of Web 2.0 applications on learners' academic success. The questionnaire has been designed on a Five-point Likert scale, and the items rank from "I strongly agree (5)" to "I strongly disagree (1)". Research participants were requested to indicate their preferred choice to each statement in the questionnaire.

"The questionnaire has been designed by reviewing the relevant studies (Almekhlafi et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2009). To ensure validity and reliability criteria, the designed questionnaire was reviewed by eight experts from various disciplines; three ICT specialists specialized in educational technology and five English teachers' already incorporating Web 2.0 technology in their lessons. Experts were asked to check the questionnaire, specify any unclear expression, and offer their comments to ensure that each statement in the questionnaire is appropriate to achieve the research objectives. During this process, based on expert opinion, some editing was done on the existing items to help the researcher shape the final version of the questionnaire".

Moreover, prior to applying the questionnaire, a written ethical approval was obtained from the school directors. Participants were given detailed information related to the purpose of the study, and they were requested to sign a consent form (see Appendix 3), indicating their consent. The questionnaire was implemented with the teachers in the school contexts. The participants were requested to respond to each single statement in the questionnaire.

### **3.5.2. Interviews**

The interview questions have been prepared in English, as was the questionnaire, informed by the related literature on the use of Web 2.0 tools and the objective of the study. The interview was employed in order to obtain an in-depth inquiry of English language teachers' views about the use of Web 2.0 tools in their English lessons, and to uncover the meanings teachers attach to their experience (Seidman 2006) in using such technological tools. Accordingly, the researcher formulated five interview questions (See Appendix 4). Applying the interviews, the

participants were requested to express their opinions related to what kind of Web 2.0 tools they use in their lesson, why they use them in their English lessons, their opinions about the benefits and potential challenges they may experience in using these digital tools, and whether or not students experience any challenges in using Web 2.0 tools.

A piloting procedure was carried out with the interviews. Six experts were consulted to have their opinions of the interview questions. The supervisor of the thesis, three English teachers regularly using Web 2.0 technology in their lessons and two ICT specialists were requested to assess the interview questions to ensure that each statement in the interview is appropriate and comprehensible for the interviewees.

### **3.6. Data Collection Procedures**

As stated before, a questionnaire specifically developed for the present study was used to seek answers for the research questions (see Appendix 2 for the Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire). Data was collected from the TED private schools located in various provinces using “Purposeful Sampling” (Patton, 2002, p. 243).

The study was conducted in two phases: The first phase of the study involved administering the questionnaire, and in the second phase interviews were implemented with the participants who expressed their interest to take part in the interviews.

Before implementing the questionnaire, ethical considerations were completed. The researcher contacted the directors of the schools. English teachers working in those TED private schools were administered the questionnaire after being granted permission(see Appendix 6 for the Permissions from the TED schools ) by the Directors of each school, from which data was collected. The data were collected during 2019-2020 academic year. Before the actual implementation of the questionnaire, detailed information were provided to research participants related to the study, and for ethical reasons, their approval to participate in the study was obtained through the signed a consent form (See Appendix 3 ). Also, both the teachers and the school administration were ensured that the participants’ identity would be kept confidential and that research findings would be used only for the present study.

The participants who had completed the questionnaire were asked to indicate whether they would be interested to participate in the following interviews. Only 12 participants indicated their willingness to participate in the interview through the questionnaire. As teachers were working in different TED colleges in different cities, it

was not feasible to hold face-to-face individual interviews with all the participants. Thus, written open-ended interviews questions were presented to the participants following the implementation of the questionnaire for reasons of practicality and because of the limitation of time and resources. The interviews provided the researchers with the opportunity to further explore and have an in-depth inquiry of the results received from the questionnaire.

### **3.7. Data Analysis**

Data analysis was carried out in two stages. First a numerical value was given for each single variable and each one of the 15 closed-ended statements of the questionnaire. Then raw data were digitized manually in order to code using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 21.0 (SPSS).

#### **3.7.1. Analysis of Descriptive Statistics**

To describe demographic information of participants, frequencies in relation to gender, age, year of experience and the grade that they teach were calculated. Descriptive statistics were employed to reveal mean and standard deviation scores of the 15 Likert scale questionnaire items. Then the mean scores and standard deviation for each close-ended item were calculated. They are presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

To address the third research question of the present study, first, Mann Whitney U Test was run to see whether gender influences the participants' decision to use Web 2.0 tools. Additionally, Kruskal Wallis Test was applied to understand the relation between year of experience and the use of Web 2.0 tools. These non-parametric tests were run because the normality test results of those variables were under 0.05. Findings are illustrated in Tables 4-7.

#### **3.7.2. Analysis of the Qualitative Data**

For the analysis of the qualitative data obtained from the written open-ended questions in the interview, content analysis was applied. Content analysis was conducted following the procedures described by Creswell (2014). Accordingly, participants' responses to each interview question were read carefully a number of times by the researcher. Then the coding process was used to describe emerging themes. The

findings for each open-ended question are presented in themes, and finally, they are interpreted and supported with appropriate excerpts in Chapter 4 of the thesis.

To preserve confidentiality, the real names of the participants are not disclosed. Instead, different codes were assigned to represent the participants such as 'P1 (Participant 1) and P2 (Participant 2). Then, written form of data was read over and over in order to obtain a general understanding of the information. During this step, short notes were taken and general thoughts about the data were recorded. The results were sorted out into categories in order to interpret and discuss the findings. The findings from lecturers and from teachers were analysed separately. The findings were categorized under themes derived from gathered data according to the research questions and literature review.

To ensure trustworthiness in the qualitative data analysis part of the study, several measures recommended by Shenton (2004) were considered. Second, the researcher has been working in the TED College for some time, and he has therefore familiarity with the use of Web 2.0 tools, and also observing his colleagues using these tools in their lessons. It can therefore be pointed out that these two points have the potential to increase the credibility of the qualitative data in the study.

To conclude, this chapter has given information regarding the methodology of the present study. The design of the study, participants and context of the study, data collection instruments, and data analysis methods were described. The next chapter deals with findings obtained from the questionnaires and interviews.

## CHAPTER IV

### 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter presents the main findings obtained from the Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire and the interviews. Firstly, findings from the questionnaire are presented. Next, findings from the interviews are described. In order to seek answers for the research questions, mixed-research was adopted, which required quantitative and qualitative approaches to collecting data; thus, the data was evaluated via a number of statistical methods including descriptive statistics, Mann and Whitney U Test. In addition, content analysis was applied to evaluate the qualitative data from the questionnaire.

#### 4.1. Analyses of the Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire

The quantitative data from the 15 close-ended items on the Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire was analysed using SPSS 21.0 version. Descriptive statistics were employed to reveal frequencies and percentages in relation to demographic information of the participants as well as closed-items in the questionnaire. In addition, Mann Whitney U-Test was run to see whether there is any influence of variables such as the participants' gender, teaching experience and the use of computers and the Internet on their use of Web 2.0 tools.

##### 4.1.1. Background of Participants

Demographic information about the participants was obtained by using the answers given to eight items in the first section of the Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire (See Appendix 1). These items were about gender, age, year of teaching experience and time spent on using the Internet daily, participants' use of the computer for teaching purposes. In addition, in this section of the questionnaire, whether the participants teach at the primary or secondary levels or both or if they received any training on technology was also asked with a view to obtaining comprehensive background information about the participants.

Descriptive statistics concerning the background information about participants are given in Tables 2 below:

Table 2.  
*Demographic Information about Participants*

<b>Demographic Information</b>		<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Variables</b>			
Gender	Female	20	35.7
	Male	36	64.3
Year of experience	1-5	20	35.7
	6-10	22	39.3
	11-15	8	14.3
	16-20	3	5.4
	21-25	0	0
	Over 26	3	5.4
Class size	1-10 students	1	1.8
	11-20 students	37	66.1
	21-30 students	18	32.1
Hours of Internet time	1-2 hours	28	50.0
	3-5 hours	24	42.9
	Over 6 hours	4	7.1
Teaching position	Primary	20	35.7
	Middle	17	30.4
	High	19	33.9
The use of computer for teaching	Frequently	19	33.9
	Rarely	3	5.4
	Almost always	22	39.3
	Occasionally	5	8.9
	All the time	7	12.5
Training on technology	Yes	6	10.7
	No	50	89.3

Table 2 demonstrates personal information of 56 participants. As seen in the table, 64.3% of the participants were male (f: 36) and 35.7% female (f: 20). Namely, there were more male participants than female participants. With regard to years of teaching experience, most participants had between 1-10 years of teaching experience at

the time the present study was conducted. Accordingly, 39.3% of the participants (f: 22) had been working between 6-10 years, and 35.7% (f: 20) displayed 1-5 year's experience in teaching English.

The class size of the participants was mostly between 11-20 students for 66.1% of the teachers (f: 37), and 32.1% of the teachers (f: 18) had between 21-30 students in their classes. In line with the objective of the present study, it was important to find out hours of the Internet use by the participants. It was noted that half the participants (50%) actually spent 1-2 hours using the Internet, and 42.9% spent between 3-5 hours. Few participants (f:4) representing 7.1% of the participant teachers were engaged in over 6 hours weekly on using the Internet. All participants had graduated from a Teacher Education Department in Turkey. The participants' ages were between 26 to 45.

Another important issue to find out was the participants' use of computer for teaching purposes. All participant teachers used computers at certain frequency. About 39.3% of the participants (f:22) reported that they use it "almost always"; a similar number of participants (f:19) corresponding to 33.9% of the research population stated that they "frequently" used computer; and some participants (12.5%, f:7) stated that they used computer "all the time". A minority of the participants (f:5, 8.9%) stated that they used computer "occasionally" and only 3 participants (5.4%) reported to use it "rarely".

The final question on this part of the questionnaire aimed to find out whether participants received any training on the application of technology. The responses given to this item revealed that most participants (f:50, 89.3%) had not received any training on the use of technology for education, and only few participants (f:6, 10.7%) responded positively to this statement. Those who stated "yes" reported that they did not receive any specific training on the use of technology, but they learned it through their personal interest. One of the participants (P38), for example, stated that "I used to be a website administrator so I can easily use technology in my classes". Another participant (P34) mentioned that he attended to a national ELT conference on using technology which taught him how to accommodate students with various learning styles. For another participant (P2), attending to the schools' ELT meetings taught her the effective use of technology for educational purposes.

#### 4.1.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Questionnaire

Table 3.

##### *Descriptive Statistics of the Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire*

Using Web.2 technology in my English lessons.	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
1. increases student academic success	0	0	9	16,1	0	0	19	33,9	28	50,0
2. Is effective because I can implement it successfully.	0	0	6	10,7	1	1,8	19	33,9	30	53,6
3. Promotes collaboration among students.	2	3,6	9	16,1	1	1,8	20	35,7	24	42,9
4. Develops students' communication skills	3	5,4	10	17,9	2	3,6	16	28,6	25	44,6
5. Is an indispensable teaching tool.	3	5,4	14	25,0	2	3,6	20	35,7	17	30,4
6. Takes up too much time to prepare instructional activities.	4	7,1	28	50,0	1	1,8	9	16,1	14	25,0
7. Gives me as a teacher an opportunity to be a facilitator instead of information provider.	0	0	7	12,5	0	0	22	39,3	27	48,2
8. Requires too much time to spend on technical problems.	2	3,6	25	44,6	1	1,8	13	23,2	15	26,8



9. Meets the needs of students with varied ability to learn.	0	0	4	7,1	0	0	23	41,1	29	51,8
10. Helps me to develop professionally.	0	0	5	8,9	0	0	16	28,6	35	62,5
11. Helps to accommodate students' with various learning styles.	0	0	6	10,7	0	0	10	17,9	40	71,4
12. Motivates students to be more engaged in activities.	0	0	3	5,4	0	0	16	28,6	37	66,1
13. Necessities training for me.	1	1,8	22	39,3	0	0	22	39,3	11	19,6
14. Develops students' interpersonal skills.	2	3,6	7	12,5	1	1,8	23	41,1	23	41,1
15. Increases students' stress and anxiety.	16	28,6	19	33,9	3	5,4	9	16,1	9	16,1

As mentioned earlier, descriptive statistics were applied to determine the frequencies and percentages in relation to each of the 15 close-item on the questionnaire. In the questionnaire, Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12 and 14 aim to find out potential benefits of applying Web 2.0 tools in English classes. However, through the item 6, 8 and 15, the possible drawbacks of using these tools are assessed. Item 7, 10 and 13 are intended to determine teacher-related factors, from the perspective of the participants.

Regarding the first statement “using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons increases student academic success.” most participants expressed their agreement ranging from “strongly agree” (f: 28) to “agree” (f:19). Only a small number of the participants (f: 9) did not think that Web 2.0 technology enhances student academic success.

The second item on the questionnaire was related to “using Web.2 technology in my English lessons is effective because I can implement it successfully”. In response to this statement, a vast majority of the participants expressed their strong agreement 53.6% (f: 30) and 33.9% (f:19) agreement. A few participants (f: 6) did not agree with the idea of this technology being an effective tool, as opposed to a good number of teachers (87.5%, f:49) who agree with this idea while one participant remained neutral .

The third item in the questionnaire asked participants’ opinion about “using Web.2 technology in my English lessons promotes collaboration among students”. A similar finding was obtained for this item in that 42.9% of the participants (f:24) strongly agreed and 35.7% (f:20) agreed; one participant remained neutral, and a small number of participants disagreed (f:2) or strongly disagreed (f:9) with the idea that this technological tool increases student collaboration.

The next item on the questionnaire (Item 4) asked participants’ beliefs related to the statement “using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons develops students’ skills for communication”. A similar finding was recorded for this statement in that most participants strongly agreed (f:25) or agreed (f:16), while minority of the participants did not think that this technological tool develops students’ communication skills with stating their beliefs through “strongly disagree” (f:3) and “disagree” (f:10) while two participants remained neutral.

Item 5 on the questionnaire elicited participants’ perspective related to “using Web.2 technology in my English lessons is an indispensable teaching tool”. A similar finding has been observed, as most participants’ level of agreement ranged from “strongly agree” (f:17) to “agree” (f:20). Only 2 participants remained undecided on this statement, and minority of the participants disagreed (strong disagreement: (f: 3), and disagreement (f:14).

“Using Web.2 technology in my English lessons takes up too much time to prepare instructional activities” was Item 6 on the questionnaire. Participants were divided with regard to their beliefs to this item. 50% of the participants (n:28) expressed their disagreement and strong disagreement (f:4); on the other hand, 25% of the participants (f:14) strongly believed and some participants (f:9) only believed that preparing activities is time consuming, with 1 participant remaining undecided.

Item 7 on the questionnaire asked participants’ perspectives on “using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons gives me as a teacher an opportunity to be a facilitator instead of information provider”. A vast majority of the participants strongly agreed

that (f:27) or agreed that (f:22) using Web 2.0 tools enabled them to function as a facilitator; on the other hand, only a minority of the participants disagreed (f:7) with this idea.

The next close-ended item on the questionnaire, Item 8, elicited participants' opinion regarding to "using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons requires too much time to spend on technical problems". In fact, through this statement, one possible drawback of using technology in language classes was intended to be revealed. Participants were almost equally divided in their responses to this statement. Almost half of the participant teachers thought that Web 2.0 technology is time consuming, agreeing with this idea (f:15) strongly agreed and (f:13) agreed); one participant remained neutral and the remaining participants did not believe that Web 2.0 technology needs extra time for technical problems. Participants' level of disagreement ranged from strongly disagree (f:25) to disagree (f:2).

It is maintained that "using ICT gives the teacher an ability to provide teaching practices according to students' different needs and interests" (Hubbard, 2008). Item 9 of the questionnaire aimed to find out the participants' views on related to this issue stating that "using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons meets the needs of students with varied ability to learn". With the exception of a few participants (f:4) who expressed their disagreement, the remaining participants, constituting the majority, responded positively to this statement. In other words, there was a high degree of agreement with 29 participants reporting that they "strongly agree" and 23 participants stated that they "agree" with the idea that using Web 2.0 tools is helpful in addressing students' needs with different learning ability.

Item 10 in the questionnaire were related to "Using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons helps me to develop professionally". A big majority of the participants strongly agreed (f:35) and also agreed (f: 16) that using this technology contributed to their professional development as an English teacher. Only few participants (f:5) expressed their disagreement.

"Using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons helps to accommodate students' with various learning styles" was the Item 11. As in the responses given to the previous statement, an overwhelming majority of the teachers expressed their strong agreement (f: 40) and their agreement (f: 10) that they were able to address students' different learning styles by using Web 2.0 technology in their English lessons. On the

other hand, a minority of the participants (f:6) held an opposite view expressing their strong disagreement to this statement.

As discussed in Chapter 2 of the thesis, Web 2.0 technology has the potential to create more interactive learning environments and learners can actively carry out various tasks effectively (Richardson, 2009). Item 12 on the questionnaire aimed to find out the participants' perspectives about this particular aspect of this technology through the statement "using Web.2 technology in my English lessons motivates students to be more engaged in activities". With the exception of a very few participants (f:3), all the remaining participants expressed their agreement ranging from strongly agree (f:37) to agree (f:16).

Effective use of the technology requires the users to have the necessary knowledge and skills. Therefore, the participants' perspective of "Using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons necessities training for me" was sought by item 13 on the questionnaire. More than half the participants believed that they needed training expressing strong agreement (f:11) and agreement (f:22) to this statement. It was evident from the participants' responses that only 1 participant with strong disagreement and some participants (f:22) reported their disagreement that they did not need any training to be able to use Web 2.0 tools effectively.

As presented in Chapter 1 of the present study, Web 2.0 technology has the potential to develop students' interpersonal skills. Accordingly, Item 14 on the questionnaire aimed to find out participants' opinion with regard to this issue: "Using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons develops students' interpersonal skills". There was an overwhelming agreement among the participants with most participants (f:23) expressing strong agreement, and the same number of participants (f:23) expressing agreement that Web 2.0 tools develop students' interpersonal skills. Only some participants (f:7) disagreed or strongly disagreed (f:2) with this statement and just one participant was (f:1) uncertain.

One of the possible drawbacks of using technology was stated to cause stress and anxiety in its users. In the present study participants' perspectives related to this view was sought through the final item (Item 15) on the questionnaire which asked "using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons increases students' stress and anxiety". Participants mostly expressed their disbelief that Web 2.0 tools increases students' stress and anxiety". In fact, a large number of participants (f:19) disagreed and some participants (f:16) strongly disagreed with this idea. Few participants (f: 3)

were uncertain. On the other hand, those participants who thought that Web 2.0 technology does not cause stress and anxiety for students appeared to remain in minority. Some participants (f: 9) reported their disagreement and the same number of participants (f: 9) expressed strong disagreement.

#### 4.1.3. Inferential Statistics of the Questionnaire

The third research question of the present study aimed to unravel whether there a significant difference among various variables such as gender, experience in using computers and hours of daily Internet use, and finally teachers' use of the computer for teaching integrating Web 2.0 tools and applications in the teaching and learning. In order to see whether gender influences the participants' decision to use Web 2.0 tools, Mann Whitney U Test was run. Additionally, Kruskal Wallis Test was employed to understand the relation between year of experience and the use of Web 2.0 tools. These non-parametric tests were run because the normality test results of those variables were under 0.05. Findings are illustrated in Tables 4-7.

Table 4.

*Mann Whitney U Test Results for Gender Variable*

Gender	N	X	SD	Z	P
Female	20	35.7	.483	-1,113	.266
Male	36	64.3			

p<0.01

The results of the analysis of the Mann Whitney U Test Results did not show any significant differences based on the teachers' gender and their applying Web 2.0 technology

Table 5.

*Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Year of Experience Variable*

Year of experience	N	X	Chi-square	Df	P
1-5	20	35.7	3.640	3	.303
6-10	22	39.3			
11-15	8	14.3			
16-20	3	5.4			
21-25	0	0			
Over 26	3	5.4			

p<0.01

As seen from Table 5, Kruskal Wallis Test Result does not indicate a significant difference between year of experience and the use of Web 2.0 tools with p value (p<0.01).

Table 6.

*Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Hours in Internet Variable*

Hours in Internet	N	X	Chi-square	Df	P
1-2 hours	28	50.0	.713	2	.700
3-5 hours	24	42.9			
Over 6 hours	4	7.1			

p<0.01

The effect of the time “spent daily on using the Internet” variable on the participants’ applying Web 2.0 technology for English teaching purposes was determined via Kruskal Wallis Test. As Table 6 shows, no significant difference was identified (p<0.01) between the time spent on the Internet use and the teachers’ actual use of the Web 2.0 tools in their lessons.

Table 7.

*Kruskal Wallis Test Results for the Use of Computer for Teaching Variable*

The use of computer for teaching	N	X	Chi-square	Df	P
Frequently	19	33.9	1.768	3	.622
Rarely	3	5.4			
Almost always	22	39.3			
Occasionally	5	8.9			
All the time	7	12.5			

p<0.01

Kruskal Wallis Test was also run to find out whether the participants' computer use had any influence of their decision to incorporate Web 2.0 technology for teaching purposes. As seen in Table 7, no significant difference was detected regarding the effect of this variable on the participants' decision to apply Web 2.0 technologies in their lessons (p<0.01)

To sum up, as demonstrated by inferential statistics, there is not a significant relationship among the use of Web 2.0 tools and such variables as gender, year of experience, the hours spent in Internet and the use of computer for teaching. This finding could be interpreted in terms of the participants as regular users of Web 2.0 tools as reflected to their language teaching and learning activities.

#### **4.2. Analysis of the Interview Administrated to Teachers**

The first research question of the present study aimed to elicit teachers' perspectives on what type of Web 2.0 tools they used in their English lessons. It was assumed that the teachers were already using these tools because the researcher himself had been working in one the TED colleges in which the current study was conducted. Data for this research question was obtained mainly through the analysis of qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interviews, as will be illustrated in this section. As stated in Chapter 3, content analysis was employed in analysing the interview data.

#### 4.2.1. Types of Web 2.0 Tools Used by the Teachers

The first interview question asked the participants what type of Web 2.0 tools they use in their classes. All participants were found to use at least three different types of Web 2.00 tools. Some participants (f:4) stated that they use ICT tools supplied by the English coursebook which provided a kind of a digital platform for them. Besides that, they used some additional tools, as expressed by the following excerpts:

Excerpt 1:

*I apply ICT tools in the course books we use in the lessons. I also use Classdojo-Kahoot, and Voscreen in my lessons. (P10)*

The most frequently used Web 2.0 tools utilized by the participants was Kahoot and YouTube, which were mentioned by all the participants interviewed. These tools were followed by Achieve 3000, used by many participants (f:8), TED-ed video used by several participants (f:7), vialogues.com and lessonwriter.com utilized by another group of participants (f:6). Many participants (f:7) stated that they used newsela.com for reading and quizzes and websites for examinations. One participant mentioned that the kind of tool he chooses depends on the nature of the subject covered in the class as well as the projects assigned to students. Participants' comments are illustrated in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 2:

*The kind of digital tool I use in my lessons depends entirely on the topic. Also, students can choose the tools for their projects. Mostly we use YouTube, Kahoot, and Prezi. (P7)*

Interview extracts below highlights the common point expressed by the teachers:

Excerpt 3:

*I use Kahoot & Achieve 3000 for reading and writing activities. With the help of Kahoot, I ask questions about a text, in this way my students develop their reading skills and sometimes after playing with Kahoot, I ask my students to*



*write a different version of the story or I ask my students to write about something imaginary using a particular grammar point. (P2)*

Excerpt 4:

*I often use vialogues.com and lessonwriter.com to create reading lessons by pasting a text. This tool automatically generates vocabulary, pronunciation, word roots and grammar support to help students. My students find it very helpful. With vialogues, students watch videos and we talk about the vocabulary and as a teacher I make sure that the vocabulary items are understood and I check my students' pronunciations. (P3)*

#### **4.2.2. Benefits Offered by the Use of Web 2.0 Tools to Students**

Content analysis of the open-ended interview questions led to the emergence of six main themes. In relation to various benefits obtained from Web 2.0 tools, they included “the development of language skills and a variety of abilities” (f:12), “the development of interactive and collaborative learning” (f:10), “increase student motivation (f:9); “attracting students’ attention and keeping them engaged” (f: 8), and finally, “assessment of knowledge” (f:8).

The participants all believed that Web 2.0 tools developed students’ language skills ranging from listening and reading skills to improving vocabulary knowledge and pronunciation. The following extracts demonstrate effects of Web 2.0 tools on improving students’ reading skills, as perceived by the participants.

Excerpt 5:

*I often use vialogues.com and lessonwriter.com to create reading lessons by pasting a text. This tool automatically generates vocabulary, pronunciation, word roots and grammar support to help students. My students find it very helpful. With vialogues, students watch videos and we talk about the vocabulary and as a teacher I make sure that the vocabulary items are understood and I check my students' pronunciations. (P3)*

In the following excerpt, the participant expresses her experience of using the tool Voscreen to improve students’ listening and related skills.

Excerpt 6:

*I use Voscreen to improve my students' listening skills. It is a very useful and enjoyable. Voscreen is a language learning tool that helps my students to listen and translate the sentences. It is a great way to check grammar and it is very helpful for my students to practice listening. Voscreen selects sentences from movies, TV series or even musicals. My students can hear different accents. The tool also allows you to listen to the conversations as much as we want and it includes English subtitles as well. (P11)*

Participants also reported that the use of Web 2.0 tools enabled students to practice the English language, increased students' awareness of the target language, provided them visual support and hence contributed greatly to students' academic success". These benefits of the technology are highlighted by P1 and P10 in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 7:

*Web 2.0 technologies enable my students to use the target language more effectively  
And increase their awareness about the target language.(P1)*

Excerpt 8:

*Students get exposed to the target language, in this way they practice the target language and they build language awareness. also, students like visual materials so they are into the topic more easily. (P1)*

Excerpt 9:

*Ted-ed videos, Kahoot and YouTube are useful tools to develop my students language skills. Ted-Ed videos are very helpful because, my students and I often learn new things and are able to listen useful information from native speakers. At the end of the videos we often bring up a discussion topic about the video, first my students try to take notes while we are watching and they are dicussing their notes with their partners and at the end we make a whole class discussion. This improves my students public speaking skills, note-taking skills and listening skills. (P10)*

A further benefit yielded by using Web 2.0 tools was the development of “interactive and collaborative learning” environment. Many participants agreed that many of these digital tools required the students to interact with the technology and collaborate with their peers in order to perform the assigned classroom task. This is illustrated in the extracts given below:

Excerpt 10:

*I use vialogues.com and lessonwriter.com in my lessons very frequently. They facilitate interactive learning because students interact with technology as well as with their environment using these tools. Therefore these tools help me to create an interactive classroom environment. (P3)*

Excerpt 11:

*I use Kahoot extensively in my lessons. They offer numerous benefits. First of all they promote effective learning and also enhance collaborative learning. While doing activities with these tools students are able to learn from each other's mistakes also, students to collaborate for example using Kahoot and to review subject. (P6)*

Excerpt 12:

*Collaboration and cooperation are very important skills for 21st century. I use to encourage student collaboration. These tools help us raise skilled people for 21<sup>st</sup> century. Without these skills, students will lack a lot of social skills in real life. As teachers our aim is not only raise language proficient students but also raise socially skilled people for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. (P8)*

As for increasing student motivation, participants unanimously agreed that the regular and effective use of technological tools contributes greatly to boosting student motivation. Teachers' comments are presented below:

Excerpt 13:

*Students get motivated because of the technology integration in teaching, unfortunately, is not as common as using textbooks or as we can say traditional teaching. Once we integrate technology into our teaching students get motivated*

*because they think they are spending their class time entertaining but in fact with these online games and tools they keep learning. (P2)*

Excerpt 14:

*I have come to realize that my students are more motivated and focused on the activities when we are dealing them with the help of Web 2.0 tools. They say that they are more motivated because the tools that we are using are more authentic rather than our course books. And I personally choose videos that are related with real-word which my students enjoy much. They learn through the videos and they revise with the online games such as Kahoot. (P12)*

An additional benefit mentioned by participants was that Web 2.0 tools helped teachers to attract student attention and kept them engaged with subject content.

Excerpt 15:

*I teach in primary level. I use to attact students' attention and keep them engaged. The tools that we are using in our classes increase the time of the attention span with sounds and visual images. Especially, games bring up the students competitive emotions and by doing that games help students to stay focused and at the same time they have a joyful time. As the students are on the activity, they become much focused since there is a fun element in these tools. (P2)*

Excerpt 16:

*The tools that we are using in our classes are quite colourful and this attracts my students attention easily. There are many visuals to keep them engaged and the topic of the listening tracks and videos are up to date and interesting. These attract my students and they stay engaged with the whole activity. (P7)*

The final benefit Web 2.0 tools served as an assesment tool for the teachers. Teachers were able to review topics, reinforce and supplement textbook related teaching and assess student learning. In this way they noted that learning became more effective and students were able to they keep what they previously learned in mind longer, as seen in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 17:

*I use many technological tools to evaluate them and check their understanding. One of the them is Kahoot. Kahoot is an excellent way to entertain my students, at the same time it helps me to asses my students and give them feedback. At the end of the quiz, I see my students' performance on a particular topic such as present simple and present continuous or modals. At the end of each unit of the course book, I prepare questions on Kahoot and my students log in and we play the game. The last game that we have played was about the modals, infinitive of purpose and quantifiers. After the quiz, I realized that many of my students struggled on quantifiers but they were pretty good at modals and they didn't struggle on infinitive of purpose as I anticipated. After I detected my students' needs' I went back to the topic of quantifiers and we revised this specific topic in the class one more time. (P8)*

It can be suggested that incorporating Web 2.0 offers can take learners one step further from the regular textbook-based studies to giving the teachers and learners an opportunity to create teaching and learning activities to enhance students' learning. This finding is consistent with the argument put forward by several researchers (Kocak & Oyman, 2012).

#### **4.2.3. Challenges posed by the Web 2.0 tools**

The participants were asked whether using Web 2.0 tools caused any challenges to them as well as the students. The participants (f: 5) stated that they did not experience much problem in relation to using such tools in their lessons. On the other hand, the challenges focused on as summarised by the following participants:

Excerpt 18:

*We can face some technical problems such as, low internet connection, power cut, not always being able to get connected and speakers are unable to work sometimes. We have to be prepared for such challenges. I personally connect from my own device to the internet. I make sure that speakers and the comupter is working properly. But, for power cuts unfortunately I can not do much but I always arrange some extra activites just in case. (P3)*

As for the students experiencing any challenges, the participants unanimously agreed that their students experienced no problem as highlighted below:

Excerpt 19:

*No they do not. All of my students are digital natives. It is when our Internet is faulty we feel unhappy. Some distracting ads can be a problem. (P4)*

Excerpt 20:

*Not all students are digital natives. The major challenge is how to ensure an equal contribution among all the members and increase students' editing efforts in a collaborative writing. (P3)*

This chapter has presented the main research findings obtained from the questionnaire and interview conducted with the teachers. The next chapter deals with the conclusions and discusses research findings in line with research questions. The implications to be drawn from the research findings are also presented along with the limitations and suggestions for further studies.

## CHAPTER V

### 5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

#### 5.1. Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the study. It also includes discussion of the main findings in accordance with research questions. In addition, relevant previous research studies are discussed and related to the findings of the present study. Finally, implications, recommendations and the limitations of the study are given, and suggestions for future research are presented.

#### 5.2. Summary of the Study

The present study was conducted to investigate the type of Web 2.0 tools used by the EFL teachers for teaching and learning purposes, teachers' perceived benefits and possible challenges they might experience in using such applications. In addition, the study aimed to reveal whether there a significant difference among various variables including gender, years of teaching experience, hours of daily Internet use, and use of the computer on teachers' actual use of Web 2.0 applications in teaching and learning process.

Data was collected using the Web 2.0 Application questionnaire specifically developed for this study and written open-ended interview questions. Participants were 56 English teachers working in TED colleges, highly prestigious private schools in Turkey, and 12 of the volunteering participants were administered written open-ended interview questions.

Descriptive statistics was run to analyse the data from the 15 Likert-Scale items on the Questionnaire, including demographic information of the participants. In addition, Mann Whitney U Test was employed to see the influence of "gender" variable, and Kruskal Wallis Test was used to see the effects of "use of computer for teaching", "year of teaching experience" and "the daily Internet use" on teachers' applying Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. Qualitative data from the written open-ended interview questions were subjected to content analysis.

### **5.3. Discussion of the Findings with Reference to Research Questions**

#### **5.3.1. Research Question**

##### **1. What types of Web.2 tools are used by EFL teachers in their classes?**

The first research question investigated the type of digital tools teachers used. The participants' responses to interview questions revealed that the most commonly used digital tools were Kahoot and YouTube, which were used by all the teachers (f:12) for teaching and learning purposes. The second most frequently mentioned digital tool was Achieve 3000 used by eight participants, which was followed by TED-ed video, newsela.com, vialogues.com and lessonwriter.com. Some participants reported to use ICT tools accompanying the English coursebook they regularly used in their lesson.

This finding seems to suggest that teachers participating in this study are well aware of most Web 2.0 tools; the potential uses of ICT technology, and that they are inclined to incorporate various Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. The result also confirms the findings of various previous researchers (Almekhlafi et al., 2018; Cahyani & Cahyono, 2012; Çakır & Top; Kartal & Arıkan 2011; Özel & Arıkan, 2015; Rahimi & Yadollahi, 2011; Solmaz & Bekleyen, 2011; Şahin-Kızıllı, 2011) who found that teachers applied Web 2.0 tools as part of their instructional process.

#### **5.3.2. Research Question**

##### **2. What are the EFL teachers' perspectives of using Web 2.0 applications in terms of its benefits and potential challenges?**

The second research question investigated benefits and potential challenges resulting from the Web 2.0 applications. As revealed by the questionnaire data, most participants agreed that using Web 2.0 technology in their English lessons increases student academic success; it enhances collaboration and develops students' communication skills. Participant teachers also felt that using these technological tools in their lesson enables them to adjust their instructional practices in line with students' needs, and interests. There was also a high degree of agreement among the teachers that they were able to meet the needs of students with different ability to learn English with the help of Web 2.0 technology.

Participants also expressed strong agreement that Web 2.0 tools made the lesson more effective. Clearly, engagement is one of the characteristic strongly associated with successful use of ICT (Hubbard, 2008). Teachers, in the present study, also



unanimously agreed that Web 2.0 technology made it possible to create more interactive learning environment where the learners are engaged in classroom tasks and activities and they are motivated.

The analysis of the interviews provided further support for these findings. Teachers believed that Web 2.0 applications contribute to the development of students' language skills, ranging from reading to speaking, as well as vocabulary knowledge and pronunciation. Teachers confirmed that regular use of technology develops a variety of abilities in the students. In line with the findings obtained from the questionnaire, many of the participants felt that using these digital tools required the students to interact with the technology and collaborate with their peers in performing the assigned classroom task; as a result, Web 2.0 developed interactive and collaborative learning. Teachers unanimously agreed that the regular and effective use of technological tools contributes greatly to boosting student motivation and keeping them engaged on the task. In addition, it was found that Web 2.0 tools served as an assessment tool helping them to review topics, reinforce and supplement textbook related teaching and assess student learning. In this way, they noted that learning became more effective and students were able to they keep longer what they previously learned in mind.

Teachers having high positive perception toward Web 2.0 tools and their strong belief about the benefits of these applications for the kind of reasons mentioned above seem to suggest that teachers are well aware of the importance of integrating Web 2.0 in education, and of their effect on the students' academic learning. This result is similar to those of other researchers such as Kavandı (2012) who found that students develop writing skills by using Web 2.0 tools.

Based on the research findings, it can be suggested that incorporating Web 2.0 technology can take learners one step further from the regular textbook-based studies to giving the teachers an opportunity to create instructional activities to enhance students' learning. As such, this finding supports the argument put forward by several researchers (Kocak & Oyman, 2012). In line with the earlier studies (Albarbari, 2016; Almekhlafi, et al., 2018; Ranasinghe & Leisher, 2009; Richardson, 2009), the present study has demonstrated that Web 2.0 applications can encourage students to actively involved in activities and construct content knowledge. The study revealed that Web 2.0 technologies enabled the participant teachers to create an effective learning environment where their students were more engaged with tasks and activities. This finding confirms

the argument put forward by Dudeney & Hockly (2007), and Kay et al., (2009) that Web 2.0 technology leads to a more engaging learning environment.

The results of the present study may suggest that Web 2.0 tools also support the teachers themselves in terms of using innovative and authentic content for instructional purposes, as identified from the Questionnaire findings (Items 7, 10. and 11). A majority of the participants strongly agreed that using Web.2 technology in their English lessons gives them an opportunity to facilitate teaching and learning, rather than providing information directly to students In addition, teachers believed that using Web 2.0 technology in their lessons helped them to develop professionally.

Effective use of the technology requires the users to have the necessary knowledge and skills. Therefore, the participants' expressed agreement to "using Web 2.0 technology in their English lessons necessities training" in the questionnaire, suggests that teachers need training to use Web 2.0 tools effectively. In this respect, the results also conform to those of Akayoğlu et al., who stress the necessity of training to provide the required skills to promote teachers' experience and application of these tools.

As for the potential challenges that Web 2.0 technology may cause, it was found through the questionnaire that participants were divided in their level of agreement to items "Using Web.2 technology takes up too much time for them" and "the technology requires considerable amount of time to spend on technical problems". In other words, while half the participants expressed their agreement for experiencing such challenges, the remaining participants disagreed with such challenges that may result from using Web 2.0 technology in their English lessons. One of the possible challenges the use of technology may cause is stress and anxiety in its users (Rahimi & Yadollahi, 2011). The participants' opinion was sought through the final item (Item 15) of the questionnaire which asked "using Web 2.0 technology in my English lessons increases students' stress and anxiety". Most participants thought that students did not experience much stress and anxiety. This is justified by questionnaire findings. Teachers highlighted that students faced no challenge whatsoever with using technology as most of them are "digital natives".

The interview data provided further evidence regarding the teachers' opinion on this issue. While some of the teachers reported "having no technical problems whatsoever", two ICT-related problems reported were "speed of the Internet connection and some distracting adds". A relatively small number of teachers reported that "when

the speed of the Internet is slow, this may cause frustration and interrupt the flow of the activity". Poor internet connection is still an important issue that can affect successful use of digital technology in the classroom. Similar problems are reported by McCormick and Li (2006) who also observed Internet challenges in their research.

### **5.3.3. Research Question**

#### **3. Do gender, teaching experience, daily Internet use, and the computer use for teaching have a significant effect on EFL teachers' decision to use Web 2.0 applications for instructional purposes?**

The third research question in this study sought to examine whether certain variables significantly affect teachers' decision in using Web 2.0 tools. Overall, the results show insignificant differences based on the teachers' gender, hours of daily Internet use, the computer use and years of teaching experience on teachers' application of Web 2.0 tools.

The insignificant difference between males and females, recorded from the analysis of Mann Whitney U Test results, as can be seen in Table 4 (Chapter 4), suggests that male teachers prefer using Web 2.0 tools for teaching purposes as well as female teachers. The results are harmony with Narasuman's study (2014), which demonstrated that gender was an insignificant factor between female and male teachers in ICT integration in teaching language.

Kruskal Wallis Test was used to see the effects of "use of computer for teaching", "year of teaching experience" and "the daily Internet use" on teachers' applying Web 2.0 tools for instructional purposes. As demonstrated in Tables 5-7, (Chapter 4), no statistically significant differences were recorded due to these variables.

The fact that no significant difference exists related to experience using computers and the internet could also be attributed to the school context, where participants of this study are working. In other words, all teachers in their schools have the same kind of facilities of access to resources; they are required to apply the same regulations concerning the use of technology, particularly using Web 2.0 or social networking services in their classes. This insignificant difference among the teachers might also be attributed to teachers' self-efficacy and capabilities in using ICT. Also, the insignificance in regard of the experience could be attributed due to the existence of other individual or institutional factors that are outside the scope of this study. It could

also be due to the fact that the TED colleges are well equipped with ICT facilities which allow teachers to apply different Web 2.0 tools easily. This result is in line with those of other studies such as Mahdi and Al-Dera (2013) and Narasuman (2014), who investigated the influence of teachers' experience on ICT integration in teaching, and found that experience was an insignificant factor in teachers' using technology in their classes.

To sum up, as demonstrated by inferential statistics results, there is no relationship between the use of Web 2.0 tools and such variables as gender, year of experience, the hours spent in Internet and the use of computer for teaching. This finding could be interpreted in terms of the participants as regular users of Web 2.0 tools as reflected to their language teaching and learning activities.

#### **5.4. Implications**

The present study investigated EFL teachers' perspectives on applying Web 2.0 technologies in one type of private secondary schools in Turkey. In the light of findings, the study offers several implications for practicing teachers, universities teacher educators, and school directors.

With many developments in ICT technologies, it is important that teachers are aware of how to use existing digital tools, but they also need to be digitally literate so that they can critically evaluate such tools for safe and productive use (Akayoğlu et al., 2020; Barnatt, 2008; Dudeney & Hockly, 2012). Hennessy, Ruthven and Brindley (2005) underline the crucial role that teachers play in integrating ICT into classroom practice. The results of the present study suggest that most teachers have successfully incorporated various types of Web 2.0 tools into classroom practice. Yet, it is true to point out that not all teachers may be technologically literate. Therefore, professional learning programmes and its job-embedded support might be given to teachers on how to use Web 2.0 technology to support classroom learning. Although in the present study teachers reported that they incorporated technology in their lessons and that they felt competent in using such tools, undoubtedly they would benefit from further guidance in using different tools in a variety of ways to become more digitally competent in their profession.

A similar suggestion can be offered to teacher educators. It is essential that the digital literacy levels of future language teachers needs to be increased. To achieve this

objective, teacher educators can give prospective teachers concrete guidance and experiential hands-on practice on pedagogical purposes of different digital tools and create opportunities for them to design digital material.

In addition, infrastructure facilities for the Internet should be improved to enable teachers to apply relevant technological tools without being concerned about the technology-related infrastructure problems in their schools.

### **5.5. Suggestions for Further Research**

The present research investigated teachers' perspectives of Web.2.0 tools. Further research needs to be conducted focussing on the students' perspectives on how effective they think technology is as a tool to support their learning in order to correlate research findings.

In the present study, questionnaire and interview are used as research instruments. Future research can also employ different research instruments such as observations. This could give a deeper insight into the teachers' actual use of technology in their classes.

The present study, by focussing on a type of private schools, brought to light teachers' perspectives on using ICT in their English classes. Future research also needs to investigate teachers' needs and concerns about the effective use of different digital tools, because such research findings can give insights into designing professional development programmes for teachers.

### **5.6. Limitations of the Study**

The present study was conducted with English teachers working in a type of private schools, TED colleges, in Turkey. Therefore, the results of this study may differ in other schools, both public and private with larger research participants. In addition, the Web 2.0 Application Questionnaire was limited to 15 items. A larger pool of items would increase the reliability of the research instrument.

Although the participants of the study is relatively small, the manner in which the teachers expressed their opinions through the questionnaire and interview provides clear evidence of how teachers have integrated Web 2.0 applications to create an active and effective learning environments to enhance student engagement, motivation and collaboration. The Ministry of Education in Turkey has been encouraging foreign

language teachers to incorporate technology in their teaching practices through its policies. The present study represents a good example of schools that seem to be applying this policy very effectively. Due to these reasons, the study can be considered unique and original.



## 6. REFERENCES

- Akayoğlu, S., Satar, H. M., Dikilitaş, K., Cirit, N. C., & Korkmazgil, S. (2020). Digital literacy practices of Turkish pre-service EFL teachers. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(1), 85-97.
- Alexander, B. (2008). Web 2.0 and emergent multiliteracies. *Theory into Practice*, 47, 150-160.
- Almekhlafi, A. G. Ain, A., & Abulibdeh, E.S.A. (2018). K-12 teachers' perceptions of Web 2.0 applications in the United Arab Emirates?. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 15(3), 238-261.
- Anderson, P. (2007). *What is Web 2.0? Ideas, technologies and implications for education*. Bristol: JISC Technology and Standards Watch.
- Atkins, N. E., & Vasu, E. S. (2000). Measuring knowledge of technology usage and stages of concern about computing: A study of middle school teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(4), 279-302.
- Baker, R., Harrison, J., Thornton, B., & Yates, R. (2010). Podcasting in higher education: Does it make a difference? *American Journal of Business Education*, 3, 7-10.
- Balçıkınlı, C. (2012). Language learning in second life: American and Turkish students' experiences. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 13(2), 131-148.
- Barnatt, C. (2009). Higher education 2.0. *International Journal of Management Education*, 7, 47-56.
- Brandl, K. (2012). Effects of required and optional exchange tasks in online language learning environments. *ReCALL*, 24(1), 85-107.
- Cahyani, H., & Cahyono B. Y. (2012). Teachers' attitudes and technology use in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 23(2), 130-148.
- Cephe P. T., & Balçıkınlı, C. (2012). Web 2.0 tools in language learning: What do student teachers think?. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications (IJONTE)*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Chen, C.Y., Pedersen, S., & Murphy, K. L. (2011). Learners' perceived information overload in online learning via computer-mediated communication. *Research in Learning Technology*, 19(2), 101-116.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2006). *Research methods in education* (6th ed). London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Coyle, D. (2011). *Introduction to Web 2.0*. London: Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Crook, C. (2008). *Web 2.0 technologies for learning: the current landscape opportunities, challenges and tensions*. Coventry: Becta.
- Çakır, R., & Top, E. (2015). Pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions about using web 2.0 in education. *Participatory Educational Research*, 2(2), 70-83.
- Dawley L. (2007). *The Tools for Successful Online Teaching*. Hershey, PA: Information Science.
- Drent, M., & Meelissen, M. (2008). Which factors obstruct or stimulate teacher educators to use ICT innovatively?. *Computers and Education*, 51(1), 187-199.
- Dudeny, G., & Hockly, N. (2012). ICT in ELT: How did we get here and where are we going?, *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 533-544.
- Ferdig, R. E. (2006). Assessing technologies for teaching and learning: understanding the importance of technological pedagogical content knowledge. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(5), 749-760.
- Fuller, M. (2011). *Social media in higher education: Building mutually beneficial student and institutional relationships through social media*. Unpublished master's thesis. East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN.
- Grant, S. (2016). Peer review process completion rates and subsequent student perceptions within completely online versus blended modes of study. *System*, 62(1), 93-101.
- Harris, A., & Rea, A. (2009). Web 2.0 and virtual world technologies: A growing impact on is education. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 20, 137-144.
- Hernández-Ramos P. (2004). Web logs and online discussions as tools to promote reflective practice. *The Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Hubbard, P. (2008). CALL and the future of language teacher education. *CALICO Journal*, 25(2), 175-188.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112-133.



- Kartal E., & Arıkan A. (2011). Future Foreign Language Teachers and the Online Tools they Use to Learn about Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures. A paper presented at International eLearning Conference, 119-124. January 13-14, 2011. Impact Muang Thong Thani, Thailand.
- Kavaliauskienė G., & Anusienė, L. (2009). Podcasts for Listening Skills. *Santalka. Filologija Edukologija*, 17(2), 28-37.
- Kavandı, E. (2012). *The effects of using blogs on the development of foreign language writing proficiency*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gazi University, Ankara.
- Kay, R., Knaack, L., & Petrarca, D. (2009). Exploring teachers perceptions of Web-Based learning Tools. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects*, 5, 27-50.
- Kemper, E. A., Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Mixed methods sampling strategies in social science research. In A. Tashakkori, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 273-296). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Kessler, G., & Plakans, L. (2008). Does teachers' confidence with CALL equal innovative and integrated use? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(3), 269-282.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2013). The Use and Uptake of Information and Communication Technology: A Turkish Case of an Initial Teacher Education Department. In J. E. Aitken, (Ed.), *Cases on communication technology for second language acquisition and cultural learning* (pp.140-171). An IGI Global Publication.
- Narasuman S. (2016). An Analysis of the Effect of Demographic Factors on the Level of ICT Integration. In C. Fook, G. Sidhu, S. Narasuman, L. Fong & S. Abdul Rahman, (Eds.), *7th International Conference on University Learning and Teaching (InCULT 2014) Proceedings* (pp. 1-15).. Singapore: Springer.
- Kim, H. (2002). Teachers as a barrier to technology-integrated language teaching. *English Teaching*, 57(2), 35-64.
- Koçak, N.G., & Oyman, M. (2012). Social Media Usage Behaviors of Individuals: An Application in Eskişehir. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(22), 177-188.
- Lai, L. S., & Turban, E. (2008). Group formation and operations in the Web 2.0 environment and social networks. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 17(5), 387-402.

- Lee, G., (2010). *Second life as an educational platform for collaborative learning by the millennial generation at a laptop university*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Walden University, Minneapolis, MN.
- Mahdi, H. S., & Al-Dera, A. S. (2013). The impact of teachers' age, gender and experience on the use of information and communication technology in EFL teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 57-67.
- McCormick, R., & Li, N. (2006). An evaluation of European learning objects in use. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 31(3), 213-231.
- Motteram G., & Sharma P. (2009). Blending Learning in a Web 2.0 World. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies & Society*, 7(2), 83-96.
- Narasuman S. (2016). An Analysis of the Effect of Demographic Factors on the Level of ICT Integration. In Fook C., Sidhu G., Narasuman S., Fong L., Abdul Rahman S. (eds) 7th International Conference on University Learning and Teaching (InCULT 2014) Proceedings. Singapore: Springer.
- Park, C. N., & Son, J.B. (2009). Implementing computer-assisted language learning in the EFL classroom: Teachers' perceptions and perspectives. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 5(2), 80-101.
- Rahimi, M., & Yadollahi, S. (2011). Computer anxiety and ICT integration in English classes among Iranian EFL teachers. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 203–209.
- Richardson, W., (2009). *Blogs, wikis, podcasts and other powerful web tools for classrooms*. London: SAGE Ltd.
- Shahrokni, S. A. (2008). Iranian Efl Teachers' Perception, Familiarity and use of Web 2.0 Tools in TEFL. *Teaching English with Technology*, 15(3), 31-46.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75.
- Son, J., Robb, T., & Charismiadj, I. (2011). Computer literacy and competency: A survey of Indonesian teachers of English as a foreign language. *CALL-EJ*, 12(1), 26-42.
- O'Reilly T. (2007). What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communications & Strategies*, 65, 17-37.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2006). The validity issue in mixed research. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 48-63.
- Özel, A.G., & Arıkan, A. (2015). The use of the Internet and Web 2.0 tools among EFL instructors. *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, 1, 313-325.

- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Prashnig, B. (2006). *Learning styles and personalized teaching*. London, UK: The Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New York and London: Teachers College Press.
- Solmaz O., & Bekleyen N. (2011). The use of the internet by high school EFL teachers for professional purposes. *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17-28.
- Şahin Kızıl, A. (2017). EFL Learners in the Digital Age: An Investigation into Personal and Educational Digital Engagement *RELC Journal*, 48(3), 373-388.
- Wang, S., & Vasquez, C. (2012). Web 2.0 and second language learning: What does the research tell us? *CALICO Journal*, 29(3), 412-430.
- Zelick, S. (2013). The perception of Web 2.0 technologies on teaching and learning in higher education: A case study. *Creative Education*, 4, 53-93.

## 7. APPENDICES

## Appendix A. Ethics Committee Permit Document

T.C	
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ	
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ	
TEZ / ARAŞTIRMA / ANKET / ÇALIŞMA İZİNİ / ETİK KURULU İZİNİ TALEP FORMU VE ONAY TUTANAK FORMU	
ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ	
T.C. NOSU	
ADI VE SOYADI	METİN ÖZCAN
ÖĞRENCİ NO	20188035
TEL. NO.	
E - MAİL ADRESLERİ	
ANA BİLİM DALI	İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ
HANGİ AŞAMADA OLDUĞU (DERS / TEZ)	TEZ
İSTEKDE BULUNDUĞU DÖNEME AİT DÖNEMLİK KAYDININ YAPILIP-YAPILMADIĞI	2019 / 2020 - GÜZ DÖNEMİ KAYDI YENİLENDİ.
ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ BİLGİLER	
TEZİN KONUSU	EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF WEB 2.0 TECHNOLOGIES ON TEACHING AND LEARNING
TEZİN AMACI	Bu çalışmanın amacı, EFL öğretmenlerinin İngilizce derslerinde Web 2.0 uygulamaları ile ilgili görüşlerini incelemektir. Ayrıca, çalışma aynı zamanda cinsiyet ve öğretmenlerin bilgisayar ve interneti kullanmada yaşadıkları deneyim gibi değişkenlerin bu tür uygulamaların kullanımı üzerinde herhangi bir etkisinin olup olmadığını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır.
TEZİN TÜRKÇE ÖZETİ	Bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerini kullanma (BİT) son yıllarda hızlı bir artış yaşamıştır. ICT, öğrencilerin eleştirel düşüncelerine, yaratıcı olmalarına ve daha başarılı bir öğrenme çıktılarını elde etmelerine yardımcı olmak amacıyla kullanılmaya başlanmıştır. Wiki, blog, podcast, MySpace ve Facebook gibi sosyal ağlar, YouTube ve Instagram gibi Web 2.0 uygulamaları, derslerde BİT uygulaması için önemli kaynaklar oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmalar, Web 2.0 uygulamalarının kullanılmasının çeşitli faydalar sağladığını açıkça göstermektedir; kullanımı kolaydır, kolayca ve bazı durumlarda özgürce elde edilebilirler ve sınıf ortamında öğretmen ile öğrenci arasında öğrenciyle öğrenci etkileşimi arasında etkileşime ve iletişime izin verirler. Bu çalışmanın amacı, EFL öğretmenlerinin İngilizce derslerinde Web 2.0 uygulamaları ile ilgili görüşlerini incelemektir. Ayrıca, çalışma aynı zamanda cinsiyet ve öğretmenlerin bilgisayar ve interneti kullanmada yaşadıkları deneyim gibi değişkenlerin bu tür uygulamaların kullanımı üzerinde herhangi bir

	<p>etkisinin olup olmadığını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır.</p> <p>Araştırma, Türkiye'de 10 ilde TED (Türk Eğitim Derneği) Kolejleri ile yapılacaktır.</p> <p>Bir anket kullanılarak karma yöntemli bir araştırma tasarımı izlenecek ve ardından temel araştırma aracı olarak görüşmeler gerçekleştirilecektir. Araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen 2.0 Uygulama Anketi nicel veri toplamak için uygulanacak, daha sonra gönüllü öğretmenlerle görüşme yapılacaktır. Sonuç olarak güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik sorunları için soru sorma ve görüşme soruları yönlendirilecektir. Ankete ait nitel veriler, tanımlayıcı istatistikler ve bağımsız örneklem t testleri kullanılarak analiz edilirken, nicel veriler içerik analizine tabi tutulur. Anket verileri, tanımlayıcı istatistikler kullanılarak analiz edilecektir. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulguların, öğretmenlerin Web 2.0 uygulamalarını kullanmaları açısından literatüre katkı sağlayacağı beklenmektedir.</p>
<b>ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OLAN SEKTÖRLER/ KURUMLARIN ADLARI</b>	<p>TED Adana, TED Ankara, TED Batman, TED Diyarbakır, TED İstanbul, TED İzmir, TED Malatya, TED Mersin, TED Şanlı Urfa, TED Van.</p>
<b>İZİN ALINACAK OLAN KURUMA AİT BİLGİLER (KURUMUN ADI- ŞUBESİ/ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ - İLİ - İLÇESİ)</b>	<p>TED Adana Koleji-Seyhan/Adana TED Ankara Koleji-Ankara/Gölbaşı TED Batman Koleji - Merkez/Batman TED Diyarbakır Koleji -Kayapınar/Diyarbakır TED İstanbul Atakent Koleji -Esenyurt/İstanbul TED İzmir Koleji -Urla/İzmir TED Malatya Koleji - İnönü Üniversitesi Kampüsü/Malatya TED Mersin Koleji -Çeşmeli/Mersin TED Şanlı Urfa-Karaköprü/Şanlı Urfa TED Van Koleji - Tuşba/Van</p>
<b>YAPILMAK İSTENEN ÇALIŞMANIN İZİN ALINMAK İSTENEN KURUMUN HANGİ İLÇELERİNE/ HANGİ KURUMUNA/ HANGİ BÖLÜMÜNDE/ HANGİ ALANINA/ HANGİ KONULARDA/ HANGİ GRUBA/ KİMLERE/ NE UYGULANACAĞI GİBİ AYRINTILI BİLGİLER</b>	<p>Çalışmaya katılanların hepsi yüz İngilizce öğretmeni olup, TED Adana, Ankara, Batman, Diyarbakır, İstanbul, İzmir, Malatya, Mersin, Şanlı Urfa ve Van okullarında çalışan yetmiş erkek ve otuz kadın öğretmendir.</p> <p>Tüm bu yüz öğretmenlerden veri; anket ve mülakatlar kullanılarak toplanacaktır.</p> <p>Tüm katılımcılar, Türkiye'de bir Öğretmen Eğitimi Bölümü mezunudur. Katılımcıların yaşları 23 ile 45 arasında değişmektedir.</p> <p>Bu kolejler iki nedenden dolayı amaçlı örneklem kullanılarak seçilmiştir; İlk olarak, katılımcıların Web 2.0 öğelerinin farkında olup olmadıklarını bulmak gerçekten gereklidir. Bunları derslerinde kullanma konusunda biraz deneyime sahip olur.</p> <p>İkinci olarak, katılımcılar, ikinci araştırma sorusuna cevap bulmak için gerekli bir koşul olan erkek ve kadın öğretmenlerden oluşur.</p>
<b>UYGULANACAK OLAN ÇALIŞMAYA AİT ANKETLERİN/ ÖLÇEKLERİN BAŞLIKLARI/ HANGİ ANKETLERİN - ÖLÇEKLERİN UYGULANACAĞI</b>	<p>1. Web 2 Uygulama Anketi -Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire; Appendix 1</p> <p>2. Rıza Formu - Consent Form; Appendix 2</p> <p>3. Öğretmen Görüşme Soruları -Teacher's Interview Questions ; Appendix 3</p>
<b>EKLER (ANKETLER, ÖLÇEKLER, FORMLAR, ....V.B. GİBİ EVRAKLARIN İSİMLERİYLE BİRLİKTE KAÇ ADET/SAYFA OLDUKLARINA AİT BİLGİLER İLE AYRINTILI YAZILACAKTIR)</b>	<p>1. Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire; Appendix 1 ( 2 Sayfa )</p> <p>2. Consent Form; Appendix 2 ( 1 Sayfa )</p> <p>3. Teachers' Interview Questions ; Appendix 3 ( 1 Sayfa )</p>

<b>ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI - SOYADI: Metin ÖZCAN</b>		<b>ÖĞRENCİNİN İMZASI: Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır</b>		
		<b>TARİH: 09/ 12/ 2019</b>		
<b>TEZ/ ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ DEĞERLENDİRME SONUCU</b>				
<b>1. Seçilen konu Bilim ve İş Dünyasına katkı sağlayabilecektir.</b>				
<b>2. Anılan konu İngiliz Dili Eğitimi faaliyet alanı içerisine girmektedir.</b>				
<b>1.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI</b>	<b>2.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI (VARSA)</b>	<b>SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRÜNÜN ONAYI</b>	<b>A.B.D. BAŞKANININ ONAYI</b>	
Adı - Soyadı: Yasemin KIRKGÖZ	Adı - Soyadı: .....	Adı - Soyadı: Murat KOÇ	Adı - Soyadı: Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKA	
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: .....	Unvanı:Doç. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	
İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası: .....	İmzası: Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası: Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	
25/ 11/ 2019	/ / 20	25/ 11/ 2019	25/ 11/ 2019	
<b>ETİK KURULU ASIL ÜYELERİNE AİT BİLGİLER</b>				
Adı - Soyadı: <b>Mustafa BAŞARAN</b>	Adı - Soyadı: <b>Yücel ERTEKİN</b>	Adı - Soyadı: <b>Deniz Aynur GÜLER</b>	Adı - Soyadı: <b>Ali Engin OBA</b>	Adı - Soyadı: <b>Mustafa Tevfik ODMAN</b>
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.
İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır
25/ 11/ 2019	25/ 11/ 2019	25/ 11/ 2019	25/ 11/ 2019	25/ 11/ 2019
<b>Etik Kurulu Jüri Başkanı - Asıl Üye</b>	<b>Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi</b>	<b>Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi</b>	<b>Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi</b>	<b>Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi</b>
<b>OY BİRLİĞİ İLE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Çalışma yapılacak olan tez için uygulayacak olduğu Anketleri/Formları/Ölçekleri Çağ Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Asıl Jüri Üyelerince İncelenmiş olup, 09/ 12/ 2019 - 10 /01/ 2020 tarihleri arasında uygulanmak üzere gerekli izin verilmesi taraflarımızca uygundur.</b>		
<b>OY ÇOKLUĞU İLE</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<b>AÇIKLAMA: BU FORM ÖĞRENCİLER TARAFINDAN HAZIRLANDIKTAN SONRA ENSTİTÜ MÜDÜRÜNE ONAYLATILARAK ENSTİTÜ SEKRETERLİĞİNE TESLİM EDİLECEKTİR. AYRICA YAZININ PUNTOSU İSE 12 (ON İKİ) PUNTO OLACAK ŞEKİLDE YAZILARAK ÇIKTI ALINACAKTIR.</b>				



## Appendix B. Web. 2.0 Application Questionnaire

**Dear Colleague,**

This questionnaire aims to find out your opinions about Web 2.0 technology in your English classes. The questionnaire has two main parts. Please indicate the choice that is most relevant to you. Your answers will be kept confidential. They will not be disclosed; instead, they will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your help.

Metin ÖZCAN

### SECTION I - Your Background

**Gender:** Male \_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_

**Age:** \_\_\_\_

**The University you graduated from:**

**Years of Teaching Experience**

1-5 years \_\_\_\_ 6-10 years \_\_\_\_ 11-15 years \_\_\_\_

16-20 years \_\_\_\_ 21-25 years \_\_\_\_ Over 26 years \_\_\_\_

**Average class size that you teach**

1) 1- 10 students      2) 11-20 students      3) 21- 30      4) More than 30 students

**The number of hours you spend using the internet daily**

1-2 hrs \_\_\_\_      3-5 hrs \_\_\_\_      Over 6 hrs \_\_\_\_

**Please indicate how often you use computers in your teaching activities.**

1. Not at all \_\_\_\_ 2. Frequently \_\_\_\_ 3) Rarely    4) Almost Always \_\_\_\_ 5)

Occasionally \_\_\_\_ 6) All the Time \_\_\_\_.

**Current teaching position** Please indicate the school level you teach

1) Primary School \_\_\_\_      2) Middle School \_\_\_\_      3) High school \_\_\_\_

**Have you received any in-service training on using computer technology in the classroom?**

**If your answer is YES please explain what kind of training?**

### SECTION 2- Your Views on Web 2. Technology

In this part of the questionnaire, there are 15 statements related to Web 2.0 technology. As a Web 2.0 user, please indicate your opinion about each statement. Please make sure that you answer each item in the questionnaire.

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Slightly Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Slightly Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
Using Web.2 technology in my English lessons...	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. Increases student academic success (e.g. grades).							
2. Is effective because I can implement it successfully.							
3. Promotes collaboration among students.							
4. Develops students' skills for communication.							
5. Is an indispensable teaching tool.							
6. Takes up too much time to prepare instructional activities.							
7. Gives me as a teacher an opportunity to be a facilitator instead of information provider.							
8. Requires too much time to spend on technical problems.							
9. Meets the needs of students with varied ability to learn.							
10. Helps me to develop professionally.							
11. Helps to accommodate students' with various learning styles.							
12. Motivates students to be more engaged in activities.							
13. Necessitates training for me.							
14. Develops students' interpersonal skills.							
15. Increases students' stress and anxiety.							



## Appendix C. Interview Question

This section contains 5 written open-ended interview questions related to your opinion about using Web 2.0 tools for teaching and learning purposes in your English classes. Please explain your personal opinion about each question in as much detail as possible. Your answers will be kept confidential and they will be used solely for my research study.

Thank you for your assistance.

**Metin ÖZCAN**

### **Section 1: Your opinion about the use of Web 2.0 tools**

- What kind of Web 2 tools do you use in your lesson?
  
- What purposes do you use them for? Please give examples.
  
- In your opinion what benefits do the use of Web 2.0 tools offer to students?
  
- Do you experience any challenges in using Web 2.0 tools in your lessons? If so please explain.
  
- Do your students experience any challenges in using Web 2.0 tools? If so please explain.

### **Section 2: Final Comments on the use of Web 2.0 tools**

1. Is there anything else would you like to add?

Thank you very much for having time to share your opinion your opinion about this topic and your valuable answers.

## Appendix D. Consent Form

[Çağ University]

**Proposal:** *EFL teachers' Perception of Web 2.0 Technologies on Teaching and Learning*

**Responsible Researcher/Supervisor:** [ Metin ÖZCAN / Prof.Dr.Yasemin KIRKGÖZ ]

**Additional Researchers:** (.....)

**Name of Participant:** (.....)

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written plain language statement to keep.

I understand that the purpose of this research is to investigate [EFL teachers' Perception of Web 2.0 Technologies on Teaching and Learning]

2. I understand that my participation in this project is for research purposes only.
3. I acknowledge that the possible effects of participating in this research project have been explained to my satisfaction.
4. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from this project anytime without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data that I have provided.
5. I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements; my data will be password protected and accessible only by the named researchers.
6. I understand that despite the small number of participants involved in the study, my anonymity is guaranteed.
7. I understand that after I sign and return this consent form, it will be retained by the researcher.

**Participant Signature:**

**Date:**

## Appendix E. Approval from Çağ University

T.C.  
**ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ**  
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

1316-95  
SAYI : 23867972  
KONU: Tez Anket İzni Hakkında

10.12.2019

**(DAĞITIM YERLERİNE)**

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi olan (20188035 numaralı) **Metin ÖZCAN "EFL Teachers' Perception of Web 2.0 Technologies on Teaching and Learning "** konulu tez çalışmasını Çukurova Üniversitesi öğretim elemanı Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ danışmanlığında yürütmektedir. Adı geçen öğrencinin tez çalışması kapsamında Kolejiniz bünyesinde ders veren İngilizce Öğretmenlerini kapsamak üzere kopyası Ek'lerde sunulan bir anket uygulaması yapmayı planlamaktadır. Tez çalışması kapsamında yukarıda belirtilen anketin uygulayabilmesi için gerekli izin verilmesi hususunu bilgilerinizi sunarım.

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır  
Doç. Dr. Murat KOÇ  
Sos. Bil. Enst. Müdürü

**DAĞITIM:**  
**GEREĞİ:**  
TED Adana Koleji  
TED Ankara Koleji  
TED Batman Koleji,  
TED Diyarbakır Koleji,  
TED İstanbul Koleji,  
TED İzmir Koleji,  
TED Malatya Koleji,  
TED Mersin Koleji,  
TED Şanlıurfa Koleji ile  
TED Van Koleji

**EKLERİ:** Dört Sayfa tez anket formları ile Dört sayfa tez etik kurul izin formunun fotokopileri.

**Appendix F. Permissions from eight TED Schools**

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır



TED BATMAN KOLEJİ

T.C.

BATMAN VALİLİĞİ

TED BATMAN PETROL KOLEJİ ÖZEL ORTAOKULU/LİSE

MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı : 99952152/200/247  
Konu : Tez anket İzni Hk.

Tarih : 12/12/2019

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi: 238679727 Sayı 10.12.2019 Tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketini okulumuz TED Batman Petrol Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Hasan ERDAL

TED Batman Petrol Koleji Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır



TED DIYARBAKIR KOLEJİ



T.C.

KAYAPINAR KAYMAKAMLIĞI

ÖZEL TED DIYARBAKIR İLKOKULU/ORTAOKULU

MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı :99971375/ 405.01 / 52  
Konu: Tez anket İzni Hk.

Tarih: 19/12/2019

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi:238679727 Sayı 10.12.2019 Tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketini okulumuz TED Diyarbakir Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Mustafa IRGAT

Özel TED Diyarbakir Koleji Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır

T.C.  
KÜÇÜKÇEKMECE KAYMAKAMLIĞI  
TED Özel Atakent İlkokulu/Ortaokulu Müdürlüğü

**Sayı** :99960533-200/5  
**Konu** :Tez Anket İzni

21.01.2020

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

**İlgi:** 10.12.2019 tarih ve 238679727 sayılı yazı.

İlgili yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketi Okulumuz TED Atakent Kolejinde uygulamamızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Naime DEMİRBAŞ  
TED Atakent Koleji  
Kurucu Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır





TED İZMİR KOLEJİ

T.C.  
URLA KAYMAKAMLIĞI  
TED İZMİR ÖZEL ORTAOKULU/LİSE  
MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı :2019/103  
Konu: Tez anket İzni Hk.

Tarih:19/12/2019

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi:238679727 Sayı 10.12.2019 tarihli yazınız hak.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketini okulumuz TED İzmir Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Mine MAVİOĞLU

TED İzmir Koleji  
Genel Koordinatör  
Ortaokul – Lise Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır





TED MERSİN KOLEJİ

T.C.

ÇEŞMELİ KAYMAKAMLIĞI

TED MERSİN ÖZEL ORTAOKULU/LİSE

MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı : 500/5

Konu: Tez anket İzni Hk.

Tarih:10/01/2020

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi:238679727 Sayı 10.12.2019 tarihli yazınız hak.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketini okulumuz TED Mersin Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Savaşkan İLMAK

TED Mersin Koleji  
Genel Eğitim Koordinatörü  
Ortaokul/Lise Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır



TED ŞANLIURFA KOLEJİ

T.C.

KARAKÖPRÜ KAYMAKAMLIĞI

TED ŞANLIURFA ÖZEL ORTAOKULU

MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı :99971375/ 405.01 / 3  
Konu: Tez anket izni Hk.

Tarih: 15/12/2019

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi:238679727 Sayı 10.12.2019 Tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketini okulumuz TED Şanlıurfa Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Reşat KIZILATEŞ

TED Şanlıurfa Koleji Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır



**TED VAN KOLEJİ**

T.C.

TUŞBA KAYMAKAMLIĞI

ÖZEL TED VAN İLKOKUL/ORTAOKULU

MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı :99982308 / 200 / 97

Konu: Tez anket İzni Hk.

Tarih: 13/01/2020

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi:238679727 Sayı 10.12.2019 Tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen Tez Anketini okulumuz TED Van Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Önder ÖZBAY

TED Van Koleji Kurucu Müdürü

Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır