



## English Teachers' Views on the Use of Web 2.0 Tools in Educational Environments

Imam Bakir ARABACI<sup>1</sup>

Ceyda AKILLI<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Firat University Turkey.

<sup>2</sup>Elazığ Provincial Directorate of National Education, Turkey.

Email: [ceyda\\_akilli@hotmail.com](mailto:ceyda_akilli@hotmail.com)



(✉ Corresponding Author)

### Abstract

New practices that support the use of technology in education are developed in order to create a modern education-training process within the framework of quality and efficiency standards throughout the world. Web 2.0 tools that help to make the most of technology in educational environments are one of these applications. It has been proven that Web 2.0 tools, which were used in education in Turkey in 2009, increase the motivation of students and increase their academic success. Teachers' professional development accelerates by producing new materials with these tools, and cooperation, communication and coordination among colleagues increase. The aim of the study is to reveal the opinions of English teachers working in Elazığ about the use of Web 2.0 tools in educational environments. The study is based on the situation analysis technique, which is one of the qualitative research methods. The interview form developed by the researchers was used as the data collection tool. The working group consists of 30 English teachers working in Elazığ province of Turkey. The responses of the participants to the questions in the interview form were subjected to content analysis, categories were created, and frequencies and percentages were determined. According to the results of the research, teachers generally have positive perceptions of Web 2.0 tools, they generally use these tools for content development, Web 2.0 tools provide positive contributions to classroom management and student development.

**Keywords:** Educational technologies, Web 2.0 tools, English teachers.

**Citation** | Imam Bakir ARABACI; Ceyda AKILLI (2021). English Teachers' Views on the Use of Web 2.0 Tools in Educational Environments. Asian Journal of Education and Training, 7(2): 115-125.

**History:**

Received: 18 February 2021

Revised: 22 March 2021

Accepted: 26 April 2021

Published: 2 June 2021

**Licensed:** This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

**Publisher:** Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

**Acknowledgement:** Both authors contributed to the conception and design of the study.

**Funding:** This study received no specific financial support.

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

**Transparency:** The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study was reported; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

**Ethical:** This study follows all ethical practices during writing.

### Contents

1. Introduction .....	116
2. Methodology .....	117
3. Findings .....	118
4. Discussion and Conclusion.....	123
References.....	124

### Contribution of this paper to the literature

The study contributes to the existing literature by revealing the opinions of English teachers working in Elazig about the use of Web 2.0 tools in educational environments.

## 1. Introduction

Today, the fact that technology is an integral part of our lives has greatly affected the education world and has led to radical changes in education. The integration of technology with education has brought new dimensions to applied education programs, course materials, teaching methods / techniques and curricula (Castells, 2012). New practices that support the use of technology in education are developed throughout the world in order to create a modern education process within the framework of quality and efficiency standards. The use of Web 2.0 tools in classroom environments is one of these new applications (Murugesan, 2010).

The concept of "Web 2.0", first used by Tim O'Reilly in 2004, defines the second generation of the World Wide Web (www) and includes a number of new applications that allow for a participatory structure. Web 2.0 is an umbrella concept and contains tools that enable many applications to be implemented. The most important reason why Web 2.0 tools are preferred is that, unlike web 1.0 tools, it is not only read the information given on the screen, but can focus many users on the same goal or product in a social and active environment (O'reilly, 2007). Anderson (2007) states that Web 2.0 tools are created from the thoughts of using personalized content, the power and unity of collective intelligence and providing ease of access. Web 2.0 tools; the transformation of websites from being information shelters to operating platforms; By offering internet programs to the end users, it helps users to share an information or an occupation and use it again (Atici & Yildirim, 2010).

Web 2.0 tools include diaries, presentations, online tests, games, animations, boards, concept maps, word clouds, logo and poster applications. Web 2.0 tools according to their functions; content management systems, file storage and sharing, concept maps and drawing tools, presentation tools, word clouds, animation and video, online meeting tools and questionnaire (Elmas & Geban, 2012). Some of the applications belonging to these titles are as shown in Figure 1:



Figure-1. Web 2.0 Tools and Functions.

All these practices can be easily included in the training processes; it can provide teachers and students with many benefits at the same time and they can contribute to create rich content (Solomon & Schrum, 2007). Weblogs and blogs that can be used in education are beneficial in sharing announcements and transferring new information to the other part quickly (Davies & Merchant, 2008). Podcasts allow students to repeat a missed lesson. Word clouds and concept maps help students quickly internalize new schemes; presentation tools turn the transfer of knowledge into an effective and enjoyable one. Wiki, which means rush in Hawaiian language, is widely used in education by students, teachers and academicians around the world (Genç, 2010). Additionally, blogs can create an environment for students to access what other friends have written, read information or express the thoughts on special themes (Cych, 2006).

Studies on the use of Web 2.0 tools in education show that these tools support constructivist learning, innovation and the team spirit that will develop among students in the classroom (McLoughlin & Lee, 2007). While these tools play a critical role in preparing students for the business and education life of the 21st century, they support students' creative and innovative thinking skills. In addition to education and business life, these tools also have a positive effect on students' becoming more active and participatory individuals in the future (Richards, 2010). Web 2.0 tools, which prepare students to be technology literate, active and participatory individuals in their future lives, prepare them for their future professional lives (Punie & Cabrera, 2006). The use of Web 2.0 tools enriches classroom environments and positively affects the technological literacy levels of students who are described as "today's digital natives" (Prensky, 2001). Web 2.0 tools contribute to teachers in terms of developing their technological competence, creating innovative course contents, and creating original materials. A teacher using Web 2.0 tools brings vitality and movement to his classroom, uses modern assessment methods, and uses up-to-date and functional contents in his lessons (Byrne, 2009).

Undoubtedly, teachers must have the competence and motivation to use Web 2.0 tools effectively in educational environments (Haydn & Barton, 2007). Many studies examined in the literature reveal that the

frequency of teachers' use of these tools is not at the desired level (OECD, 2009). According to a report published by the OECD in 2009, there are three main reasons why teachers do not actively use Web 2.0 technologies in their classrooms: These are teachers are not encouraged to use such technologies; the fact that the academic studies showing the positive educational outcomes provided by the use of these technologies in the lessons are not found effective enough by the teachers, they have difficulties in getting out of the old, dominant educational culture barrier, and they have not fully understood the benefits of technology-enriched lesson experiences and technology incorporation (OECD, 2009). According to the research conducted by Horzum (2010) and Kıyıcı (2010) teachers' level of readiness to use Web 2.0 tools is insufficient. Teachers' opinions and attitudes towards Web 2.0 tools, which make many contributions to educational processes, are also a determining indicator of the increase in their frequency of use (Youngs & King, 2002).

The aim of this research is to determine the opinions of English teachers working in Elazığ about the use of Web 2.0 tools; in this way, it is to be able to offer solutions that make the use of vehicles widespread, taking into account the opinions. The reason why only English teachers were included in the study is that according to the data obtained by the Elazığ Provincial Directorate of National Education Strategy Development Branch, 75% of the teachers working in Elazığ and using Web 2.0 tools are English teachers. The questions for which answers are sought within the scope of the research are as follows:

1. What are the general perceptions of English teachers working in Elazığ province towards Web 2.0 tools?
2. What is the frequency of English teachers working in Elazığ province to use Web 2.0 tools in their lessons?
3. What are the Web 2.0 tools commonly used by English teachers working in Elazığ?
4. How do English teachers working in Elazığ integrate Web 2.0 tools into their lessons?
5. What changes are observed in students as a result of the use of Web 2.0 tools in the education process?
6. What are the contributions of Web 2.0 tools to classroom management?
7. What are the contributions of Web 2.0 tools to language skills?
8. What are the contributions of Web 2.0 tools to professional development?
9. Are the institutional capacities of schools sufficient to use Web 2.0 tools effectively?

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Research Design

The research was carried out according to the situation analysis pattern found in qualitative research methods. The most basic feature of the qualitative case study is that one or more cases are investigated in depth (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). All factors related to a situation are handled with a holistic approach and the focus is on how they are affected by the relevant situation. Situation analysis is an empirical research method used in cases where the boundaries between the fact and its content are not clear and there are more than one evidence or data source (Yin, 1994). Situation analysis is a qualitative research approach in which the researcher examines one or several situations in depth with the help of data collection tools and defines situations and situational themes (Creswell, 2007). The research is based on a cross-sectional survey model. Screening researches, which are widely used in social sciences, are studies that include individuals' opinions and attitudes about a phenomenon and an event (Tanrıoğen, 2012).

### 2.2. Study Group

The study group of the research consists of 30 English teachers who work in educational institutions of different types and levels in Elazığ. While creating the working group, criterion sampling method was used and English teachers who had knowledge about Web 2.0 tools were determined. Criterion sampling, one of the purposeful sampling methods, is that the study group consists of people who have the qualifications specified for the problem (Büyükoztürk, Cakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012). Code names such as K-1, K-2 were given to the forms in order to ensure the confidentiality of the interviews with the participants in the study group. The demographic data of the participants in the study group are as follows:

**Table-1.** Distribution of participants in terms of gender variable.

Gender	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Female	20	66.7
Male	10	33.3
Total	30	100

As seen in Table 1, 66.7% of the participants are female and 33% are male English teachers. The reason for this is that, according to the data obtained from the Elazığ Provincial Directorate of National Education, Strategy Development Branch, the number of female English teachers working in Elazığ is more than men. Information on the education levels of the participants is included in Table 2.

**Table-2.** Distribution of participants by level of education.

Level	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
License	25	83.3
Master	3	10.0
Doctorate	2	6.7
Total	30	100

As seen in Table 2, most of the participants ( $f = 25$ ) are undergraduate graduates. The main reason for this situation is that approximately 75% of the English teachers working in Elazığ are undergraduate, 20% have a master's degree, and 5% have a doctorate degree. Information about the level at which the participants work is given in Table 3.

**Table-3.** Distribution of the participants regarding the level they worked.

Level	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Primary school	11	36.7
Secondary school	12	40.0
High school	7	23.3
Total	30	100

As seen in Table 3, 40% of the participants work in secondary school, 36.7% in primary school and 23.3% in high school. Although participant frequencies related to school type are not equal, it can be said that these frequencies are close to each other.

### 2.3. Data Collection Tool

Semi-structured interview form was used as data collection tool. The form was developed by the researcher with the help of an expert. The most important convenience offered by the semi-structured interview technique to the researcher is that it provides more systematic and comparable information since the interview is carried out in accordance with the previously prepared interview protocol (Yıldırım & Simşek, 2011). In this study, a 9-item interview form was developed to determine the opinions of English teachers about Web 2.0 tools. The questions in the interview form were examined by 6 academicians who were experts in their field and various arrangements were made in line with their opinions and suggestions. Interview is used as the shortest way to learn about individuals' knowledge, thoughts, attitudes and behaviors on various issues and their possible reasons (Karasar, 2012). The main purpose of using the interview technique is usually not to test a hypothesis; (Türnüklü, 2000) The interview technique used in qualitative research is to reveal the perspectives and worlds of meaning of the people who are researched and to serve the purpose of seeing the world through their eyes (Tanrıöğen, 2012).

### 2.4. Analysis of Data

Research data were interpreted with descriptive analysis, one of the qualitative research techniques. Interpretation is the process of giving meaning to the analyzed data (Karasar, 2012). In descriptive analysis, the answers given by different people to the same questions are conveyed in the form of quotations without changing (Yıldırım & Simşek, 2011). Descriptive analysis consists of the processes of forming the conceptual framework, processing the data according to this framework, defining the findings, and interpreting the findings (Altunışık, Coşkun, Bayraktaroğlu, & Yıldırım, 2010). While analyzing the data, codes in the form of K-1, K-2, .. were given to the interview forms filled out by the participants in order to ensure confidentiality and impartiality. The answers given by the sample group to the interview form questions were analyzed by categorizing them according to the problem areas. Percentages and frequencies were determined by listing these categories according to the number of citations of the participants. Striking references from the participants were shown as examples, and problem areas were strengthened. In the process of data analysis, categories and patterns were taken into consideration, the frequency of the variables was interpreted, the relationships between the variables were considered, and the variables were grouped according to their characteristics. The answers are interpreted in a way to reflect the reality as it is by establishing logical meaning chains. Because whether the meanings and results reached are correct, valid and repeatable is the most important problem of the research (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

## 3. Findings

The responses of the participants in the study group to the semi-structured interview form created by the researchers were subjected to content analysis and categories were determined, and the frequency (f) and percentages (%) belonging to each category were calculated. The findings reveal the views of English teachers in the study group about Web 2.0 tools.

### 3.1. English Teachers' Perceptions of Web 2.0 Tools

In the interview form, firstly the question of "If you were to describe Web 2.0 tools with two words, what would these words be?" has been asked. With this question, it is aimed to reveal the general perceptions of English teachers about Web 2.0 tools. Table 4 has been created for the answers given by the participants:

**Table-4.** Perceptions of english teachers about web 2.0 tools.

Perception	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Technology	9	16.37
Interaction	7	12.73
Creativity	7	12.73
Materiel	6	10.9
Innovativeness	5	9.09
eTwinning	5	9.09
Project	5	9.09
Information technology	5	9.09
Team work	3	5.45
Internet	2	3.64
Task	1	1.82
Total	55	100

As seen in Table 4, most of the teachers associate Web 2.0 tools primarily with the word "technology". The main reason for this situation is that teachers need to have a certain level of technological infrastructure



in order to use Web 2.0 tools effectively. Likewise, when Web 2.0 tools are integrated into lessons, students have the opportunity to benefit from innovative technologies for their academic development. Web 2.0 tools, which are very easy to use and develop content, provide free access to teachers and students, helping education stakeholders to increase their digital literacy levels.

"Interaction", "creativity" and "material" are among the other words mostly expressed by the participants regarding Web 2.0 tools, one of the most important elements of educational technologies. During the use of Web 2.0 tools, teachers and students work collaboratively to produce innovative, creative and original content. As teachers and students work together in the content produced, they simultaneously feel the emotions such as taking responsibility, sharing the sense of success and dividing the work. Interactive course materials are also created with Web 2.0 tools.

Web 2.0 tools are mostly used in eTwinning projects coordinated by the Ministry of National Education General Directorate of Innovation and Educational Technologies in our country. For this reason, it is seen that 5 participants perceive Web 2.0 tools as "eTwinning" and "project". Within the scope of eTwinning projects, teachers create concrete products with their domestic and foreign partners, create country teams, and create innovative project contents.

### 3.2. Participants' Use of Web 2.0 Tools in Foreign Language Teaching and Web 2.0 Tools Frequently Used

In the second question of the interview form, "Do you use Web 2.0 tools in foreign language teaching? If your answer is yes, which one (s) you frequently use among these tools?" statement is included. Table 5 shows the participants' benefiting from Web 2.0 tools in foreign language teaching; The names of the vehicles they usually use are included in Table 6.

**Table-5. Participants' use of web 2.0 tools in foreign language lessons.**

Situation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
I use of	30	100
I don't use of	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

Care was taken to ensure that all teachers in the study group have a branch in English and are aware of Web 2.0 tools. For this reason, it was concluded that all teachers made use of Web 2.0 tools in their lessons. In foreign language teaching, which focuses on the development of 4 basic skills, namely reading, writing, listening and speaking, it is thought that students will acquire foreign language acquisitions permanently and effectively by using Web 2.0 tools in their lessons. The tools they usually use in their lessons are shown in Table 6:

**Table-6. Web 2.0 tools my participants frequently use.**

Tool	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Edmodo	20	26.67
Kahoot	15	20.00
Prezi	10	13.34
Tagul	7	9.34
Canva	5	6.67
Google Forms	3	4.00
Weebly	2	2.67
Logopit	2	2.67
Animaker	1	1.34
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 6, the majority of the participants use Edmodo, which creates online training environments, and Kahoot, a test solving tool. While the frequency of the participant using Prezi, which is the presentation tool, is 10 cited; participant frequency that uses Tagul tool, which enables word cloud creation, is 7 cited.

*"I started using Edmodo with the distant education started due to the pandemic. In this way, I was able to follow the progress of the students by creating my virtual classrooms. " (K- 29)*

With the help of Edmodo, which allows teachers to create a virtual classroom environment, materials are shared in an easy and accessible manner, online exams are carried out, students are given tasks with time limits and announcements regarding these tasks can be made. Edmodo brings together teachers and students in virtual classrooms, and allows the creation of monitoring systems to increase interaction with parents. It is thought that the main reasons why teachers prefer Edmodo in the distance education process, especially during the pandemic process, is that it is a Web 2.0 tool that brings together internal and external stakeholders of education, is easy to use and helps achieve academic goals. Another Web 2.0 tool that teachers often use is the Kahoot application.

*"I devote some of my lessons almost to using these tools. I also use this tool because students like the Kahoot application the most. It is both racing with time; and they are trying to give the correct answer. " (K-4)*

With the Kahoot application, teachers can quickly and practically prepare surveys and exams. When the opinions of the participants are examined, it is revealed that the students handled the questions and surveys they solved with the Kahoot application in an entertaining way without entering any race or competitive environment. This situation suggests that Kahoot is considered by teachers as an alternative assessment and evaluation tool. Another Web 2.0 tool frequently used by participants is Canva.

*"I use these tools regularly as it is a national eTwinning project that I run with students. In the project, we created a logo with Canva, a competition was organized with Google forms and the logo with the highest number of votes was determined. I feel students' creativity improve when using the Canva app " (K-20)*

Canva is a web design application that allows the preparation of materials such as posters, logos, invitations, and banners. According to participant views, students also improve their creative thinking skills while using the Canva application.

Teachers working in rural areas where computers and smart boards are not available stated that they continue to use Web 2.0 tools despite all difficulties. These teachers, with their own means, bring their students together with Web 2.0 tools.

*"I work in the district, there is no smart board or internet in our school. Despite this, I take my own computer and connect the internet from my mobile phone and I use Prezi the most. " (K- 12)*

### 3.3. Integration of Web 2.0 Tools to Lessons

In the third question of the interview form, "How do you integrate Web 2.0 tools into your lessons? Please explain." statement was used. With this question, it was tried to determine the methods in which the participants used Web 2.0 tools in their lessons. Table 7 was created according to the answers given by the participants.

Table-7. Integration of web 2.0 tools to lessons.

Integration Way	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
I am preparing materials for use in live lessons.	12	32.44
I do group work.	7	18.92
I do project work with students.	7	18.92
I am preparing a presentation to tell the lesson.	5	13.52
I give homework.	3	8.1
I use it to reinforce the subject.	2	5.4
I use it in listening and speaking activities.	1	2.7
Total	37	100

As can be seen in Table 7, the majority of the participants (32.44%) stated that they used Web 2.0 tools to prepare materials for the live lessons held during the distance education process. In addition, participants use Web 2.0 tools for group work ( $f = 7$ ) and project work with students ( $f = 7$ ). Participants in the study stated that while integrating Web 2.0 tools into lessons, they created course materials to ensure the active participation of the student in the lesson and to make the teaching process more enjoyable.

*"I use Web 2.0 tools to make the distance education process more attractive to students and to keep students active. All my students are very satisfied with this situation. " (K-27)*

Participant views show that when Web 2.0 tools are used as course material, students participate in the lesson more actively and they enjoy the lesson more. In addition, it was determined that the participants used Web 2.0 tools in order to better understand and reinforce a topic discussed in the course.

*"I support the subject with these tools so that any subject is better understood and reinforced." (K- 19)*

Some of the participants stated that they use Web 2.0 tools to create animations, thus making the lessons more enjoyable. Living with many digital devices, especially tablets, computers and smart phones in their social lives, and encountering hundreds of stimulants every day, students can learn more easily through content that appeals to all their senses. In this context, Web 2.0 tools such as animations, podcasts and wikis that appeal to all sensory organs of students are thought to make educational environments more attractive.

*"I do listening activities with animations. English lessons are getting more enjoyable. " (K-24)*

### 3.4. Changes Observed in Students Using Web 2.0 Tools

In the fourth item of the interview form, the question of "What kind of changes do you observe in students when you use Web 2.0 tools in your lessons (increase in motivation, active participation, etc.)?" has been asked. With this question, it was tried to determine the effects of using Web 2.0 tools in foreign language lessons on students. Table 8 was created according to the answers given by the participants.

Table-8. Observed changes in students.

Changes	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Participation is increasing	8	21.62
They enjoy the lesson more	7	18.92
Their sense of responsibility is developing	5	13.52
Students' active participation is increasing	4	10.82
They get used to teamwork	4	10.82
Their creativity is increasing	3	8.1
Their self-esteem is improving	3	8.1
Their technological competence is increasing	3	8.1
Total	37	100

As can be seen in Table 8, most of the participants who benefited from Web 2.0 tools in their lessons observed that the participation of students to the lesson increased. Other changes observed in students are; they enjoy the lesson more, their sense of responsibility develops and they become more accustomed to teamwork. Participants in the study stated that students were more interested in, focused and enjoyed the lessons in which Web 2.0 tools were used.

*"When I use Web 2, all the students listen carefully and participate actively. They express that the lessons are more fun. " (K-1)*

It is thought that the reason why students show more interest in the lessons in which Web 2.0 tools are used is the happiness of these tools to find the technological elements they are accustomed to in the course environment. Due to the generation gap between teachers and students, students' digital skill levels may be higher than most teachers. Students are also aware of this difference. For this reason, it is thought that teachers who use Web 2.0 tools are perceived as technological literate by students and they feel closer to these teachers. Likewise, teachers and students create products by using these tools in teamwork. Some participants stated that they experienced

various problems in teamwork when they first started using these tools. However, they stated that they could overcome these problems in time.

*"We had difficulties in teamwork at first, but these problems disappeared over time." (K-13)*

### 3.5. The Contribution of Web 2.0 Tools to Language Skills

In the fifth item of the interview form, "Which of the four basic skills of foreign language teaching, reading, writing, listening and speaking skills do you believe do you believe?" The question is included. With this question, it was tried to determine the contributions of Web 2.0 tools to foreign language skills. Table 9 was created according to the answers given by the participants.

**Table-9.** Contribution of web 2.0 tools to language skills.

Skills	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Listening	13	43.34
Speaking	9	30.00
Reading	4	13.33
Writing	4	13.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that Web 2.0 tools mostly contribute to the listening skill, and the number of participants expressing this situation is 13. The number of participants who stated that they contribute to the speaking skill is also high, and the number of frequencies belonging to the participants in this group is 9. Following the listening and speaking skills are reading and writing skills.

*"I mostly use Web 2.0 tools in students' listening activities. I listen to dialogues, songs and audiobooks in my lessons. In addition, I create some texts as avatars and voice them with my own voice" (K-5)*

As can be seen from the statements above, Web 2.0 tools offer many different content opportunities for listening activities in foreign language lessons. In addition, teachers use avatars voiced with their own voices in their lessons. The semantic and functional structures of the language are internalized in the language learning process with the method of listening, in other words, exposing to the language. Alternative listening activities are thought to make students' internalization process more permanent. One benefit of listening activities for students is the correct pronunciation of words.

*"It helps students to pronounce words correctly." (K-15)*

Participants in the study also mentioned that Web 2.0 tools improve creative writing skills.

*"I create cork boards online to improve students' creative writing skills, and these boards quickly improve students' writing skills." (K-30)*

Based on the results of the research, it is thought that Web 2.0 tools contribute to all 4 basic skills of the foreign language learning process. Thanks to these tools, it is thought that students can express themselves with self-confidence and use the language they learn actively.

### 3.6. Effects of Web 2.0 Tools on Classroom Management

In the sixth item of the interview form, "What are the positive and negative effects of using Web 2.0 tools on classroom management process?" The question is included. With this question, it is aimed to reveal the advantages and disadvantages of using Web 2.0 tools in educational environments in terms of classroom management. Table 10 and Table 11 were created according to the answers given by the teachers in the study group.

**Table-10.** Positive effects of web 2.0 tools on classroom management.

Positive Effect	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
All students focus on the lesson.	7	23.3
Class attendance is increasing.	6	20.00
All students express themselves.	5	16.64
Discipline problems have decreased.	4	13.33
Lessons become permanent.	3	10.00
The gains become permanent.	3	10.00
Student-centered studies are increasing.	2	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 10, among the most important positive effects of using Web 2.0 tools on classroom management is that students focus on all lessons and ensure active participation in the lesson. In addition, it was concluded that all students expressed themselves easily, discipline problems decreased and what was learned became more permanent.

*"All students are listening more, focusing and participating more." (K-3)*

The main purpose of the classroom management field is to enable students to gain the basic gains related to the lessons. Participants in the study stated that thanks to the use of Web 2.0 tools, students' participation in the lesson increased and they focused more on the lesson. Participants stated that the students expressed themselves more comfortably. Thus, it can be said that Web 2.0 tools help students orient themselves to the lesson with an intrinsic motivation. Another subject area of classroom management is to minimize discipline problems in the classroom. Participants of the study stated that Web 2.0 tools reduce students' negative behaviors. A participant statement regarding this is as follows.

*"Negative behavior in the classroom has decreased and I noticed that discipline problems have also decreased." (K-25)*

Within the scope of the research, the negative effects of Web 2.0 tools on classroom management were also examined. The negative effects of Web 2.0 tools determined according to the opinions of the participants in terms of classroom management are as indicated in Table 11.

**Table-11.** Negative effects of web 2.0 tools on classroom management.

Negative Effect	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
When the internet slows down, there is a waste of time.	6	20.00
Keeping track of student work can be difficult.	5	16.64
When the activities don't catch up, time management becomes difficult.	4	13.33
Security gaps can occur.	4	13.33
It can cause noise.	3	10.00
Applications that require mobile phones make it difficult to track students.	3	10.00
When the computer is broken, the activity cannot be performed.	3	10.00
Students can compete.	2	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

Among the participants' comments about the negative aspects of using Web 2.0 tools in terms of classroom management, the negative aspects that are frequently mentioned are the loss of time due to the slowness of the internet or the length of activities. There are also opinions that it becomes difficult to follow the students' studies, that there may be a security gap, and that it causes noise and competition among students.

*"Some applications require students to use cell phones. It seems like all the students have attended the lesson, but it's hard for me to control. (K-24)*

As can be seen in the statement above, in some cases, teachers find it difficult to follow the process of students' use of Web 2.0 tools. This situation is thought to occur in applications that require the use of phones or tablets individually by students. Another negative effect of Web 2.0 tools on classroom management is the waste of time due to the slowdown of the internet.

*"In the middle of the application, the internet is completely cut off or slowed down. This causes a waste of time. " (K-9)*

As can be seen from the participants' opinions, Web 2.0 tools can cause a waste of time due to problems arising from the internet connection. Time management, one of the most important elements of classroom management, requires meticulous planning of the course process. For this reason, it is thought that it will be beneficial for teachers to produce alternative classroom plans against any kind of mishaps that may occur while using Web 2.0 tools. Another negative effect of Web 2.0 tools in terms of classroom management is the occurrence of security vulnerabilities.

*"It may be necessary to share personal information of students in order to use some Web 2.0 tools; this situation can create a security vulnerability. " (K- 26)*

Although it has many positive effects for students, teachers must be wary of security problems that may arise from Web 2.0 tools. Teachers should be careful not to share students' personal information, not to use their pictures without permission, and not to share content on social media where students' faces will be recognized. Against such problems, it is thought that it will be beneficial for all schools today to prepare strategic plans for digital security applications for security vulnerabilities and to act in accordance with these plans.

### 3.7. Institutional Capabilities of Schools to Use Web 2.0 Tools

In the seventh item of the interview form, "Do you think schools are suitable enough to use Web 2.0 tools in terms of their institutional capacity?" The question is included. With this question, it was tried to determine whether schools have the necessary equipment to use Web 2.0 tools. Participants' opinions about whether the institutional capacities of schools are sufficient to use Web 2.0 tools are as stated in Table 12:

**Table-12.** School capacities' suitability for web 2.0 tools.

View	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Suitable	14	46.66
Not suitable	16	53.34
Total	30	100

As can be seen in Table 12, the number of participants (f = 14) stating that the institutional capacity of schools is not suitable for using Web 2.0 tools without any problem is more than the number of participants who find it suitable (f = 16). As seen in Table 12, the number of participants (f = 14) stating that the institutional capacity of schools is not suitable for using Web 2.0 tools without any problem is more than the number of participants who find it suitable (f = 16). Stating that the institutional capacity available in schools is insufficient, the participants stated that the technological infrastructure in schools is insufficient, the internet connections are slow, and the internet providers to which the schools are connected do not have access to all applications. Teachers usually use their own means to solve this situation. A participant's statement summarizing this situation is as follows.

*"The technological infrastructure of schools, especially in districts, is very insufficient. Something is happening with the teacher's own efforts." (K-12)*

In our country, many macro projects are carried out and initiatives are carried out so that all students can benefit from technology in their education process. However, especially in schools located in low-income regions, lack of institutional infrastructure, lack of laboratories and materials make it difficult to use Web 2.0 tools.

*"Not every student has a tablet or cell phone. Our computer lab at the school is not enough. For this reason, there are difficulties in applying." (K-22)*



In this process, it may be beneficial for teachers to divide students into teams, meet with sponsors or philanthropists, prepare projects and receive grants so that they can use the existing materials in the most effective way.

### 3.8. The Effects of Web 2.0 Tools on Professional Development

In the last item of the interview form, "What effects did using Web 2.0 tools have on our professional development?" The question is included. With this question, it was tried to determine how benefiting from Web 2.0 tools contributed to the professional development of the participants. Table 13, which was created according to the answers given by the participants, reflects the effects of using Web 2.0 tools on their professional development.

Table-13. Effects of web 2.0 tools on professional development.

Effects	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
My technological competence has increased.	11	36.67
I can make the lesson more enjoyable.	7	23.3
I can provide student participation.	5	16.64
I can prepare material.	3	10.00
My classroom management skills have improved	3	10.00
I come better prepared for lessons.	1	3.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 13, the majority of the participants stated that their technological competence increased by using Web 2.0 tools ( $f = 11$ ). In addition, the participants stated that they could make the lesson more enjoyable ( $f = 7$ ) and ensure student participation ( $f = 5$ ). Participants in the study stated that they felt more efficient with the increase of their technological skills, and stated that they performed their professions more effectively because they created content that would appeal to today's students.

*"I realized that I can use technology more effectively. Now I can even create a website." (K-6)*

Another area where Web 2.0 tools contribute to the professional development of teachers is ensuring full participation in the classroom. A participant's opinion regarding this is as follows.

*"I used to have a few students who never listened to the class. Now I get their participation even." (K-17)*

As a result, when examining the effects of Web 2.0 tools on teachers' professional development, teachers' content development, material preparation, effective classroom management and making the lesson more attractive to students can be listed.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusion

Technology has brought many changes in the education world as well as in all areas of life. Web 2.0 tools, which facilitate the use of technology in educational processes and enable the creation of original content and materials, have been used frequently in educational institutions in our country, especially in recent years. Foreign language education that requires the development of four basic skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking; Web 2.0 tools are highly likely to be used in this process, as it requires original, different-sensory materials. Therefore, the study group of the research consists of English teachers. In the study, it was tried to determine the general opinions of English teachers about Web 2.0 tools.

First, teachers were asked to describe Web 2.0 tools in two words, and thus their perceptions about these tools were revealed. Teachers generally perceive Web 2.0 tools as technology, interaction and creativity. In the study conducted by Golshan and Tafazoli (2014), it was revealed that teachers have positive perceptions of Web 2.0 tools. Huitt (2000) revealed that teachers generally associate Web 2.0 tools with educational technologies.

It has been determined that perceptions about Web 2.0 tools, which are one of the most prominent examples of educational technologies, are generally related to the functional features of the tools. Another result of the study is that teachers often use online test, presentation and word clouds tools. It was concluded that the teachers developed materials by reinterpreting classical methods with the support of technology. Participants use these tools in their lessons as group work, project work or lecture technique. These findings are similar to the results of the research conducted by Bozna (2017). In the research conducted by Bozna (2017), it was revealed that teachers generally use Web 2.0 tools for content creation.

Based on the research findings, it can be said that Web 2.0 tools help students participate in the lesson more actively, learn in a fun way, take responsibility and adapt to group work. These findings are similar to the results of the study conducted by Oğütveren (2014). In the research of Oğütveren (2014), an experimental study was conducted for students and it was revealed that students' academic achievements and attitudes towards courses were positively affected after using Web 2.0 tools. In the research conducted by Oğütveren (2014), it was found that Web 2.0 tools increase the active participation of students in the lessons and make the lessons fun. In the study conducted by Wang and Vásquez (2012), it has been proven that foreign language teachers quickly acquire language skills and show a high level of development when they perform computer-based learning activities with Web 2.0 tools. In addition, Web 2.0 tools not only improve students' language skills, but also contribute to critical thinking skills and problem solving skills (Kivunja, 2015). Despite this, Tuzlukova and Hall (2017) stated that Web 2.0 tools do not have direct effects on students' acquisition of basic skills, and these tools only motivate students to lessons. Based on all these studies and research findings, it was concluded that when using Web 2.0 tools, teachers should use Web 2.0 tools meticulously, taking student age groups, cognitive levels and current language skills into account. In addition, while integrating these tools into the lessons, care should be taken not only to gain academic achievements, but also to achieve gains that will endanger their lives, such as criticized thinking, acting in the team, and problem solving.

According to the opinions of the participants in the research, the most important domain of these tools in the foreign language education process is the listening skill. It is thought that this may be due to the assumption that

teachers concentrate more on preparing materials that improve the sense of listening. This result differs from the results of the research conducted by Gün (2015). In the study conducted by Gün (2015), the effect of Web 2.0 tools on foreign language learning skills is most evident in speaking skills. In the study conducted by Ozbal (2017), the contributions of Web 2.0 tools to writing skills were discussed. In the study, it was seen that students can produce creative texts using Web 2.0 tools. Ozek Günyel (2018) found out that Web 2.0 tools generally provide positive contributions to listening skills. In the study conducted by Campbell and Larson (2013), the heartbeat of the students while practicing speaking through Web 2.0 tools was examined and it was concluded that the students were more excited and anxious when speaking through these tools. For this reason, it is thought that it is important for teachers to prepare students to use these tools first, and to encourage them to relieve their anxiety and calm them.

According to the participants, using Web 2.0 tools in educational processes has positive and negative effects on classroom management. Among its positive effects, it can be said that it increases student participation, makes lessons permanent and reduces discipline problems. The findings are similar to the findings of the study conducted by Aldır (2014). Teachers who took part in the study of Aldır (2014) stated that Web 2.0 tools constitute an alternative to traditional learning methods and provide positive contributions to classroom management. Its negative effects are usually the loss of time that may arise from infrastructure problems. For this reason, the participants think that the institutional capacity of the schools is not sufficient to benefit from these tools effectively and efficiently.

It is among the results of the research that thanks to the Web 2.0 tools, the technological competence of the participants increased, they made more pre-lesson preparations and their material preparation skills improved. The findings are similar to the results of the research conducted by Akkaya (2019). Akkaya (2019) examined the positive contributions of Web 2.0 tools to the professional development of teachers, and it was revealed that the largest of these contributions was directed towards teachers' technological competence. Lewin and McNicol (2014) considered Web 2.0 tools as very important elements in the acquisition of 21st century skills, especially the informatics skills of individuals.

Suggestions developed as a result of the research are divided into two groups as aimed at educators and researchers.

**1. Suggestions for Educators:** As a result of the research, it was determined that the participants benefited from Web 2.0 tools but generally used similar tools. For this reason, it is recommended that they recognize different tools and use tools that support modern teaching methods instead of enriching classical methods with technology. In-service training courses can be prepared at central and local levels so that teachers can get to know these tools better and use them effectively. Improving the technological infrastructure of schools is one of the areas that our country has been working on frequently in recent years. However, until this process is completed, teachers' personal efforts are also needed. For this reason, bringing their personal computers to the classroom environment of teachers working in schools where smart boards or computers are not available will help students to receive technology-supported education. It will be useful for teachers to apply the tools before the lessons and determine the estimated time of these applications so that they can effectively manage their time while using Web 2.0 tools in the classroom.

**2. Suggestions for Researchers:** In this study, qualitative research method was used and therefore the number of participants was determined as 30. They can expand the sample group of researchers who will work on Web 2.0 tools by using quantitative research method. This will increase the generalizability of the findings. In addition, only the opinions of English teachers are included in the study. A research can be prepared to reveal the usage areas of Web 2.0 tools in different lessons, including numerical and verbal, and teachers' opinions on this subject. In the study, only teacher opinion on the subject was taken; however, researchers can also take opinions of school administrators and students regarding Web 2.0 tools.

## References

- Akkaya, A. (2019). *The effects of activities developed with web 2.0 tools on computer hardware on student achievement*. Master's Thesis. Balıkesir University Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences. Balıkesir Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
- Aldır, Z. (2014). *The teacher regarding the use of Web 2.0 Tools in teaching examining the opinions of candidates in terms of various variables*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yıldırım, E. (2010). *Research methods in social sciences: Applied to spss*. Sakarya: Sakarya Publishing.
- Anderson, P. (2007). What is Web 2.0?: Ideas, technologies and implications for education (Vol. 1, pp. 1-64). Bristol: JISC.
- Atıcı, B., & Yıldırım, S. (2010). *The effect of Web 2.0 applications on e-learning*. *Academic Informatics'10 - XII*. Paper presented at the Academic Informatics Conference Papers. Muğla University.
- Bozna, H. (2017). *Using web 2.0 tools of digital natives learning foreign languages determination of Levels: A case study*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Büyüköztürk, S., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, S., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Scientific research methods* (11th ed. Vol. 249). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Byrne, R. (2009). The effect of web 2.0 on teaching and learning. *Teacher Librarian*, 37(2), 50-53.
- Campbell, S., & Larson, J. (2013). Public speaking anxiety: Comparing face-to-face and web-based speeches. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 10, 1-8.
- Castells, M. (2012). *The rise of the network society*. Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Cych, L. (2006). Social networks. In A. Pinder (Eds.). *Emerging technologies for learning*, British educational communications and technology agency (pp. 32-41). UK: Becta ICT Research.
- Davies, J., & Merchant, G. (2008). *Web 2.0 for schools: Learning and social participation*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Elmas, R., & Geban, Ö. (2012). Web 2.0 tools for 21st century teachers. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1), 243-254.
- Genç, Z. (2010). *Use of Web 2.0 innovations in education: A facebook education application example*. *Academic Informatics'10 - XII*. Paper presented at the Academic Informatics Conference Papers. Muğla University.
- Golshan, N., & Tafazoli, D. (2014). Technology-enhanced language learning tools in Iranian EFL context: Frequencies, attitudes and challenges. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 114-118. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.299>.
- Gün, S. (2015). *Web 2.0 audio and video in teaching Turkish as a foreign language the effects of interview applications (Skype) on speaking skills*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale.

- Haydn, T. A., & Barton, R. (2007). Common needs and different agendas: How trainee teachers make progress in their ability to use ICT in subject teaching. Some lessons from the UK. *Computers & Education*, 49(4), 1018-1036. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2005.12.006>.
- Horzum, M. B. (2010). Examination of teachers' awareness of Web 2.0 tools, their usage frequency and purpose in terms of various variables. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 7(1), 603-634.
- Huitt, W. (2000). *Teacher efficacy. Educational psychology interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Scientific research method* (23th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Publishing House.
- Kivunja, C. (2015). Exploring the pedagogical meaning and implications of the 4Cs "super skills" for the 21st century through Bruner's 5E lenses of knowledge construction to improve pedagogies of the new learning paradigm. *Creative Education*, 6(2), 224-239. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2015.62021>.
- Kıyıcı, F. B. (2010). The definitons and preferences of science teacher candidates concerning web 2.0 tools: A phenomological research study. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(2), 185-195.
- Lewin, C., & McNicol, S. (2014). Creating the future classroom: Evidence from the iTEC project. Full Report. Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom.
- McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. (2007). Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the Web 2.0 era. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, S-K. A. Soong, & C. Cheers (Eds.), *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning* (pp. 664-675). Syngapur: Centre for Educational Development, Nanyang Technological Universit.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Murugesan, S. (2010). *Handbook of research on Web 2.0, 3.0, and X.0: Technologies, business, and social applications*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- O'reilly, T. (2007). What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communications & Strategies*, 65(1), 17-37.
- OECD. (2009). *The new millennium learners: Main findings*. Paris: OECD.
- Oğütveren, M. (2014). *Google in the teaching of social studies 6th grade geography subjectsThe impact of the earth program on success*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Giresun University, Giresun.
- Ozbal, A. (2017). *Using Web 2.0 tools to improve writing skills*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Akdeniz University, Antalya.
- Ozek Günyel, F. (2018). *Web 2.0 supported ARCs applied instructional design the effect of listening comprehension and motivation*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives. *Digital Immigrants on the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Punie, Y., & Cabrera, M. (2006). The future of ICT and learning in the knowledge society. European Communities, Luxembourg. Retrieved from: <http://www.eenet.org/upload/File/Vision%202015/ThefutureofIctandlearningintheknowledgesociety.pdf>. [Accessed March,15,2021].
- Richards, R. (2010). Digital citizenship and web 2.0 tools. *MERLOT Journal of online Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 516-522.
- Solomon, G., & Schrum, L. (2007). *Web 2.0: New tools, new schools*. Eugene: International Society for Technology in Education.
- Tanrıöğen, A. (2012). *Scientific research methods* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Türnüklü, A. (2000). A qualitative research technique that can be used effectively in educational science research: Interview. *Educational Administration in Theory and Practice*, 6(24), 543-559.
- Tuzlukova, V., & Hall, A. (2017). A virtual professional development model: Bringing innovation to language teaching practice. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 4(3), 603-614.
- Wang, S., & Vásquez, C. (2012). Web 2.0 and second language learning: What does the research tell us? *CALICO Journal*, 29(3), 412-430.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences* (8th ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing House.
- Yin, R. (1994). *The case study research, design and methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 643-670. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X02239642>.