GÖZEM ÇEÇEN

TERTIARY LEVEL EFL STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE USE OF EDMODO, QUIZLET, AND CANVA WITHIN TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL (TAM)

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

GÖZEM ÇEÇEN

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

JUNE 2020

2020

Tertiary Level EFL Students' Perceptions Regarding the use of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva within Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

The Graduate School of Education

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

Gözem Çeçen

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Ankara

June 2020

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Tertiary Level EFL Students' Perceptions and Attitudes Regarding the use of Less Commonly Investigated Web 2.0 Tools within Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

Gözem Çeçen

May 2020

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hilal Peker (Supervisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erdat Çataloğlu (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Prof. Dr. Belgin Aydın, TED University (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Alipaşa Ayas (Director)

ABSTRACT

TERTIARY LEVEL EFL STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE USE OF EDMODO, QUIZLET, AND CANVA WITHIN TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL (TAM)

Gözem Çeçen

M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hilal Peker

June 2020

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions on the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva). This study was conducted with 90 participants at an English language preparatory school of a state university in Turkey. The results indicated that lower level students reported more positive opinions pertaining the use of the tools individually or altogether when compared to higher level students. The participants significantly differed from one another in terms of their perceptions of the awareness and actual system usage of the tools. It was also found that the perceptions of the awareness could slightly and the perceptions of the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could moderately predict the perceptions of the perceived usefulness of the tools. The implications of this study indicate that these already repeatedly used tools as a curricular task could be substituted or replaced with other tools to alleviate the oversaturation and reluctance of the use of the Web 2.0 tools by learners. Also, their opinions could also be taken into consideration when choosing which Web 2.0 tools to be implemented into language laboratory lessons so that their perceptions on the perceived usefulness, awareness and actual system usage of the tools could be positively shaped. Further research is required in the literature to give more support to generalize the results.

Keywords: Web Enhanced Language Learning, Technology Acceptance Model, English as a Foreign Language, Web 2.0

ÖZET

Yüksek Öğrenim Gören ve İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Öğrencilerin Teknoloji Kabul Modeli (TAM) Çerçevesinde Edmodo, Quizlet ve Canva Kullanımına Yönelik Algıları

Gözem Çeçen

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hilal Peker

Haziran 2020

Bu nicel çalışmanın amacı yüksek öğrenim gören ve İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin Web 2.0 araçlarının (Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) kullanımına yönelik algılarını araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmanın katılımcılarını Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitesinin İngilizce hazırlık okulunda eğitim gören 90 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları daha yüksek seviyedeki öğrencilere kıyasla Web 2.0 araçlarının kullanımıyla ilişkili olarak daha düşük seviyedeki öğrencilerin daha olumlu algıya sahip olduklarını göstermiştir. Web 2.0 araçlarıyla (ayrı ayrı veya bütün hepsi) ilgili farkındalık ve gerçekte sistem kullanımı algılarıyla ilişkili olarak katılımcılar birbirlerinden anlamlı derecede ayrılmışlardır. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin Web 2.0 araçlarına ilişkin farkındalık algılarının çok az ve öğrencilerin Web 2.0 araçlarının gerçekte sistem kullanımı algılarının da kısmen Web 2.0 araçlarının yararlılık algılarını öngördüğü söylenebilir. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları başka Web 2.0 araçlarının halihazırda müfredatın içinde defalarca kullanılan bu üç aracın yerini almasını ve böylece öğrencilerin bu araçları kullanma konusundaki fazla doygunluk ve isteksizlik sorunlarını iyileştirebilmesini önermektedir. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin dil laboratuvar derslerinde kullanılacak olan Web 2.0 araçlarının seçiminde fikirlerinin alınması bu öğrencilerin Web 2.0 araçlarının kullanımıyla ilgili farkındalık, gerçekte sistem kullanımı ve yararlılık algılarını olumlu etkileyebilir. Sonuçların genellenebilmesi ve alanyazının desteklenebilmesi için daha çok çalışmaya ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Web ile Zenginleştirilmiş Dil Öğrenimi, Teknoloji Kabul Modeli, Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce, Web 2.0

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has been one of the strangest years of my life. “The crazy roller-coaster” would be the name of it if it was made into a Hollywood movie! ☺ I would like to thank all the below mentioned people that helped me to “enjoy the ride”. First and foremost, I am grateful to Asst. Prof. Dr. Hilal Peker who was my supervisor, my energy booster and even my relationship mentor! ☺ Her never-ending trust in me and constant support stood as a lighthouse when I felt like I lost my direction. Without her guidance, involvement and encouragement on daily basis from the very beginning of my MATEFL journey till date, this work would have not been possible. I have found inspiration in her own ardor for perfection, passion, dedication and courage. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Belgin Aydın and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erdat Çataloğlu for their kindness and thoughtful comments and recommendations for my thesis.

I am grateful to Anadolu University and especially Prof. Dr. Ümit Deniz Turan for giving me the permission to carry out my Master’s study at İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University. I am also thankful to İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University for funding my Master’s study.

I cannot express my gratitude to my husband Kürşat who was never tired of showing his full compassion, affection and support during my countless emotional breakdowns in this conquest. Thank you for being my “knight in shining armor” and my “north star”, permeating into each and every piece of me with your warmth and peaceful shine. Thank you for enduring all the hardships of my studies. It is a joint work of both of us that we have seen this day. I would also like to thank my parents in law who opened their home to me and stood by me with their kindness and encouragement.

A big “thank you” goes to the wonderful people in the “fellowship of MATEFL”, especially Özge Özsoy, Gökçe Arslan, Pelin Ayla Akıncı and Derya Ilgın Yaşar for making this adventure more enjoyable, bearable and most importantly unforgettable. Another “thank you” is for my “HÜLLE girls”, “Sururi” and “Kiraze” who are the evidence in flesh that no distance or no stages of life can come between us. I felt all of your presence right next to me although we are miles away. Also, I would like to thank Behiç Yaymacı who has one of the most compassionate and gentle hearts I have had known in my life. Thank you for your never-failing sympathy and encouragement that gave me the spur and optimism that I needed in my MATEFL journey. You make everything and everyone a lot better with your kind heart and humane touch. Last, but not least at all, a very special “thank you” is for my Patronus Ecenur Yalçın. Thank you for helping me fight against all the dementors I have encountered. Thank you for putting my heart, mind and soul at ease and peace with your magical, nurturing nature and healing presence that you have made available to me.

I dedicate this thesis study to my son Can. My hopes are that one day you will find it good enough to forgive me for stealing from the time I should have spent with you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

As stated by Kern and Warshauer (2000), striking changes have been observed in terms of how languages are taught in English Language Teaching (ELT). This is because of the advancements in computer and Internet technologies. Much the same as these technologies have shaped the everyday life of individuals, which can also be referred as 'macrocosm', the EFL classroom, thus microcosm, has also been affected by these revolutionary technologies. As stated by Dudeney and Hockly (2012), although the terminology ranges from such concepts as computer-assisted language learning (CALL) to technology-enhanced learning, Web-enhanced language learning (WELL), and to information and communication technologies (ICT), the intention is one: to nourish prospects for language learning through the integration of technology into language teaching.

However, technology integration into language teaching is not a recent idea. The late 1970s and later on early 1980s were the periods in which microcomputers were started to be used by teaching practitioners to support learning. Since then, the interest in and the practice of CALL in ELT have been escalating (Egbert, 2005; Hubbard & Levy, 2016; Levy, 2000). Luke and Britten (2007) prognosticated that teachers would need to be aware of the upcoming fact that technology was going to be an essential part of foreign language (FL) teaching and that how to implement technology to serve the needs of learners would emerge as a major concern to be considered by teachers.

Luke and Britten's (2007) self-fulfilling prophecy relies mostly on the characteristics of contemporary learners who are defined as "digital natives" (Prensky, 2001, p. 2), "Net generation" (Jones, Ramanau, Cross, & Healing, 2010, p. 3) and "millenials" (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005, p. 29). These learners are born into technology, making it possible for them to encounter technology in various and recurring occasions.

Therefore, for today's learners, technology stands as a student-owned territory in which they are familiar and comfortable with. Consequently, they expect a constant stream of new media to stay focused and they also want control in their learning (Motteram & Sharma, 2009; Prensky, 2001; Tapscott, 2008). For this reason, Farkas (2012, p. 85) draws attention to the integration of Web 2.0. into education and coins the term "Pedagogy 2.0." accordingly. This is in line with what Prensky (2001) posits: today's learners employ technology differently and learn differently from their parents and teachers.

Within this respect, it can be safely suggested that implementation of Web 2.0 technologies into teaching practice and learning settings is of utmost importance for teachers who would not want to lag behind their students who see technology as a part of their lives. Thus, as Granito and Chernobilsky (2012) highlight, teachers ought to make efforts to provide learners with activities which contain some forms of technological tools because students have positive reaction to technology and are more motivated via technology. Consequently, there is a need for implementation and integration of Web technologies because CALL and Web enhanced language learning/teaching give learners the opportunity to actively search and produce materials rather than a purely passive material consumption which relies on teacher to find, present and make use of materials and learning since it fosters such settings

that allow for both individual and collaborative learning and meaning making processes (Chun & Plass, 2000; Kung, 2002).

Regarding the implementation, integration and effective use of Web 2.0. tools in learning and teaching environments, one of the important elements that should be taken into consideration is the attitudes of the user (Çobanoğlu & Yücel, 2017; Hernández-Ramos, Martínez-Abad, Garcia Penalvo, Esperanza Herrera Garcia, & Rodríguez-Conde,2014). In this regard, as put by Aşıksoy (2018), investigation of learners' perceptions and attitudes towards the use of technologies plays a crucial role so as to decide on a path pursuant to the current scenario.

Background of the Study

Rapid advancements in computer and web technologies have revolutionized the lives of people as a result of the evolution of web technologies in their own nature. Kapp and O'Driscoll (2010, p. 7) defined the shift from Web 1.0. to Web 2.0. as "webvolution". This evolution was from 'read-only Web' to 'read-write Web' or 'participatory Web' thanks to the introduction of Web 2.0 tools which can be categorized as 'social media tools', 'wikis', 'blogs', 'podcasts', 'Rich Site Summary (RSS)' and '3-D worlds' (Chang, Pearman, & Farha, 2012). Considering this in mind, it did not take long enough for ELT practitioners and researchers to tailor their teaching and practices by taking their learners into consideration. Therefore, quite a vast amount of literature has been built on Web 2.0 technologies integration into language teaching and perceptions and attitudes of EFL learners towards the use of Web 2.0 technologies. However, among these Web 2.0 tools, social media tools, wikis, blogs, podcasts and 3-D worlds 'share the lion's part' in terms of popularity of use and frequency of investigation. Therefore, as Başal (2016) posits, "this is only

the tip of the iceberg when the great variety in terms of Web 2.0 tools is considered" (p. 155).

A number of endeavors have been made with the purpose of maximizing the potency of the Internet so that learners and teachers alike could be supported in their quests of learning/teaching. Edmodo can be considered among these ventures. Being a learning/teaching platform, it offers promising potentials in terms of connecting the users, be it students or teachers, to each other or allowing for content sharing and collaboration (Al-Ruheili & Al-Saidi, 2015; Hakim & Kodriyah, 2015). Furthermore, Edmodo could also serve useful for learners in terms of developing their writing skills (Al-Naibi, Al-Jabri, & Al-Kalbani, 2018; Alsmari, 2019; Ma'azi & Janfeshan, 2018). Also, Edmodo can be helpful with sentence structure, spelling and vocabulary for EFL students (Al-Naibi, et al., 2018; Yusuf, Yusuf, Erdiana, & Pratama, 2018). In addition, Edmodo could provide scaffolding for students' motivation for learning English. Students who use Edmodo have also positive opinions and attitudes regarding its usage for their language learning process (Ali, 2015; Al-Naibi et al., 2018; Al-Ruheili & Al-Saidi, 2015).

As another Web 2.0 tool, Quizlet, an online learning platform in the form of interactive flashcards for vocabulary development in particular, could also be viewed as a promising company for both the learners and teachers considering the opportunities for vocabulary learning/teaching (Ashcroft & Imrie, 2014; Barr, 2016; Kálecký, 2016). The way learners perceive the use and the usefulness of Quizlet is also another significant issue to be considered and positive reactions have been found as the most recurrent emergence (Köse, Çimen, & Mede, 2016; Lander, 2016).

As a content creation & publishing/sharing tool in the form of infographics, Canva, on the other hand, is another Web 2.0 tool on which empirical studies are

scarce regarding its implementation for pedagogical purposes. The research interest in this tool has been reflected on its implementation with regard to development of EFL learners' reading skills (Manowong, 2017) and writing skills (Yundayani, Susilawati, & Chairunissa, 2019) and their perceptions on and attitudes towards the use of Canva in their learning process.

Statement of the Problem

Ever since the use of Web 2.0. tools has taken a rise for educational purposes, a vast number of studies have been conducted regarding the use of these tools in EFL. However, the focus of these studies revolves around the most popular and widely investigated 'the top of the iceberg' Web 2.0. technologies such as blogs, wikis, social media tools, podcasts and 3-D worlds (Lee & McLouglin, 2011; Liu, Kalk, Kinney, & Orr, 2012; Luo, 2013; Yadav & Padwarthan, 2016; Wang & Vasquez, 2012). Therefore, there is a need for studies that focus on less investigated Web 2.0 tools such as content creation tools, online study platforms and learning management systems (Yadav & Patwardhan, 2016; Wang & Vasquez, 2012). Furthermore, as for Turkish ELT context, Yağız, Aydın and Akdemir (2016) found in their study that such research areas as CALL, ICT and multimedia, regarding implementation and materials, have not attracted much research attention from Turkish ELT researchers, for Turkish ELT researchers tend to focus mostly on areas such as language learning & teaching, and teacher education.

The institution in which the researcher of this research study works introduced the Web 2.0 tools into language assignments of the preparatory school students for language laboratory classes in 2015 and Web 2.0 tools have been actively implemented in the curriculum since then. The tools selected for language assignments are mostly from those 'hidden' Web 2.0 technologies such as language

management systems, game based study platforms or content creation & publishing tools rather than those more widely investigated ones.

However, no research studies on the English preparatory school students' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of Web 2.0 have been conducted in the English preparatory school that the researcher works at, to the very best knowledge of the researcher. In this respect, this study will make use of three Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo (language management system), Quizlet (game based online study platform through interactive flashcards), and Canva (content creation & publishing tool in the form of infographics) in order to investigate tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions on perceived usefulness, ease of use, awareness, and actual system usage of these specific tools in their language learning quest. The study also focuses on investigating EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of these tools within the framework of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) that was modified by Arshad, Hoon, and Hashim (2012). In this study, it is also examined whether EFL learners' perceptions on their awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could predict their perceptions on the perceived usefulness of these Web 2.0 tools.

Research Questions

This study will address the following questions:

1. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
    a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?

   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

2. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

3. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of theWeb 2.0 tools?
b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

4. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
    a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools?
    b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
    c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

5. What are A, B, and C level EFL perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?
6. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?
7. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?

Significance

With the advent of Web 2.0 technologies, we have witnessed such rapid developments and changes in the 21st century. These technologies have a great impact on not only social life but also on business and educational spheres in which

such concepts as creation of information, accessing to information, and use of knowledge have been reshaped (Özerbaş & Mart, 2017). Web 2.0 technologies, by enabling communication and interaction, also reshaped and blended the roles of teachers and learners, which, thus, means blending the practice of teaching and learning as well (Altıok, Yükseltürk, & Üçgül, 2017; Trilling & Fadel, 2009). Therefore, it is not surprising to observe that Web 2.0 technologies stirred so much interest in the field of education inasmuch as the functions of these technologies give a new impulse to the roles of the learners, enabling them in many aspects such as content creation and publishing which was impossible with Web 1.0 technologies before (Jeng, He, Jiang, & Zhang, 2012).

Furthermore, Web 2.0 technologies offer other opportunities which can be listed as active participation of learners in learning process, autonomy and cognitive growth of learners, formulation of a more dynamic, flexible and creative learning atmosphere; leverage to the preparation for students' future careers in terms of ICT skills, opportunities to practice the 21st century skills such as collaboration, content creation, visualization, evaluation and creativity (Ajjan & Hartshorne, 2008; Grosseck, 2009; Kutlutürk & Akbayrak, 2010). Regarding this, it should also be taken into consideration that the perceptions and attitudes of users towards the utilization of Web 2.0 technologies play a key role for the effectiveness of these Web 2.0 tools (Çobanoğlu & Yücel, 2017; Hernández-Ramos, Martínez-Abad, Garcia Penalvo, Esperanza Herrera Garcia, M., & Rodríguez-Conde, 2014). In this respect, as Aşıksoy (2018) asserts, there is a need for investigation of students' perceptions and attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 technologies so that the practitioners and teachers could gain a more accurate and insightful panorama of the current situations when deciding on a path to follow in terms of implementation of Web 2.0 tools.

In alignment with what Aşıksoy (2018) suggests, the purpose of this research study is to find out the tertiary level English preparatory school students' perceptions of the usefulness of Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva for language learning. Another purpose of the study is to find out tertiary level preparatory students' attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools. Furthermore, the study focuses on examining the English preparatory school students' perceptions on the ease of use, awareness, and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools in a state university in Turkey. As a part of the local context of the researcher in which she works as an EFL instructor, Web 2.0 tools have been actively used as an integrated part of language assignments of the preparatory school students in their language laboratory classes for five years. However, neither the perceptions on the usefulness, ease of use, awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools nor the attitudes of the English preparatory students towards the use Web 2.0 tools for their language learning in language laboratory classes have been investigated, to the best knowledge of the researcher. Therefore, this research study could provide suggestions and implications for the curriculum and material development units in the context of the researcher in terms of betterment in the planning of technology integration into teaching for future use. This study may also provide pedagogical insights in terms of being another real time research that is needed regarding the use of Web 2.0 tools integration into higher education as highlighted by Yadav and Patwardhan (2016).

Literature concludes that among the most popular and widely investigated Web 2.0 tools are social networking tools (such as Facebook and Twitter), wikis, blogs, podcasts and 3-D worlds (Luo, 2013; Yadav & Patwardhan, 2016; Yağız et al., 2016; Wang & Vasquez, 2012). Therefore, this study may also contribute to the literature by investigating less studied Web 2.0 tools such as content creation and

sharing/publishing (i.e. Canva), learning management systems (i.e. Edmodo) and interactive study platforms (i.e. Quizlet).

Definition of Key Terms

Integrative/Integrated Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL): The last phase(s) of the evolution of CALL as categorized by Warschauer (1996) and Bax (2003). Although different names were attributed to the last phase by Warschauer as Integrative and as Integrated by Bax, they meet on the common ground in that through the integration of Web 2.0 technologies language learning has become more collaborative, interactive and flexible which gives the users, both teachers and learners, the opportunity to experience freedom, active participation and creativity/productiveness in teaching/learning.

Web Enhanced Language Learning (WELL): It is an extension of Integrated CALL which is also known as 'blended', 'hybrid' and 'web enhanced instruction' which makes use of face to face learning and benefits that technology offers at the same time through the use of such digital technologies as materials, resources or tools in language teaching/learning within several pedagogical approaches and methodologies (Bañados, 2006; Claypole, 2010; Oliver & Trigwell; 2005; Sharma, 2010).

Web 2.0 Technologies: Second generation web-based services/tools through which users are enabled to construct and collaborate on the Internet by means of the facilitation of interactive information sharing, operability among users via user-centred interfaces (igi-global.com, 2019).

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM): A model that is used with the purpose of the analysis and interpretation of the chronological sequence of events that conduce to the acceptance of certain technologies. The original version rises on the two core

constructs identified by Davis (1993): *perceived usefulness* and *perceived ease of use*. However, this current research study is set up on the version of TAM, excluding the construct of *behavioural intention*, which was modified by Arshad et al. (2012). This version amounts to four more constructs that are *attitudes towards use, awareness, behavioural intention,* and *actual system usage* in addition to those two original constructs.

Perception: Positive or negative way of thinking of how one views or interprets a situation in their surroundings (Lindsay & Norman, 1972).

Conclusion

In this chapter, a brief introduction to the literature on the effects of Web 2.0 technologies on EFL learners' language skills, 21st century skills and EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools in educational context is given. Also, the introduction of the study, the statement of the problem, research questions and the significance of the study are laid. The next chapter will concentrate on the relevant literature on Web 2.0 tools. In addition, EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes pertaining to the use of Web 2.0 in the tertiary level EFL setting will be presented.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In this research study, the use of Web 2.0 tools, particularly Edmodo as language management system; Quizlet as interactive study platform; and Canva as content creation & sharing/publishing tool in the shape of infographics with regard to the perceptions and attitudes of the learners of English as a foreign language are examined. Therefore, in this chapter, it is aspired to provide a review of literature relevant to the scope of this research study and to present a comprehensive panorama of the related issues. In accordance with this purpose, the first section of this chapter focuses on the Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) with elaborating on the history, definitions and stages of it. The third section concentrates on the emergence of Internet and World Wide Web providing background information and definitions of both terms. The fourth section deals with the shift from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 and their outcomes along with a discussion of the specific features attributed to each. The next two sections are concerned with the educational benefits and the limitations of Web 2.0 technologies both for general users and for learners and teachers. The eighth section provides general information on Web Enhanced Language Learning (WELL) which is one of the sub categories of CALL. The ninth section provides a panorama of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as the theoretical framework of this study. The tenth section concentrates on the place of Web 2.0 in educational setting, specifically in English language learning settings through the presentation of various empirical studies with regard to learner perceptions on and attitudes towards the use of these tools in classrooms. The eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sections focus exclusively on Edmodo, Quizlet, and

Canva seriatim and shed light on the backgrounds, definitions and features of these tools while dealing with practical application of them in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms with particularly concentrating on learners' perceptions on and attitudes towards their use

Computer Assisted Language Learning

The roots of CALL date back to the early 1960s in which its practical application could only be afforded by prestigious computer science departments that developed computer programs at wealthy universities (Warschauer, 1996). It was the arrival of personal computers (PCs) in the early 1980s that made computers available to a wider public audience. This, of course, resulted in a boosting development of CALL programs. Therefore, it can be suggested that the practice of CALL in language teaching has been active since the gradual evolution of CALL into its present form (Brown, 2007; Paramskas, 1999; Reiser, 1987; Saettler, 1990; Warschauer & Healey, 1998).

Definitions of CALL

There are several definitions of CALL suggested by practitioners. The broadest definition can be attributed to Levy (1997) who defines CALL as the attempt for and study of computer applications with regard to language teaching and learning. However, with the evolution of CALL in time, the definitions for the term have also evolved. For instance, Chapelle (2001) states that the term refers to the area of technology and second language teaching and learning though there are suggestions for the revision of the term. Beatty (2003) puts emphasis on the changing nature of CALL and defines it as "any process in which learner uses a computer and, as a result, improves his or her languages" (p. 7). As for Egbert (2005), CALL is "using computers to support language teaching and learning in some way" (p. 3). In

the definition provided by Januszewski and Molinda (2008), CALL is regarded as the body of techniques for technology use in language teaching and learning. The evolution of these definitions of CALL can be regarded as an outcome of the changing theoretical backgrounds and practical uses of CALL as well. In this sense, different categorizations of CALL into three different stages by Warschauer (1996) and Bax (2003) will be dealt with in detail below

Stages of CALL

Regarding the categorization by Warschauer, the very first stage of CALL is Behavioristic CALL of 1970s and 1980s. As Warschauer (2002) posits, computer served as being a 'tutor' for students in their foreign language learning. This phase of CALL shared quite a few similarities with the behavioristic learning model in that it provided repetitive language drills, presenting a stimulus to the learner who, in turn, was required to provide a response. As suggested by Stokes (1997), in this model of CALL, the computer was regarded as tireless and non-judgemental meaning that students can play with language repeatedly and get things wrong on purpose and will not be scorned because of the mistake they have made. Behavioristic CALL allowed learners to receive discrete error correction and feedback. It was made possible via Behavioristic CALL for learners to take grammar tests, to do vocabulary exercises and to practice spelling (Kern, 2006).

After its domination of the decade, it was replaced by the second phase of CALL, Communicative CALL. With this shift from the first stage to the second stage of CALL in 1980s and 1990s, there came another shift regarding the role of the computer which, from then on, shifted to serve as a tool as Warschauer posits (2002). It can be suggested that Communicative CALL emerged as a criticism towards Behavioristic CALL because unlike

its predecessor, Communicative CALL made room for the advocates of cognitive theorists who believed that learning should be a process with a developmental and discovery basis. With regard to this, Communicative CALL made use of text reconstruction programs and simulation as software to be employed in language teaching and learning process (Daşkın, 2017). This also gave a path to students to become more explorative in their learning process with the help of online dictionaries and concordance programs (Johns & King, 1991).

The last stage of CALL is also known as Integrative CALL dating back to the early 21st century. As asserted by Kern and Warschauer (2000), multimedia and the Internet are integrated with the aim of exposing learners to language use in real-like environments. Therefore, language is viewed as a socio-cognitively developed entity through social interaction. This type of CALL allows learners to taste and toy with various technological tools in addition to working on computers. It also compromises all the four language skills that are speaking, listening, reading, and writing through the integration of technology for language learning. Table 1 illustrates the key elements with regard to the stages of CALL asserted by Warschauer (2000).

Table 1

The Stages of CALL by Warschauer

Stage	1970-1980s: Structural CALL	1980-1990s: Communicative CALL	21st Century: Integrative CALL
Technology	Mainframe	PCs	Multimedia and Internet

Table 1 (cont'd)

The Stages of CALL by Warschauer

English-teaching paradigm	Grammar-translation and audio-lingual	Communicative (sic) language teaching	Content-based, ESP/EAP
View of language	Structural (a formal structural system)	Cognitive (a mentally constructed system)	Socio-cognitive (developed in social interaction)
Principle use of computers	Drill and practice	Communicative exercises	Authentic discourse
Principle objective	Accuracy	And fluency	And agency

(Excerpted from Warschauer, 2000)

Regarding another categorization of the evolution of CALL offered by Bax (2003), CALL is divided into three stages; Restricted, Open and Integrated CALL, respectively. The first stage, Restricted CALL, confines the role of the teacher to monitoring while the role of the student is limited to do the tasks that consist solely of closed drills, and quizzes. This 'drill to kill' (Warschauer, 1996) way of teaching thus leads learners to have minimal interaction with their peers, decreasing their motivation. As for the practice of feedback, Restricted CALL allows only closed feedback with the responses of 'correct or incorrect'.

The second approach suggested by Bax (2003) is called Open CALL, possessing relatively freer and more flexible elements in such aspects as the feedback learners receive, types of software used for teaching, and the roles of the teacher and learners. Open CALL allows students to have occasional interactions with peers while maintaining the interaction with the computer as well. The feedback gets a little bit more flexible in that it now focuses more on the developmental process of linguistic skills of learners rather than a pure 'correct/incorrect' feedback provided

by the previous stage of CALL. The shift from drills and quizzes to simulations and games enable students to participate more actively and to take the role of a discoverer. Similarly, the role of the teacher is shaped accordingly, adding the role of 'facilitator' into the inventory while keeping the former function of monitoring. However, as Bax (2003) himself acknowledges, this stage of CALL cannot be regarded as completely open, yet, when compared to Restricted CALL, its components allow for a relative openness and flexibility in the aspects stated above.

The last stage of CALL posited by Bax (2003) is Integrated CALL in which students are engaged in frequent interactions with their peers and the computer through the lesson. The teacher serves as a facilitator and a manager in this type of CALL. Students receive such type of feedback that stimulates thought and make room for interpretation, evaluation and commentary of students and the teacher both. Bax's last stage of CALL differs from that of Warschauer in that while the stage offered by Bax is called Integrated, the phase suggested by Warschauer is called Integrative. Second, Bax (2003) asserts that this last stage of CALL "does not yet exist to any significant degree, but represents instead an aim towards which we should be working" (p. 22). This can be interpreted as we are still operating with the second approach, Open CALL. However, as a result of the shift from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0, the impact of this can be seen in the rampancy of Integrative CALL and/or Integrated CALL practice in language teaching (Krasne, 2009; McLeod & Vasinda, 2008). As Bax (2003) foresaw in his propositions of his categorization of CALL, it is now normalized and integrated into syllabus and it is used as an aiding tool for language learning and can be found in "every classroom, on every desk and in every bag" (p. 21) thanks to the advancement of mobile technologies and applications. To illustrate this proposition, take the institution of the researcher of this study, for

instance, in which Web 2.0 technologies are integrated into the syllabus for the language assignments of the students in their language laboratory lessons. These tools have been regarded as normal part of teaching since their first implementation into the curriculum in 2014. Therefore, it can be suggested that in terms of types of tasks, types of student activities, types of feedback, the role of the teacher, the position in curriculum and physical position of computer/technology as proposed by Bax (2003), the practical application of Integrated CALL along with Open CALL can be seen clearly.

The Emergence of the Internet and World Wide Web

The practice of Integrated/Integrative CALL cannot be separated from the concepts of the Internet and World Wide Web. The emergence of the Internet and World Wide Web has revolutionized the lives of people. However, though commonly used interchangeably, these two terms differ from one another in that while the Internet is hardware and wire, World Wide Web is software of information sharing model (Chang, Pearman, & Farha, 2012). While the origins of the Internet go back to 1969 with the background of Advanced Research Projects Agency Network (ARPANet) with defensive military purposes in the USA, the evolution of ARPANet to the Internet for public and commercial use circles around the late 1980s (Chang et al., 2012). Regarding the latter term, it was Tim Berners- Lee who invented World Wide Web in 1989.

The Shift from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0

It was in August of 1995 when Web 1.0 was born as a result of the Internet shifting from being invisible to being everywhere (Getting, 2007). It was eight years later when Dale Dougherty came up with the popular buzzword ‘Web 2.0’ in 2004 (O’Reilly, 2007). As stated by West and West (2009), the very first half of the three

decade history of World Wide Web (will be called web from this on) is called differently such as ‘the read-only Web’ or ‘Web 1.0’ whilst the second half of the three decade hosts the definitions for a different Web such as ‘the read-write Web’ or ‘Web 2.0’.

McLeod and Vasinda (2008) portray Web 1.0 as “one way communication” or “a monologue” (p. 260). This is due to the fact that people were only able to browse, read and retrieve information on the Web 1.0 as asserted by Wang and Vasquez (2012). Via this type of Web, information was presented with almost no user control which means that users were in the position of passive consumers of online materials with limited human-computer interaction (West & West, 2009). Therefore, Web 1.0 can be likened to a ‘one way ticket’ for its users in their pursuit of Web journey. In this aspect, for the description of Web 2.0, McLeod and Vasinda (2008) liken it to a “dialogue” (p. 260). It is no wonder that Kapp and O’Driscoll (2010) describe the shift from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 as webvolution because of the benefits and opportunities provided by Web 2.0 technologies.

Benefits of Web 2.0

With the emergence of Web 2.0 technologies, it did not take long for researchers and practitioners to realize the potentials offered by Web 2.0. Some of the benefits offered by Web 2.0 technologies are listed below as a presentation of general panorama:

- Web 2.0 tools and technologies allow for self-expression and presentation for the users (Crook, 2008).
- Web 2.0 provides inquiry and exploration opportunities to the users (Şahin Kızıl, 2017)
- Web 2.0 permits user generated construct and “remixing” (Lessig, 2008).

- Web 2.0 technologies make content sharing and publishing possible (Adebanjo & Michaelides, 2010; Alexander, 2006; Grosseck, 2000; Mason & Rennie, 2007; Zimmer, 2008).
- Web 2.0 allows users to interact and collaborate with one another occurring generally in such settings as social networking tools, blogs and wikis (Daşkın, 2017).
- Web 2.0 technologies have altered the roles of the users from passive recipients to active contributors (Wolcott, 2007).
- With Web 2.0 tools learners have obtained such new names as knowledge creators, producers, editors and evaluators (Richardson, 2010).

For a more detailed explanation for the benefits and opportunities of the use of Web 2.0 in learning context, it would be a good idea to have a look at what West and West (2009) claim. In a sharp opposition to Web 1.0 that includes only such functions as browsing and reading on the Internet, Web 2.0 tools enable users to construct; that is to write on the Internet. Accordingly, this shift from passive reference to active participation and collaboration provide exciting opportunities for students also in terms of the development of such skills as interaction, creativity, inventive thinking and autonomy, which are regarded among the 21st century skills (Ekici, Abide, Canbolat, & Öztürk, 2017). Students may demonstrate creativity and innovation through using Web 2.0 tools with graphic organization, presentation and content creation features (Thieman, 2008).

If we consider Web 2.0 technologies as an extension and part of Integrated CALL or Integrative CALL as Bax (2003) and Warschauer (2000) claim, another benefit of Web 2.0 can be suggested with an adaptation to what Beauvois (as cited in Gonglewski, 1999) argues in that since the computer (thus Web 2.0 enhanced

language learning as a component of Integrated/Integrative CALL) allows for a less confrontational or immediate atmosphere, it diminishes students' feeling of embarrassment which is accompanied by the fear of making mistakes. Therefore, it can be suggested that with Web 2.0 technologies the learning environment becomes less stressful which, in turn, boost participation and engagement and creativity of students in language learning. This is in alignment with what Loveless (2002) argues such that in order for the teacher to nourish creativity, the teacher should provide a social and safe atmosphere in which students feel secure enough so that they can take risks and play with the ideas. She also claims that students can produce finished products quickly and easily through the use of a range of media technologies that could give opportunity to foster creativity in classroom.

As another overview, Gulley and Thomas (n.d) list other benefits of the use of Web 2.0 tools as follow:

- Web 2.0 tools are intuitive and user friendly, thus little time is wasted in learning how to use them.
- The ease of use along with the quality of the finished products boosts the self-efficacy of learners, motivates them to engage more earnestly and actively in the content they are forming in their learning process.
- Web 2.0 tools facilitate interactive learning and allow learners to respond to assignments innovatively.
- Through Web 2.0 tools, learners see their ideas take shape quickly and they are awarded with professional-looking results.
- Editing projects is easy with Web 2.0 tools that enable learners to take more risks during the creative process.

- Web 2.0 tools facilitate authentic interactions both with content and with other learners.
- Web 2.0 tools offer learners real world problems to solve thus giving an opportunity for the practice of problem solving skills, which is among the 21st century skills (Ekici et al., 2017; Kaufman, 2013; Thieman, 2008; World Economic Forum, 2015).
- Web 2.0 allows students to practice another 21st century skill which is called collaboration skills (Ekici et al., 2017; Kaufman, 2013; Thieman, 2008; World Economic Forum, 2015) in meaningful ways with peers in face to face or on online platforms.
- Web 2.0 tools offer liberty to students to customize their responses through the utilization of multi-media or multiple modalities. Consequently, no two works look exactly the same unlike a term paper or a more traditional response project.
- Web 2.0 tools could increase the learning opportunities for all in that through the use of Web 2.0 tools, students can easily share their individual interpretations or representations from what they have understood from a topic.

It can be understood from the previous research studies that Web 2.0 tools provide important benefits not only for the students of English as a foreign language (EFL) but also for the learners of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) as supported by several studies (Balula & Moreira, 2014; Buzzetto-More, 2015; Khany & Boghayeri, 2013). To exemplify, Khany and Boghayeri (2013) investigated the use of blogs, podcasts and vodcasts, wikis, e-mails, and social networking sites for EFL learning, taking the Iranian tertiary level

of education as the setting and focusing on the attitudes of Iranian EFL teachers. According to the results of their study, the tools in question were reported as being highly effective for the improvement of the receptive and productive language skills and cooperation skills of the learners. Furthermore, the study by Buzzetto-More (2015) revealed that American students had positive perceptions regarding learning efficiency and the use of Youtube in online, hybrid and WELL courses. Also, the student engagement in the study process increased with the integration of Youtube into online, hybrid and WELL courses. It was found that the integration of Youtube into courses was especially effective with regards to the development of fully online learners' educational experiences.

As for the studies exploring the use of Web 2.0 tools in ESP context, parallel findings were reported. To illustrate, Balula, Martins, and Marques (2014) investigated the educational benefits of a concept-mapping tool, called IHMC Cmap. It was used for the purpose of teaching reading and speaking in a Business English course. According to the results of the study, in addition to the vocabulary acquisition of Business English, the linguistic competence of the Portuguese learners were enhanced. Additionally, their collaboration and communication skills were also developed.

Limitations of Web 2.0

Even though Web 2.0 may offer numerous benefits for its users, still there are some limitations regarding the utilization of these technologies. As Reynard (2009) and Hulburt (2008) claim, new technologies could serve as an aid for teaching and learning provided that they are utilized effectually with appropriate methods and clear objectives. Therefore, it can be argued that if the teacher overuses a Web 2.0 tool, students most definitely would feel 'oversaturated' with the usage of that tool.

Another problematic issue lies in the assumption that all the learners take the use of Web 2.0 technologies for granted. Although today's learners are widely considered 'technologically savvy' because of the fact that they incorporate technology into their daily lives and use technology as a mean to communicate with people, Oblinger (2008) warn that "not all students have computers, not all are skilled users, and not all want to use technology" (p. 18). Therefore, it should be born in mind that teachers who want to use Web 2.0 technologies in teaching and who want their students to benefit from these technologies in learning need to be prepared so that they could provide scaffolding to the learners.

The findings of the study conducted by An, Aworuwa, Ballard, and Williams (2009) in relation to the drawbacks of the use of Web 2.0 tools for instructors and learners at tertiary level were in line with what Oblinger (2008) argued in that a majority of the instructors reported that most of the students regarded Web 2.0 technologies as still being new to them and that some of the students were rather uncomfortable with the open nature of Web 2.0 technologies.

Within this regard, the questions of privacy and legal issues emerge naturally. As stated by Anderson (2007), in spite of the assumption that the open nature of Web 2.0 technologies gives opportunities to more open ways of working, content creation and sharing, this might violate privacy and intellectual property rights of the users. Anderson also continues that as long as a user cannot move his or her data back at his or her will without having to face the service provider claiming of intellectual property, encoding the data in propriety format or withholding any part of the data generated by the user the nature of the Web 2.0 cannot be considered open and safe at the same time. Therefore, online identity and privacy could be one of the problematic areas in regard to the limitations of these technologies.

The study by An et al. (2009) also provided other findings regarding the drawbacks of the use of Web 2.0 tools that are technical issues the students faced during the use of the technologies and the need of the students for guidance on how to use these tools. Therefore, the practitioners should be aware that even though Web 2.0 tools are easy to use, it still takes time to get familiar with them for the users.

Another challenge is highlighted by Valerio and Valenzuela (2013) in that Web 2.0 implementation should appeal to the interests of learners so that students may maintain engagement in learning. In addition, as asserted by Luo (2013), among the major issues concerning ICT and Web 2.0 technologies based learning there are such problems as poor technological infrastructure, high expense of educational technologies and lack of initiative to implement these facilities due to institutional barriers.

Although Web 2.0 technologies offer numerous opportunities and benefits for learners and teachers alike, it should not be regarded as a 'miracle solution' in teaching and learning. As highlighted by Warschauer and Grimes (2007), assuming Web 2.0 technologies as the "magical bullet" (p. XX) for all the educational problems could be misleading in that because these tools have not only positive but also negative effects, the careful exploitation of these technologies should be sought for in accordance with the needs of learners, the capacity of teachers, and social contexts.

Therefore, it is safe to suggest that practitioners should focus on how to make their students learn 'with' the technology, not 'from' the technology. Therefore, as Reynard (2009) posits, if a practitioner implements an ill designed activity or assessment lacking an observable connection to the overall purpose of the course, the

outcomes could yield to student frustration, decrease in student interest thus leading to little or no learning.

Web Enhanced Language Learning

As an extension of Integrated CALL, although it is attributed to different labels such as ‘blended’, ‘hybrid’, ‘technology-mediated instruction’, ‘web enhanced instruction’ and ‘web enhanced language learning’, there is a consensus among scholars (Bañados, 2006; Claypole, 2010; Oliver & Trigwell; 2005; Sharma, 2010) that this term encompasses face to face teaching, several pedagogic approaches and methodologies and classroom instruction in online or classroom setting while making use of benefits and opportunities that technology offers at the same time. Therefore, Web Enhanced Language Learning (WELL) can be regarded as the utilization of such web items as materials, applications, resources and tools in language teaching and learning. WELL allows teachers and student for language practices that can be done both in a synchronous and asynchronous way.

Technology Acceptance Model

Although CALL and therefore Web 2.0 technologies arouse interest for researchers, it is seen that the practice of research on this area seem to lack of a base for theorizing. This lacking is also highlighted by Hubbard (2016) who argues that in sharp contrast to second language acquisition in general, no theory has been dedicated to CALL. He also states that it seems hazy to ascertain whether a comprehensive one will ever emerge in the light of the current studies. In this regard, Lee, Kozar, and Larsen (2003) argue that CALL theory consists of “a set drawn from a number of sources including second language acquisition theories, general learning theories, linguistic theories, and human-computer interaction theories” (p. 752).

Among these sources for setting the theoretical frameworks of studies on the perceptions and attitudes of the users of technologies, one of them that has taken the attention of the Foreign Language (FL) researchers and practitioners is Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) which has been employed in a number of studies (Arshad et al., 2012; Aşıksoy, 2018; Çakır & Solak, 2014; Selevičiene & Burkšatiene, 2015; Tarhini, Hassouna, Abbasi, & Orozco, 2015). Also, it is considered the most widely employed and most prominent theory with the purpose of the description of the individual user acceptance of information systems and technologies (Lee et al., 2003).

As Fishbein and Ajzen assert (1975), TAM bases its roots on the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) and it was Davis who for the first time developed TAM with the purpose of conducting research in the field of social psychology in 1989. According to Davis (1989) who aspired to "pursue better measurements for predicting and explaining use" (p. 320), TAM puts *perceived usefulness* and *perceived ease of use* at the core which are regarded as the direct determining constructs of user acceptance of technologies. As put by Davis (1989), *perceived usefulness* is "the degree in which a person believes that using a particular system would enhance his/her job performance" and *perceived ease of use* accounts for "the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort" (p. 320). Within this regard, it could be understood that it is possible for users to accept a system when it is considered easier to use than another one and when it is perceived as highly useful (Emre, 2019). Although the original version of TAM rises on two main constructs that are stated above, a modified version of TAM was proposed by Arshad et al. (2012). In addition to the ones in the original version, their version also embodies four more core constructs: *awareness, attitudes towards use,*

behavioural intention and *actual system use*. The modified version of TAM offered by Arshad et al. (2012) will be applied with a slight adaptation and operational definitions for the theoretical framework of this research study.

TAM in the (E)FL Setting

As can be inferred from the literature, TAM has attracted research attention in terms of not only predicting but also explaining the use of Web 2.0 technologies in the setting of FL or EFL teaching and learning. To illustrate, in their descriptive survey study, Arshad et al. (2012) investigated tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of Web 2.0 tools for their English language learning within the framework of TAM. They also looked into the preferred Web 2.0 tools by the learners to be used in their daily and educational life. Within this regard, they distributed a 5 point Likert-scale survey to 103 senior year students from such departments as Malay language, English language, foreign language and communication. The participants were mostly female and were mostly between 23 and 24 year old.

According to the results, Facebook, a social networking Web 2.0 tool, was the most popular tool used by the participants in their daily lives. It was followed by Youtube and then Friendster, once an active social networking platform. The least popular tool was LiveMocha, an online language learning application. Furthermore, all the average mean scores of the participants were reported to be more than 3, meaning that the participants possessed mostly positive opinions for each construct of TAM. The highest mean scores belonged to the perceived usefulness construct in that the vast majority of the participants agreed that Web 2.0 tools could be helpful in English learning. The second highest mean scores were attributed to the construct of perceived ease of use in that most of the participants did not find Web 2.0

technologies difficult to use for English learning. Next, the learners reported a strong inclination to agree to have positive attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools reporting that using Web 2.0 tools is a good strategy in learning English and is more advantageous than not using them. Then, pertaining to the construct of behavioural intention, it was reported that the participants tend to agree that they would like to add a Web 2.0 tool as an alternative medium to learn English in the future.

However, with regard to the constructs of awareness and actual system usage, these two constructs received the lowest mean scores out of all the constructs. To start with, as suggested by the results, although the participants reported that they actively used Web 2.0 tools for such purposes as social networking, picture uploading or e-mail checking, their use of Web 2.0 tools were not mainly for educational purposes. As for the awareness construct, it was found that the participants were not knowledgeable of opportunities of the use of Web 2.0 tools could offer them for learning English, though they were aware of the existence of Web 2.0 technologies. Lastly, the results demonstrated that perceptions on the perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use affected the perceptions of the actual system usage of Web 2.0 tools.

Furthermore, in their quantitative survey study, Selevičiene and Burkšatiene (2015) investigated the attitudes and habits of ESP students towards Web 2.0 tools and their impact on the acceptance of these technologies for ESP. The participants consisted of 65 male and 36 female students from four different faculties of a university in Lithuania and they were all freshmen students. The results of their study demonstrated that the ability of students to use Web 2.0 tools was the only factor which had significant and positive relationship with the constructs of TAM such as students' attitude, intention to use, actual system usage and awareness of Web 2.0

tools. Also, it was found that the respondents' gender and the average of hours spent online daily and their study program had no significant correlation with the constructs of TAM that are awareness, perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, attitude, behavioural intention, and actual system usage. Furthermore, it was revealed that the majority of the participants preferred traditional teacher centered ESP classes to online interaction between the instructor and students.

As another study, Çakır and Solak (2014) explored the attitude of Turkish EFL learners regarding the use of Web 2.0 technologies, e-learning, and also aimed to find out the effects of the tools in relation to academic achievement within the framework of TAM. It was found out from the study that whilst academic achievement was affected negatively because of the anxiety towards e- learning; perceived ease of use, attitude, self-efficacy and satisfaction affected academic achievement in a positive way. It was also indicated from the study that Turkish EFL learners' attitude towards Web 2.0 technologies were positive. As another indication, the learners found to be ready to decide whether to adopt or refute the technology.

Another study was conducted by Aşıksoy (2018) who investigated the perceptions and attitudes of English Language Teaching (ELT) students regarding the use of Web 2.0 tools resorting to the constructs of TAM developed by Arshad et al. (2012). The results indicated that learners were aware of the presence of Web 2.0 tools for learning English. In addition, according to the results of the study, learners' attitudes towards the use of these tools were positive. Furthermore, it was found from the study that most of the learners thought that Web 2.0 technologies were useful for language learning.

Furthermore, Tarhini et al. (2015) investigated the factors that influence the maintenance of Really Simple Syndication (RSS) feeds on Blackboard, a language

management system (LMS) through the use of TAM. According to the results of the study, perceived ease of use did not serve as a significant indicator for perceived usefulness and attitudes. On the other hand, it was found that perceived usefulness was directly and positively effective on the attitudes of learners and their behavioural intention with regard to the use of RSS feeds on Blackboard. In addition, the results revealed that the attitudes of learners were directly effective on the intention to use RSS.

Web 2.0 in the EFL Setting

It would not be wrong to accept Web 2.0 tools as the 'neighbor next door' because they constitute an indispensable part of daily life (Greenhow, Robelia, Hughes, 2009; Hsu & Park, 2011; McBride, 2009; Richardson, 2010). In spite of the fact that most of Web 2.0 tools are not designated specifically for educational purposes, many of these tools actually can be used in the field of education, for they offer a number of features that could serve as educational value (Ferdig, 2007). Consequently, a vast amount of research that explored the use of Web 2.0 tools in language classroom has been conducted as indicated by the literature. To illustrate, according to the classification made by Lee and McLoughin (2011), among the Web 2.0 tools which were used mostly in the field of education were blogs, wikis, social networking tools such as Facebook and Myspace; multimedia archives such as podcasts, Youtube, e-portfolios; synchronous communication tools such as Skype, and 3D worlds such as Second Life.

Furthermore, Wang and Vasquez (2012) investigated the literature on the current research trends that focused specifically on Web 2.0 and the second language (L2). They selected and studied 43 empirical works that were published between 2005 and 2009, also including the first quarter of 2010. They searched 7 different

databases as data collection tool. They found that Web 2.0 technologies are helpful in creating a learning atmosphere that is comfortable, relaxed, collaboration oriented and community based. Another finding from their study indicates that Web 2.0 tools help foster a favourable language learning environment for the learners. The study also revealed that Web 2.0 tool integration into classroom teaching reinforces the confidence of the learners in writing, led to an increase in writing skills of the learners and facilitated the strategies the learners apply for writing. Furthermore, another interesting result pertaining to the types of widely investigated Web 2.0 tools concludes that blogs (35%) and wikis (23%) compromised more than half of the studies with regard to Web 2.0 tools and their effects on language learning. Those two tools were followed by podcasts (12%) and 3D worlds (12%), social media tools (9%) and other Web 2.0 tools technologies (9%) such as Google Docs, Chatbox, Multiple Technologies.

In line with the findings of this research, the literature review conducted by Liu et al. (2012) posed concurring data. They examined the literature between 2007 and 2009 with respect to Web 2.0 integration into L2 classrooms. The findings indicate that the top 5 investigated Web 2.0 tools were listed as follow:

1. Blogs (30.5 %)
2. Wikis (23.6 %)
3. Podcasts (18 %)
4. Social Network (18 %)
5. Virtual Reality (9.7 %)

As another concurring study, Luo (2013) conducted a literature review of 43 empirical studies that were published between 2008-2012 in three refereed journals that are CALL, LLT, and the CALICO Journal through three educational databases

that are ERIC, ERC, and Education Full-Text. Luo's literature review investigated the research studies that focused on the implementation of Web 2.0 technologies into language learning so as to identify specific Web 2.0 tools that have been integrated in the arena of education. According to the results, wikis and blogs stood as the top two most commonly investigated Web 2.0 tools, making up almost 55 % of the reviewed studies in total. These top two Web 2.0 tools were followed by social networking tools, microblogging (e.g. Twitter), podcasts/videocasts, discussion forums, Youtube, Googledocs, and social tagging in seriatim.

Another literature review study was conducted by Yadav and Patwardhan (2016) in order to find out the studies on Web 2.0 tools and how they were used in tertiary level. The results demonstrated that dominant tools that were widely studied are again social networking tools, blogs and wikis. Another striking outcome revealed that theoretical or feasibility studies are more in number than real-time studies. Therefore, it is clear that real-time research should be conducted on the integration of Web 2.0 tools into tertiary level of education. The study also found that the level of the use of Web 2.0 tools in developing countries is quite low. The common implication of these abovementioned five studies is the need for investigation of less examined Web 2.0 tools such as content creation and publishing, infographics, language management systems, interactive/game based learning platforms, social bookmarking and tagging.

Web 2.0 and the Changing Roles of Students

Just as the shift from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 liberated the nature and the usage of World Wide Web in terms of openness and flexibility so the roles of students evolved accordingly. In addition to their roles of being 'learners', they are also 'active participators' and 'explorers' of their language learning journey. Erstad

(2008) posits that Web 2.0 offer opportunities for content creation and publishing and these opportunities could be of aid in students having creative practices. As a result, traditional relationship between the students and the teacher and the concept of traditional schoolbook are challenged in terms of information and content supplement for learning. This is thanks to the self-directed nature of Web 2.0 enhanced language learning in that it unlocks opportunities for students to create their own learning experience. In relation to this, as Web 2.0 technologies possess immense resource and present the Internet in a stimulating way, a richer and more appealing learning atmosphere can be offered to students.

Through Web 2.0 tools, the users and learners as well are invited to get more involved in the practice of data creation and manipulation, thus, making it possible for anyone to be able to contribute and share ideas and construct content and publish. Therefore, learners now have a lot more opportunities to be active, autonomous and creative with the help of Web 2.0 technologies in their learning process. Also, Web 2.0 can give them the liberty to opt for collaboration as well as solo practice. As Consalvo (2005) highlights individuals and groups make up the essential members of the Internet activity. The Internet exists for and by these users of the Internet. The term ‘user’ also points out that because humans are active agents in the Internet activities, the term ‘use’ is exempted from decontextualization, passivity or anonymity. Therefore, it would be safe to suggest that the use of Web 2.0 tools have positive effects on the learning of the students in that they are encouraged to have a say in their learning process as participants, creators and explorers in their language learning quest.

Regarding the changing roles of today’s learners, it can also be said that the epithets that are attributed to them have also been changed. It would not be

surprising that today's learners have several epithets such as "NetGen" (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005, p. 13), "Millenial Generation" (Greenhow, Walker, & Kim, 2010, p. 63), "Neomillenials" (Baird & Fisher, 2006, p. 5) and "Digital Natives" (Prensky, 2001, p. 2). One reason for these epithets may derive from the fact that the generation born after 1990s has been encompassed by digital media in every aspect of their lives (Baird & Fisher, 2006). Also, as stated by West and West (2009), because the 21st century learners have been exposed to Web 2.0 technologies to a great extent in their lives, they have also employed these tools in their everyday life activities.

The popular notion is that there is a need for a radical change in the area of education since 'old-school' institutions fail to provide what these new 'tech-savvy' learners need. One speculated reason could be the assumption that the way these learners behave, think or learn is said to differ from their precedents resulting from the constant and permeating exposure to technology (Baird & Fisher, 2006; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Prensky, 2001). For this reason, there is the argument brought forward by Prensky (2001) claiming that there is a clash between the older generations, labelled as "Digital Immigrants" (Prensky, p. 2) and today's learners labelled as "Digital Natives" (Prensky, 2001, p. 2) in that the former party strife to teach using an 'analogue' language while the latter party employs a 'digital' language.

However, this proposition has attracted critical stance and has been subjected to a sceptical lens from the researchers who have questioned that whether the young are really digitally native (Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008; Bennett & Maton, 2010; Selwyn, 2008). To start with, it was asserted by Selwyn (2008) that today's learners are not more homogenous than their predecessors. Therefore, it would be wise to say

that not only ‘why’ but also ‘how’ the young generation uses technology cannot be confined into a homogenous, unidimensional enclosure because of the following reasons:

Learners might fail to be as skilful in technology as often considered, especially when it comes to advanced tasks (Kennedy et al., 2009; Maton & Bennett, 2010; Salaway & Caruso, 2007; Singh, Mallan, & Giardina, 2008). To illustrate, the study by Jones and Ramanau (2009) found that the types of social networking done by tertiary level students turned out to be not formal and not linked to formal learning. Therefore, although there may be several learners who are deft with using technology both in their everyday and academic pursuits, not all learners from the young generation can be attributed to such etiquette of “Digital Natives” (Prensky, 2001, p. 2).

Furthermore, Bennett and Maton (2010) stated that young people use technology variously and the reasons for their use of technology are shaped according to their interests, needs and motivation. Therefore, the notion of “Digital Natives” (Prensky, 2001, p. 2) and their so called extension to encapsulate all the young generation and prescribed assumption that they demand technology in their educational pursuits and that they adeptly use technology cannot be simplified. It is, on the contrary, a complex phenomenon that is directly related to how young people experience technology.

Learners’ Perceptions on and Attitudes towards the Use of Web 2.0 Tools in Classroom

Considering the huge impact of technology in every aspect of our lives, it would not be incorrect to suggest that the integration of technology, the implementation of Web 2.0 tools in particular have also made its presence felt in

educational sphere as well. Considering the epithets attributed to today's learners, although open to debate, it can be suggested that practitioners should make an effort to implement and make use of Web 2.0 technologies in the classroom forasmuch as Web 2.0 is already employed by the learners in informal settings with the aim of both academic and non-academic pursuits (Biçen & Çavuş, 2010; Brandl, 2012; Cullimore, 1999; Greenhow et al., 2010; Kessler, 2007; Selevičiene & Burkšatiene, 2015). Therefore, the implementation of the use of Web 2.0 tools in the formal educational settings could help the learning environment turn into a more relevant setting for the outside of the classroom, thus real life as a result of answering the needs of the learners to 'be in touch with technology' as well.

However, prior to the implementation of Web technologies into practice in the classroom, the perceptions of the learners should be born in mind first since students' initial notions on the learning environment through technologies influence learning outcome as highlighted by Howland and Moore (2002). Accordingly, as Aşıksoy (2018) posits, in order to implement Web 2.0 technologies into teaching practice optimally, students' perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of Web 2.0 technologies should be taken into consideration.

In this regard, Aşıksoy (2018) investigated ELT students' perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of Web 2.0 tools in Turkish tertiary level in her study. The results indicated that the majority of the students found Web 2.0 tools useful, entertaining and helpful for their learning. With regard to the attitudes of the students towards the use of Web 2.0 tools in terms of such factors as usefulness, entertainment, effectiveness for language learning, it can be understood from her study that the majority of the students agreed with the positive effects of the tools for their language learning. As for the perceptions of the students on the usefulness of

Web 2.0 technologies for language skills (listening skill being the most developed one, as perceived by the participants) and pronunciation, it is demonstrated that the majority of the participants held highly positive opinions for the use of Web 2.0 for their language learning.

Similarly, Çakır and Solak (2014) investigated the attitudes of Turkish EFL learners towards the use of Web 2.0 technologies in classroom with regard to the effect of these tools on learning. The findings demonstrated that the participants held positive views and that the perceived ease of use, perceived ease of usefulness, attitude, self-efficacy and satisfaction of the students influenced their academic achievement in a positive way whilst the anxiety of the learners towards e-learning yielded negative impact on it, though.

In addition, in his study, Eren (2015) investigated the feasibility of Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Facebook, wikis, blogs, and Microsoft Word) for vocabulary skills and explored the attitudes of tertiary level students at an English preparatory school in Turkey. From his experimental and qualitative designed study it was found out that almost the participants from both control and experimental groups had positive attitudes towards Web 2.0. Also, both groups had vocabulary gains through the use of Web 2.0 tools. It was reported that social networking sites were regarded as useful tool to facilitate vocabulary learning. Thanks to using visual, textual, and audible materials on the Web helped the participants focus on the target words easily, as suggested by the results of the study.

As another illustration, İnce (2015) explored the perceptions of EFL learners regarding educational podcasting for the development of listening skills and also investigated the relationship between the perceptions of the learners on podcasting and their attitudes towards English learning. The results indicated that the

participants, in general, had positive opinions on podcasts as a Web 2.0 tool. Also, the majority of the participants revealed that podcasts were not only effective for language learning, but were enjoyable as well, in addition to being not difficult to use. Finally, the study found a positive and moderate relationship between the perceptions of the participants on podcasting and their attitudes towards English learning.

Furthermore, Son (2007) investigated the perceptions, attitudes and engagement of English as a Second Language (ESL) students in Web based Language Learning (WBLL) using Web 2.0 technologies in his study. The results showed that Web 2.0 was useful and helpful for practicing language skills and language learning. Also, the participants showed positive engagement and attitude towards the Web activities in relation to their usefulness of autonomy, error correction, receiving feedback. In addition, regarding the usefulness of Web 2.0 as a learning tool, almost all the participants had highly positive opinions.

Considering the abovementioned empirical studies that investigated the most popular and widely used Web 2.0 tools such as social networking sites, wikis, podcasts and blogs, the focus will now shift to the three specific Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet and Canva) that are much less investigated compared to the tools given above within the framework of this research study.

Edmodo as a Web 2.0 Tool

Background and Definition of Edmodo

The scope of the definitions attributed to Edmodo by some researchers is quite wide. Therefore, Edmodo can be defined as a ‘learning platform’ (Hakim & Kodriyah, 2015; Hammonds, Matherson, Wilson, & Wright, 2013); as an ‘educational social networking site’ (Anbe, 2013), as a ‘court management system’

(Meerts, 2003) or as a ‘learning management system’ (LMS) (Charoenwet & Christensen, 2016; Emiroğlu, 2019; Ali, 2015). In this research study, it is opted to refer to Edmodo as LMS considering what Ellis (2009) and Remes (as cited in Alshalawi, 2013) provided in alignment with the features of LMS that are parallel with those of Edmodo. This choice is also in parallel with the definition suggested by Meerts (2003) in that considering the features and functions of Edmodo which are explained in detail in the following parts, Edmodo can also be defined as a service which “provides the instructor with a set of tools and a framework that allow the relatively easy creation of online course content and the subsequently management of that course including various interactions with students taking the course” (p. 5).

Although the wording may vary, all these definitions concur with one another in that the participatory and interactive nature of Edmodo makes it a powerful Web 2.0 tool with regard to reflecting its social-participatory media in the educational settings (Ursavaş & Reisoğlu, 2017). Edmodo came into life in 2008 in the hands of Jeff O’Hara and Nick Borg who realized that there was the need of an educational environment which should be friendly and secure and which should allow teachers and students (even parents!) to engage in a holistic learning process both actively and socially (Kongchan, 2013).

Features and Functions of Edmodo

Although Edmodo can be resembled to Facebook in such terms of the structure and interface design and its interactive and communicative nature, it differs from such social networking sites due to Edmodo’s integrating such assessment tools as quizzes, assignments, polls and grade-books thus adding an educational and pedagogical layer into the use of this tool by teachers and learners. It is also highlighted by Cauley (as cited in Monalisa & Ardi, 2013) that Edmodo combines

the features of social networks such as Facebook with regard to their offering interaction, communication and collaboration and moulds them into educational prospects with the aim of facilitation of teaching and learning. Edmodo is a free application that allows teachers to create and manage online classrooms in which students and their teachers can work together and communicate.

Edmodo also allows teachers to send text alerts or messages, to attach a file or a link. Similarly, teachers can answer messages from their students. In addition, they can send out or receive quizzes or assignments along with giving feedback. Another function of the tool is that it allows teachers to assign polls, to create and maintain class calendar. As another function, through Edmodo, teachers can contact the students as a whole class, groups or even individuals. From the students' perspective, in turn, they are enabled to send text messages and attach files or links to them. They can also store and share content. In addition, they can submit homework, assignments or quizzes, thus, receive and reply to the feedback or messages posted by their teachers. With the help of Edmodo, students can vote on polls along with setting their own calendars as well (Al-Kathiri, 2015).

Edmodo also allows students to communicate and interact with their peers and teachers. Consequently, it can be suggested that Edmodo stands as a powerful example of the 'read and write Web' because of the potentials it offers in terms of participation, content creation and sharing, collaboration and communication opportunities for the users of this Web 2.0 tool.

Advantages of Edmodo for Users

In their study, Hakim and Kodriyah (2015) list a number of benefits and advantages of Edmodo for users in teaching and learning. First, it is stated that the online and communicative atmosphere of Edmodo could assist learners with

practicing their language skills and developing their linguistic competence (Robertson, 2008). Second, Edmodo provides communication and collaboration for both teachers and students in that while students can practice their collaboration and communication skills in groups determined by the teacher, the teacher himself/herself could reach out to other learners and practitioners worldwide and get connected. Paralel to this study, the results from the study of Al-Ruheili and Al-Saidi (2015) indicate that through Edmodo students can access the course materials independent of time and place. In addition, through sending a private message, students can connect with the teacher anytime and anywhere, thus enhance their learning process.

Edmodo is free and is not bombarded with ads, which makes it easy to navigate through. Furthermore, Edmodo is easy to use with its simple and not overloaded interface and components and it provides such aid tools as Quick Guide, Frequently Asked Questions embedded in the application for users who experience trouble using it. Another leverage with Edmodo lies within its easy access. Users (students, teachers, administrators, parents) can access Edmodo from anywhere and anytime because of availability of Edmodo through such different platforms as computers, tablets or smart phones.

Another distinguishing feature of Edmodo from other content sharing & publishing, and social networking tools is that it is education specific and particularly student friendly in addition to being user friendly. Furthermore, Edmodo is a private and secure learning network since it provides privacy both to teachers and students in that only the teacher of the classroom can create and manage Edmodo accounts and communities. Only the students who receive a group code that is sent by the teacher are allowed to enrol in the group, which, in turn, blocks intruders from reaching the

group. As reinforcement, Edmodo allows parents of the students to create their own accounts so that they could track their children's assignment and deadlines or they can get updates regarding class or school events.

Limitations of Edmodo

While Edmodo offers various benefits for the participants of the educational setting, it has some drawbacks as well. For instance, as Zaidieh (2012) points out, Edmodo may affect the students' health negatively because they may have to sit and look at the screen for a long period of time. As another limitation, unlike in face to face interaction, the interaction in the virtual world lacks physical clues such as tone, inflection or body language which are important aspects of communication.

In addition, Stroud (2010) lists some other problems regarding the use of Edmodo among which are the students with low-income which could inhibit their encounters and practice of using the tool because of the lack of access to computers or mobile devices. Similarly, these students may not have access to high-speed internet connection which is required for the usage of this tool. Another issue highlighted from the study deals with the possibility that students could use Edmodo for social networking purposes instead of learning purposes.

The study by Ali (2015) revealed other limitations of Edmodo. For instance, some students may not favor Edmodo because it does not allow learners to communicate through individual and private messaging. Also, it was stated in his study that assignment type and content could play an important role in the perceptions of the learners on the use of Edmodo in that if the Web 2.0 tool is used solely for information transfer, note sharing or getting instructions about assignments, students may have negative opinions on Edmodo in terms of its usefulness which was highlighted from the findings of his study. Other findings from

the study illustrate that Edmodo may be time consuming in terms of ending the group discussion and Edmodo may not serve as a replacement of the actual face to face discussion platform because it does not provide a listening and speaking communication for learners. Also, Edmodo may be time consuming in terms of ending the discussion and making it difficult to get the gist of the discussion because of having to read the entire post through each comment by other group members.

Some other challenges faced by the EFL learners while using Edmodo were also stated in the study of Al- Naibi et al. (2018). According to the results of their study, the students found difficult to store large files in their mobile phones. In addition, students had difficulty in trouble shooting technology tasks because of lack of background information. They also had trouble in uploading materials.

Edmodo in the EFL Setting

It is obvious that Edmodo has found place in EFL setting as a tool employed for language learning purposes with its potentials and benefits to offer, as the literature suggests. For instance, Alsmari (2019) investigated the effects of the use of Edmodo on learners' development of paragraph writing skills. In his experimental research, out of eighty female Saudi ELT students of pre-intermediate level, forty were exposed to Edmodo through writing tasks. As revealed from the pre and post writing tests, the results indicated that Edmodo proved highly beneficial in developing the writing skills of the students in paragraph level. As another indication, it was found that Edmodo enhanced the learners' motivation to learn and their knowledge. It was also reported from the results that Edmodo would be a suitable and safe place for shy students in terms of being more active and feeling secure.

Ma'azi and Janfeshan (2018) conducted an experimental study to investigate the effects of the use of Edmodo on Iranian EFL learners' writing skills and to find out their attitudes towards the Web 2.0 tool. Out of 40 learners with intermediate proficiency of English, 20 of them were exposed to Edmodo in their writing tasks. As for their attitudes towards Edmodo, a Likert scale attitude questionnaire was used. According to the attitude questionnaire, it was found that the learners had positive attitudes towards the use of Edmodo for improving their writing skills. Regarding the post-test results of the treatment and control group, the former group had higher scores with statistically significant difference unlike the pre-test scores from which there was no statistically significant difference between the proficiency levels of the both groups.

Furthermore, Al-Naibi et al. (2018) investigated the use of Edmodo for process writing skills and the perceptions and attitudes of students regarding the use of Edmodo. In their action-research, 25 pre-intermediate Arab EFL learners at tertiary level volunteered. Through the pre-test and post-test, it was understood that the learners' writing skills statistically significantly improved after the intervention through the use of Edmodo in terms of paragraph organization, topic sentence accuracy, and sentence structure. Also, the survey results demonstrated that students had positive opinions with regard to the use of Edmodo for learning English. Almost all (90%) showed positive attitude towards the use of Edmodo. The results of the survey also revealed that Edmodo helped passive students to become more active. With the help of Edmodo, the learners learned from their peers. Moreover, they felt more secure and comfortable with Edmodo. They also thought that Edmodo helped with writing, grammar, spelling, and vocabulary.

Ali (2015) investigated the perceptions of twenty-four EFL learners from a technical university in Malaysia regarding the use of Edmodo for language learning and the use of Edmodo as a virtual discussion platform to supplement face to face discussion in physical classroom setting in his descriptive case study. The findings from the focus group interviews revealed that as for the students' perceptions regarding the use of Edmodo in language learning, both negative and positive thoughts emerged. For instance, a vast majority of the participants thought that Edmodo eased learning English for them. In addition, Edmodo was considered a good platform to learn English in terms of getting and sharing information among students and teachers and thus making a good learning platform. However, as for the use of Edmodo for virtual forum for discussion, there were negative thoughts on Edmodo in that Edmodo was viewed as not suitable in terms of providing enough privacy during a discussion because of the open nature of Edmodo allowing all the group members to read the conversation. Furthermore, it was found out from the interviews that some students argued that no technological tool, be it Edmodo or not, could replace the actual face to face, real platform for discussions as the latter provides opportunities for students to listen and communicate with each other, thus giving the sense of satisfaction.

In addition, Al- Ruheili and Al- Saidi (2015) conducted a descriptive, survey study to investigate the perceived usefulness of Edmodo through its mobile application for students in classroom. Fifty Omani students from three different tertiary level EFL classes participated in the study. The results of the questionnaire showed that Edmodo was thought to be useful for the learners' motivation with relation to participation and engagement in language learning activities both in and outside of the classroom. It was also thought to be helpful in terms of encouraging

students to become autonomous in their own learning. Most of the students (N = 40) viewed Edmodo as a useful tool that improves students' learning. A vast majority of students (80%) believed that Edmodo was highly effective for both in and outside of EFL classes. The majority of the students held positive opinion that Edmodo was a powerful tool to motivate them in EFL learning and it engages them to participate because of such features of Edmodo as providing a stress-free learning atmosphere, and online discussion and chatting. In addition, most students thought that Edmodo could fortify the bond between the students and the teacher. It was also revealed from the study that the students did not feel fearful when it came to making mistakes within Edmodo group tasks. Thus, Edmodo could be regarded as a suitable too for shy students to express and share their ideas, which was also highlighted in the study of Alsmari (2019).

Quizlet as a Web 2.0 Tool

Background and Definition of Quizlet

Quizlet owes its emergence to Andrew Sutherland, a high school sophomore back then, who created an online learning platform that was specifically designed for the development of vocabulary of the learners all around the world. It originated in 2005 in Albany, California. Yet, it was not until January 2007 that the tool was made available to public use (Phỉ, Thơ, Thành, Khanh, & Khanh, 2016). There are a few of different definitions attributed to Quizlet by different researchers. For instance, Toy (2019) defines Quizlet as "multi-facet CALL software" (p. 26) and also adds that it could also serve as an online platform for learning/teaching. It is also described as a software program that makes use of interactive flashcards in addition to employing study and game modes for the practice of target vocabulary (Ersoy Özer & Koçoğlu, 2017). Therefore, in the light of these descriptions, Quizlet can also be defined as a

Web 2.0 tool that serves as a game-based online platform for language learning, especially vocabulary, through interactive flashcards, study and game modes offered to the users.

Features and Functions of Quizlet

Quizlet features in various aspects. To start with, through this software program available on both computers and mobile phones, learners are given the opportunity to memorize and recall core concepts of different disciplines such as math, geography, vocabulary or language learning. Also, the software can be resembled to an 'updated' and 'digitalized' version of paper flashcards, yet, with a striking difference. Unlike the traditional paper flashcards, Quizlet allows the users to insert visuals because they can upload images that they themselves found on the Internet or they can choose from the image templates suggested by the tool that are ready to use. As another function that Quizlet offers to its users is that through Quizlet learners are able to hear how the target word is pronounced via clicking on 'Audio on' button. Also, Quizlet could serve as an online classroom as well since it allows teachers to create their classes so that they can assign/manage classroom tasks as well as tracking their students' progress (Toy, 2019). According the mission page of quizlet.com, the aim of the Web 2.0 tool is to support learners in their learning and practising process, which mostly focuses on vocabulary, whenever and wherever they like. Also, it is also stated in the mission page of the website that Quizlet provides activities that are engaging and also customizable for their users, be it teachers or learners, with contributions all around the world (Quizlet, 2019).

Quizlet has six modes in its itinerary in terms of different ways that it offers learners for study. Four of them are designated in the form of study sets which are the modes of *flashcards*, *learn*, *speller*, and *test*. In addition, there are also two

additional modes in the form of interactive games which are called *scatter*, and space *race*.

Considering the functions of these modes that Quizlet offers, through *flashcards*, learners can choose to flip or flow the interactive card to see the definition and/or the related image of the target word. Also, with the option for 'audio on/off', they can also hear the pronunciation of the target word. Second, through *learn* mode, learners' knowledge pertaining to the target vocabulary is measured. In this mode, there are word sets that act as prompts in the test that necessitates students to type a term of a definition as the answer. Learners are provided with the chance to see the questions they have missed by Quizlet marking the answers as correct or incorrect. In addition, learners can practice the spelling and pronunciation of the target words through making use of *speller* mode which requires learners to type what they hear. If the word is misspelled, Quizlet corrects it and asks the student to type it again while *test* mode contains such items as matching, true/false and multiple questions that are randomly generated by the tool.

Regarding the game modes, in the first one, *scatter*, learners must match the definitions with terms that are recorded in their 'study sets'. The faster they match, thus finish, the higher points they earn. In the second game called *space race,* while they are scrolling across the screen, students must type terms (or definitions). All of the vocabulary, terms and definitions, derive from the study sets that students created before. If the student misses the question, Quizlet helps the student to type the answer again.

Advantages of Quizlet for Users

There are a number of benefits that Quizlet offers to its users. To start with, because it is available both on tablets or PCs and mobile phones Quizlet is easy to

access and thus provides flexibility to students to use the tool whenever and wherever they would like to (Wright, 2016). As another advantage that Wright (2016) also mentions in his study, since Quizlet enables learners to interact with the target vocabulary in quite a few different ways users are given the opportunity to be exposed to different aspects of word knowledge as highlighted by Nation (2013) who proposes that not only receptive knowledge such as recognizing the word in its written and/or pronounced form but also productive knowledge which includes spelling the word or conveying its meaning are involved when it comes to knowing a word.

Furthermore, through Quizlet, drilling and repetition activities for vocabulary learning can be turned into a much fun way because of the interactive nature and the game based features of the Web 2.0 tool thus allowing to alleviate the possibility or the problem of student boredom (Anjaniputra & Salsaliba, 2018). Quizlet also allows for a collaborative learning atmosphere in that Quizlet enables all of its users to create their sets of flash cards that can be seen and used by other users as well. Considering the sets of flashcards, through Quizlet, it is possible to re-arrange the flashcards so that serial learning and/or memorization of the order can be abstained from (Barr, 2016). Similarly, learners can also contribute to the sets that are created by their teachers.

By the feature offered in the form of a game and called *Quizlet Live*, teamwork skills can also be incorporated into learning/teaching process in that students are divided into teams randomly by the game and they need to match the definitions with the correct term. The first team that answer all the questions correctly wins the game. The game nurtures the competitive spirit of students while makes them focus also on the accuracy of their answers (Stauffer, 2019).

Last, Quizlet also makes it possible to promote learner autonomy since it enables students to check their own progress and see on which part of the sets of vocabulary they seem to have trouble directly (Barr, 2016; Kálecký, 2016).

Limitations of Quizlet for Users

Although Quizlet offers numerous benefits and advantages for its users, the Web 2.0 tool also comes with some drawbacks. To illustrate, even though Quizlet offers a cost-free enrollment, it is limited only to the basic version which does not permit users (teachers) to track their students' progress. If the teacher wants to track their progress, s/he needs to upgrade his/her version and pay a yearly subscription (Envisioncu, 2016).

Another limitation lies in the technical aspects in that because this Web 2.0 tool requires technology to be used optimally problems with the internet connection, phone memory or low battery may arise (Kálecký, 2016). In addition, as Quizlet allows its users to create and share their own sets of vocabulary, if the user prepares a set of flashcards with spelling mistakes or wrong information on them, other users may come across with incorrect information from those sets of flashcards and thus learn incorrect information (Stauffer, 2019). Last, because Quizlet does not accept the answers of the students with minor mistakes such as pronunciation or articles missing, it may yield frustration among students (Köse et al., 2016).

Quizlet in the EFL Setting

Although Quizlet has several potentials and benefits to be exploited in the EFL setting, not much research attention has been given to the Web 2.0 tool by researchers (Toy, 2019). Still, there are a few of empirical studies concentrating on the use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool for EFL. To illustrate, in their experimental and mixed-method study, Köse et al. (2016) investigated the effects of the use of Quizlet

on the development of vocabulary of EFL students and their perceptions on the use of the Web 2.0 tool in addition to its advantages and disadvantages. The participants were 46 students in total. 23 of them were of elementary level students whilst the other half was of pre-intermediate level at a foundation university in İstanbul, Turkey. Through semi-structured interviews, the findings pertaining to the perceptions of the participants revealed that the learners from both groups said their motivation increased during self-study on Quizlet in the lesson hours. Also, Quizlet was generally regarded as a tool that was helpful with their vocabulary learning in terms of word definitions, synonyms, parts of speech and pronunciation.

Another study that was conducted by Chien (2015) focused on the analysis and comparison among 3 Web 2.0 tools designed as online vocabulary flashcards with the aim of finding out their effectiveness on lexical knowledge. For this reason, the researcher, in his case study research, aimed at exploring perceptions and attitudes of 64 Taiwanese tertiary level freshmen EFL learners on the use of Web 2.0 tools that are Quizlet, Study Stack, and Flashcard Exchange pertaining to vocabulary learning and word knowledge acquisition. The findings from the interviews suggest that out of the 3 Web 2.0 tools, it was Quizlet that was favored by the participants most because it was found user friendly, helpful in reviewing spelling and meanings along with pronunciation. Also, the participants reported that through the Web 2.0 tools, their motivation for vocabulary learning enhanced, their vocabulary abilities improved and vocabulary knowledge was reinforced.

Anjaniputra and Salsabila (2018) carried out a classroom action research study to explore the responses of 30 senior year students who studied Complex Vocabulary Subject at tertiary level in Indonesia with regard to the use of Quizlet for vocabulary learning. The opinions of the participants were elicited through

interviews and according to the findings of the interviews, the students regarded Quizlet as a tool that was useful to make their learning enjoyable, to help them become autonomous, persistent and engaged learners in their learning process. They also stated that thanks to a variety of features that the Web 2.0 tool offers, they had a fun experience as a differentiated learning practice. Furthermore, the students reported that through the use of Quizlet, they became more active. In addition, the field notes from the researchers demonstrated that the learners were motivated to stay persistent through the feeling of competition offered by the features of Quizlet, thus changing the short attention span of the students into a more persistent one.

In their descriptive survey study, Phỉ et al. (2016) investigated the perceptions of 210 students whose proficiency was at least at pre-intermediate level and who studied Business English in their sophomore and junior years at a university in Vietnam regarding the use of Quizlet for Business English vocabulary learning. The data for the opinions of the participants were also triangulated through interviews whilst the major instrument was a survey with 12 questions to gather information such categories as layout, tasks, and usefulness of Quizlet. According to the results, most of the participants (76%) found the interface of the Web 2.0 tool very user friendly and user friendly pertaining to the layout section. Regarding the results for the tasks section, a great number of participants (75%) found the ‘test’ feature of Quizlet very interesting and interesting while the vocabulary game feature called ‘race’ was found to be the most interesting activity that is followed by other features such as ‘speller’, ‘learn’, ‘flashcards’, and another vocabulary game feature called ‘scatter’ by the participants in seriatim. The questions with regard to the usefulness of Quizlet, and to the motivation of the students for the use of Quizlet, the majority of the participants (81%) considered Quizlet as very useful and useful meanwhile

more than half of the participants (75%) stated that through the use of Quizlet, they became very motivated and motivated in vocabulary learning.

Furthermore, Binh Minh (2018) focused on the effects of Quizlet on ESP learners' vocabulary acquisition also investigating the perceptions of 62 sophomore ESP learners at the faculty of law at a university in Vietnam with regard to the use of Quizlet. According to the results of the survey administered to gather the opinions of the participants regarding the use of the Web 2.0 tool, the participants agreed that Quizlet served as a fun and motivating tool for learning law English. Also, they thought that Quizlet was not difficult to use for their language learning. The learners also had positive opinions that Quizlet was helpful to learn vocabulary on law English more quickly. Furthermore, they concurred that through Quizlet, the learners became more autonomous in their learning process. Overall, the mean scores for the items of the perception survey ranged from 3.93 to 4.43 making the average mean scores for all the items greater than 3 out of the 5 point Likert scale survey employed for the study.

Another study conducted by Dizon (2016) concentrates on the use of Quizlet and its effects on academic vocabulary acquisition in tertiary level along with investigating the perceptions of 9 sophomore year participants studying at the faculty of foreign studies at a university in Japan with regard to the use of Quizlet for L2 vocabulary learning putting the two core constructs (perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use) of Davis' (1993) TAM. The results from the 5 point Likert scale survey indicates that in terms of those two core constructs, the participants had positive opinions in that they believed their English vocabulary improved via using Quizlet. Also, they thought that it was faster for them to learn English vocabulary with the use of Quizlet.

It was also found that the participants viewed Quizlet as useful for their vocabulary learning.

Canva as a Web 2.0 Tool

Background and Definitions of Canva

The hi(story) of the emergence of Canva goes back to 2013 and to Sydney, Australia. It actually belongs to business industry and was founded as company by Melanie Perkins with the purpose of providing a tool for production of marketing materials to businesses (Devine, 2019). However, the Web 2.0 tool also makes a valuable online platform as an educational material since it allows its users to create such content as blog graphics, Facebook headers, posters or flyers (Neltner, 2015). Therefore, Canva can be regarded as an online graphic design tool in the form of infographic that provides an informative representation, chart or poster on a specific topic through visuals (Fowler, 2015).

Features and Functions of Canva

Canva offers hundreds of elements such as photos, graphics, texts, shapes that are free of charge for its users to create and share their graphic-designs. Its drag-and-drop format allows for an easy and flexible experiment for its users during their creation process. Canva acts not only as a door opening to the wider realm outside of the classroom but also as a compilation of authentic materials created by other users which can be accessed with ease (Yundayani et al., 2019). Canva also enables its users to share their work by allowing them to download their creation in PDF or JPEG format. Therefore, Canva stands as a good choice for content creation and sharing tool in the form of infographics because of its easy to use interface and drag-and-drop image editor, also allowing for text insertation. Within this regard, the tool can appeal not only to technologically competent users (be it teachers or students)

but also to the ones who do not address themselves as technologically-savvy (Yundayani et al., 2019).

Advantages of Canva for Users

As highlighted by Manowong (2017), infographics can be regarded among promising learning tools and they can be implemented into teaching and learning settings with the purpose of fostering learning experiences of students because of numerous advantages and benefits they offer. Being one of the online infographics, Canva also offers benefits for its users.

To start with, Canva allows its users to create infographics through a simplistic and easy use so that the users are enabled to experience a new phase of visual learning (Wahyuni & Thohiriyah, 2018; Wertz & Saine, 2014). Furthermore, Canva makes it possible for its users (be it teachers or students) to mold their ideas into the form of visuals through infographics (Briggs, 2014) and thus assigning teachers and students the role of "design thinkers" (Wahyuni & Thohiriyah, 2018, p. 280) in their quests of teaching and learning since designing a content in the form of infographics requires creativity from the users. Within this respect, the users are given the opportunity to customize and personalize their works in accordance with their purposes through Canva. Furthermore, several design templates are available in the form of posters and infographics with numerous layout templates for the users to choose from and they are free of charge (Wahyuni & Thohiriyah, 2018).

As another advantage, through Canva, the monotony of the use of text books can be broken in that the text can be turned into a more visualized content focusing on the core concepts unlike a text book in which learners otherwise have to read through a long text to understand the concept and that could be repetitive and boring for learners as well teachers (Wahyuni & Thohiriyah, 2018). Also, as asserted by

Smaldino, Lowther, Mims, and Russel (2015), through making use of visual technologies, among which Canva is also included, learning could be promoted since Canva can be of service for such purposes as transforming abstract ideas into concrete, boosting the motivation of learners, reinforcing the knowledge through repetition, recalling prior knowledge, reducing the effort for learning.

In addition, through the use of infographics, thus Canva, reading comprehension and writing skills could be supported while critical thinking and synthesizing skills could also be enhanced (Davis & Quinn, 2013). Similarly, as learners create and interpret their designs through infographics such as Canva, their capability of analysis and interpretation could be developed as well (Krauss, 2012). Last, because Canva allows for a user-friendly experience and does not necessitate professional design skills for its users, it offers motivation for learning while developing their computer literacy skills (Wertz & Saine, 2014).

Limitations of Canva for Users

With all the benefits offered, Canva possesses some limitations to keep in mind as well. Internet connection problems, instability of network systems and users' unfamiliarity with the Web 2.0 tool are among these drawbacks revealed from the study conducted by Manowong (2017). Moreover, because Canva does not provide feedback pertaining to the language use of students and/or correct their mistakes such as wrong word choice, misspelling or grammar mistakes, it could be regarded one of the hindrances of this Web 2.0 technology according to the study done by Yundayani et al. (2019). Last, although Canva is available with free of charge version, it is only with the premium plan of Canva that users are allowed to have unlimited storage for photos, upload their own images, create their animations or gifs, resize their work to any other format (Canva Pro, n.d).

Canva in the EFL Setting

Despite the pedagogical benefits and potentials that Canva could offer, it has rarely been investigated in the arena of EFL research (Yundayani et al., 2019). To the best knowledge of the researcher, there are merely 3 studies that specifically concentrate on Canva in EFL setting. The study by Wahyuni and Thohiriyah (2018), rather than incorporating Canva into teaching practice, provides a valuable review of Canva as an online tool in the form of infographics highlighting the features, functions, and benefits of the Web 2.0 both for ELT practitioners and EFL learners through the commentaries of their students on the tool. According to the commentaries of the students, as an infographic tool, Canva is easy to use, can arouse interest and motivation in learning English, makes it easy to reach the concept knowledge through vivid visualization. It is also noted in their study that Canva could serve as a useful teaching material for teachers as well since it could act as a novel and less tiring substitution of the text books in which learners have to read much longer texts to understand the concept.

With regard to empirical studies, there are only 2 studies that incorporate the use of Canva as a WELL practice in the EFL classroom. One of them is a study conducted by Yundayani et al. (2019) which investigates whether there is a statistically significant difference between the use and non-use of Canva regarding the writing performances of students. Another aim of the study is to find out the perceptions of students regarding the implementation of Canva in teaching writing and the advantages & disadvantages of the use of the Web 2.0 tool. For the investigation of the statistically significant difference between the use and non-use of Canva for writing performance, the researchers opts for an experimental, explanatory mixed-method design while for gathering the perceptions of students they

interviewed students. The participants were 44 tertiary level students in Indonesia and their English competency level was mid-intermediate. The participants were randomly assigned to two intact groups (half the students in the experiment group and the other half in the control group). As pre-test, a writing task that required the students to write a 200 word paragraph in 30 minutes was administered to both groups.

Then, the treatment was given to the experimental group. It started with an orientation session in which Canva was introduced to the students with the aim of providing aid to their performance of writing activities. During the treatment, the participants were asked to use the Web 2.0 tool in their writing process along with the topic selection, the composition of the writing task and publishing it. The control group had no treatment and their learning process followed the conventional instruction in that the writing topic was given to the students by the teacher and they were asked to write directly without making use of any Web 2.0 tools or other ICT media.

After the treatment, both control and treatment groups took the same writing task as the post-test. The data regarding the scores from the pre-test and post-test were analyzed through descriptive statistics and the use of ANCOVA. The results reported a statistically significant difference on the writing performances of the students between the two groups, meaning that the participants who made use of Canva had higher writing performance and skills compared to the ones in the control group.

Regarding the findings from the interviews with 4 students from the treatment group in relation to their perceptions on the use of Canva and its advantages & disadvantages for writing skills, all of the students reported that Canva is a satisfying

and fruitful tool for their writing experience and accordingly, none of the interviewees believed that Canva was unsuitable for learning writing. From the findings of the interviews, the perceived benefits of using Canva are as follow:

- Canva was helpful for developing ideas through providing students with a number of images and colors.
- The use of Canva was beneficial in raising the interest and motivation of the participants.
- Through Canva, the learners could enhance their confidence in writing English because Canva served very helpful in writing as it eased writing process through the images that the Web 2.0 tool provided for the exploration of ideas.
- Canva gave the participants the opportunity to become creative in their writing and helped them to reinforce their ideas of writing through providing images.
- Through the option of online sharing and publishing available, readers could get interested in the work of the students.

However, the interviews also revealed findings highlighting some limitations of the use of Canva for writing skills. To start with, the lack of given feedback and/or error correction for grammatical or parts of speech mistakes made by students was the most highlighted disadvantage. Another drawback of Canva was about its being unable to provide interactive writing atmosphere. The participants reported that they felt confused regarding how to use Canva for collaborative writing.

The other study was conducted by Manowong (2017) focusing on the implementation of 3 different Web 2.0 tools (Padlet, Googledocs, and Canva) for EFL learners' reading skills. In his action research, he investigated EFL learners'

English reading and learning experiences through the use of these 3 tools in a face-to-face EFL setting. Another aim was also to find out the perceptions of students on the advantages and disadvantages of using these 3 tools for reading skills. The participants were 27 tertiary level ESP students studying English for Science and Technology in Thailand. The participants were assigned 4 infographic tasks for an 8 week period. The assignments were designated to engage the learners in close reading so that they could comprehend the texts in English as well as with the aim of practicing such reading strategies as taking notes and summarizing. Another aim was to engage the participants in developing digital literacy skills through the use of the 3 Web 2.0 tools. Along with the 3 tools, Google search engine was used as the class portal to retrieve sources. The tasks required students to be involved in close reading activity. As for the content of the readings, they were about innovations and environmental issues. Canva was used by the students as a tool for note taking, organizing their notes and presenting them in the shape of infographics. It was also used to present the facts they learned through reading in the forms of infographics. The infographics were created via Canva with the aim of increasing the reading comprehension of the participants in English and their motivation to read English texts. A 5 point Likert scale survey, an open ended survey, the students' and the teacher' reflective journals and observations were used for the data collection.

Results from the quantitative data indicates that the majority of the participants thought that infographic assignments contributed to their learning process. To illustrate, the participants were encouraged through the activities in terms of reading comprehension and the assignments helped them understand the written texts a lot more easily. Furthermore, it was found that the participants concurred that they became knowledgeable about the lexical and grammatical

structures. In addition, participants had either positive or very positive opinions that their motivation and creativity increased through the use of the three Web 2.0 tools, which thus includes Canva as well.

Through the analysis of the reflections of the participants, it was revealed that infographics made their reading process easier and interesting. Also, it was mentioned by the participants that infographic creations and presentations made the texts more attractive, beautiful, interesting and easy to read through the photos, images, diagrams, and graphics. Moreover, the reflections from the students also showed that the use of Web 2.0 tools for infographic assignments served helpful in terms of encouraging them to read the texts in a more appealing way. They were also helpful for them to ease their comprehension. Also, the tools were useful in creating a better learning experience in that they allowed the learners to practice their creativity through enabling them to generate their own infographics via the use of Canva. Furthermore, the journal of the teacher also reflected positive findings regarding the perceptions of the students. To illustrate, the students did not have much difficulty while making their own infographics through a drag-and-drop image editor in spite of the fact that it was their first time using Canva.

Pertaining to the advantages and disadvantages of the use of Canva, it was found that a majority of the participants stated that the learning process became more fun and interesting with Canva. Moreover, through the use of Canva, they were able to present what they learned from the reading texts in a more appealing and creative manner. It was also stated that Canva was regarded as a user-friendly tool. However, the issues such as the Internet connection problems, the lack of vocabulary knowledge of the students, and students' unfamiliarity with the Web 2.0 tool arouse as the hindrances regarding the use of Canva.

Conclusion

In this chapter, it was touched upon the important concepts such as CALL, the emergence of Internet, the shift from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 and its influence on EFL learners and settings, TAM, WELL and Web 2.0 tools in EFL. Also, the features of three specific Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) and their place in EFL setting were also provided in relation to studies in the literature. In the next chapter, the methodology of the study is given.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This non-experimental quantitative study focuses on the investigation of the perceptions of tertiary level English preparatory school EFL learners regarding the perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, awareness, and actual system usage and their attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva). In this study, it is examined whether there are any statistically significant differences among different levels of EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of the Web 2.0 tools within TAM. In addition, it is looked into whether EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of Web 2.0 tools in this study. For this purpose, the study addresses the following research questions:

For this purpose, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
    a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?
    b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
    c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

2. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?
3. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of theWeb 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?

c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

4. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools?

b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?

c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

5. What are A, B, and C level EFL perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools?

   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?
6. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?
7. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?

This chapter comprises of six sections: research design, setting, participants and sampling, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures. The first section provides a detailed explanation for the design of the research study. In the second section, the information relevant to the setting of the study is given. The third section gives information regarding the participants of the study. In the fourth section, instruments for data collection are illustrated. In the fifth section, data collection procedures are presented. The final section reveals data analysis procedures.

Research Design

This study is conceptualized as a quantitative approach using a non-experimental, cross-sectional survey design. It is also a descriptive study. As Gall, Gall and Borg (2007) posit, descriptive research concentrates not on the question of

"how" or "why", but on the question of "what". Therefore, the study is in alignment with this position in that the aim of this study is to present "what" EFL learners' perceptions on the use of Web 2.0 tools for their language learning are. Within this regard, this study aims at describing EFL learners' perceptions as they are without applying any intervention.

Next, this research study is non-experimental since the researcher does not attempt to control the variables as Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh and Sorensen (2006) highlight: "the researcher identifies variables and look for relationships among them but does not manipulate the variables" (p.29). Third, this study can be regarded as a survey design study because an adapted online survey was employed so as to obtain data for the study. As highlighted by Muijs (2004), surveys stand as a suitable tool in quantitative studies with the aim of gathering opinions and feelings with regard to a specific situation or an issue. Using surveys also stands as an appropriate tool as to describe a past situation or a present one as the way it exists (Balcı, 2004). Also, information was collected from a group of people with the aim of describing such characteristics as opinions (Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Gall et al., 2007). This study is also cross-sectional because the data were obtained at one point in time but from learners who had different levels of English competency and the sample was drawn from a predetermined population (Fraenkel et al., 2012; Gall et al., 2007)

Setting

This study was administered at a School of Foreign Languages of a state university in Turkey. The school has four language preparatory programs; Russian, German, French and English languages. In the English language preparatory program, English for General Purposes (EGP) is taught. The duration of English

preparatory school program is one academic year. The medium of instruction of the courses in undergraduate programs may vary from being entirely in English, partially in English (30%) or entirely Turkish depending on the undergraduate programs.

Within this regard, some students are required to attend the English preparatory school mandatorily. There are also students who wish to attend the preparatory school on voluntary basis. Yet, the procedure is the same for both cases: The students are required to sit the placement exam held at the beginning of the academic year. If the student gets 59 and below out of 100 points, s/he is placed into the relevant level at the preparatory program in accordance with the score s/he gets. If the student gets 60 (correspondent of B2 in Common European Framework of References-CEFR) or higher score out of 100, s/he then can take the proficiency exam. If s/he can get 60 or higher from the proficiency exam, s/he may pass to his/her own department and start his/her degree program. However, if s/he gets 59 and lower points, s/he is put into the appropriate level in the preparatory program in accordance with his/her exam score. Then, the student follows a sequential go-up through the levels within the academic term. Learners progress through each level in the program which means that once the spring term of the academic year is over, a student who started the fall term in D level can complete his/her education in the school of foreign languages in A level.

The competency levels of students are defined through the Global Scale of English (GSE), an academic scale that enriches the CEFR, in the preparatory program. The proficiency levels stand as A (intermediate), B (pre-intermediate), C (elementary) and D (beginner) levels in seriatim. Consequently, the students are placed in four different levels; beginner, elementary, pre-intermediate, and

intermediate at the preparatory school, depending on the scores they get at the placement and proficiency exams at the beginning of the academic year.

In the English preparatory school, each class in each level has three instructors and one of these instructors is also responsible for conducting the language laboratory hours. For the fall term of the 2019-2020 academic year, there were 12 classes in A level, 22 classes in B level and 19 classes in C level with each class consisting of roughly 20 students. In addition to conventional classroom teaching hours (24 hours for D level and 22 hours for C, B, and A levels a week), each class in each level has two hours of language laboratory classes done face to face every week. In these language laboratory classes, students are required to prepare e-portfolios which involve doing certain language tasks that could be individual or group work via using several Web 2.0 technologies. These tasks are determined and prepared by the instructors in the technology unit. These tasks are scheduled and specified in the curriculum and placed in the weekly syllabi of language laboratory classes that are available for the reach of the students as well (See the Appendix A for 2019-2020 language laboratory classes syllabi for A, B, and C levels at English preparatory school). To illustrate, A level students were required to do online discussion on particular topics using Edmodo; to practice the strategies for learning new vocabulary using Quizlet; to prepare posters (both as group and individual work) and make comparisons about particular topics using Canva. B level students were required to do online discussion and write their own comments and give response to others' comments on particular topics through using Edmodo; to prepare a vocabulary file using Quizlet; to prepare posters and make comparisons on a particular topic using Canva. Regarding C level students, they were required to write comments and give response to others' comments on a particular topic using

Edmodo; to prepare a vocabulary set using Quizlet; to prepare and present posters on particular topics using Canva. Therefore, taking into account of the language tasks that are described above and that are to be done by A, B, and C level students using these three specific tools, it can be stated that the reasons for the selection of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva as the Web 2.0 tools to be investigated in the current research study would be appropriate with regard to what literature suggests. According to literature, while such activities as information access and communication through the Internet and mobile technologies are more common among a majority of technology users, content creation activities in terms of creating texts, graphics, audios or videos are undertaken less frequently by young technology users (Kennedy et al., 2009; Maton & Bennett, 2010; Salaway & Caruso, 2007). For this reason, the use of these three specific tools, with the features and functions they offer, could provide the opportunities for the students to write on the Internet, which in turn would allow them to participate in content creation activities in a formal language education setting.

The instructors are present in these language laboratory classes and they are ready to provide support with any problems in terms of instructional issues.

Sampling/Participants

Convenience & criterion sampling was employed in the participant selection process. As stated by Mackey and Gass (2005), it is a sampling method that can be commonly seen in second language research. The reason for the researcher to opt for convenience & criterion sampling for this research study is because the participants who met the criteria for the research questions were available for the researcher to reach out. In addition, as can be remembered from the statement of the problem and significance of the study sections in this research study, one of the aims of this study

was to explore the perceptions and attitudes of tertiary level EFL learners' regarding the use of Web 2.0 tools in the English preparatory school in which the researcher also works as a lecturer of EFL. The participants were A, B, and C level students at the English preparatory program in 2019-2020 Fall Term. The reason for the exclusion of D level students from sampling is because of the fact that they did not have the Web 2.0 tool Canva in their language laboratory class syllabus, thus, they would have not matched with the students from the other three levels in terms of making use of the same Web 2.0 tools.

The minimum total sample size required was 102 (Soper, n.d). The online survey reached out a total of 106 participants who were EFL students from A, B, and C levels from the school of foreign languages. Out of 106 participants, 90 of them completed the survey revealing an acceptable response rate of 84.90 % (Dillman, 2007; Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010; Fraenkel, et al., 2012). Table 2 below provides further demographic information about the participants of the study.

Table 2

Information on the Participants of the Study

Demographic Information	*N*=90	
Gender	Frequency	Valid Percent
Female	44	48.9
Male	41	45.6
Other	3	3.3
Missing	1	1.1
Age		
17-23	88	97.8
31 or more	1	1.1

Table 2 (cont'd)

Information on the participants of the Study

Demographic Information	*N*=90	
Age		
Missing	1	1.1
The level of English in the school of foreign languages		
A	15	16.7
B	43	47.8
C	31	34.4
Missing	1	1.1
The year in the school of foreign languages		
First year	69	76.7
Second year (repeat)	20	22.2
Missing	1	1.1
Years of experience of learning English		
1-5	23	25.6
6-10	56	62.2
11-15	9	10.0
16 or more	1	1.1
Missing	1	1.1
Nationality		
Turkish	87	96.7
Congolese	1	1.1
Bashkiri	1	1.1
Missing	1	1.1

Instrumentation

In order to collect the data, an online survey that was created by Qualtrics, a survey creation software/website, was employed. The survey (See Appendix B) consisted of two main sections. The first section of the survey focused on the participants' perceptions regarding perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, awareness, actual system usage, and their attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools within the framework of TAM. Within this regard, this section was adapted from Selevičienė and Burkšaitienė (2015). Because their survey in their research study and also their study were open access, there was no need for initiation of personal correspondence with those researchers with regard to the access to and permission for the usage of their survey. Nevertheless, their work was cited properly in accordance with academic ethics at all times. The survey items of Selevičienė and Burkšaitienė (2015) derive from TAM that was modified by Arshad et al. (2012). The Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the items in their study are as follow:

Table 3

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients of Each Construct of TAM of the Survey from the Study by Selevičienė and Burkšaitienė (2015)

Construct	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient
Awareness	.85
Perceived Usefulness	.85
Perceived Ease of Use	.87
Attitude towards Use	.88
Behavioral Intention	.77
Actual System Usage	.75

This current research study adopted the five constructs that are *perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, attitude towards use, awareness and actual system usage.* The reason for the exclusion of the construct *behavioural intention* from the current study is because the focus of this study is not on the personal intention of using Web 2.0 tools for language learning outside the classroom but on the use of Web 2.0 tools for language learning as a requirement in the curriculum for the learners. Therefore, that construct would not serve for the purpose of the study. The operational definitions of these five constructs in this current study are given as follow:

- *Perceived ease of use:* It stands for the extent to which learners believe that using a specific Web 2.0 tool would be effortless.
- *Perceived usefulness:* It represents the extent to which learners believe that employing a Web 2.0 tool in particular would reinforce their EFL learning.
- *Attitude towards use:* It is related to the degree to which a particular Web 2.0 tool is favored by learners for their EFL learning.
- *Awareness:* It is defined as the degree to which learners are knowledgeable of utilizing Web 2.0 tools to help them for their EFL learning.
- *Actual system usage:* It is described in relation to the recurrence of the usage of specific Web 2.0 tools by learners in EFL context (Selevičienė & Burkšaitienė, 2015).

Concordantly, the first section of the survey consists of 25 questions with sub-items all of which were on a 5-point Likert scale stretching from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The second section of the survey focused on gathering demographic data from the participants regarding their gender, age, level of English at the School of Foreign Languages, their duration of study at the School

of Foreign Languages (i.e. whether it is their first year or second year), their years of experience of learning English, and their nationality.

Piloting the Survey

As Muijs (2004) indicates, in quantitative studies, in order to diminish the occurrences of problems regarding wordings of the items of the survey it is imperativ**e** to conduct piloting since it "can reveal subtle flaws in the design or implementation of the study that may not be readily apparent from the research itself" (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 43). Consequently, the stage of piloting testing was launched having received official permissions from the Ethics Committee of İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University on November 21st, 2019 and later from the administration of the School of Foreign Languages in which the research study was conducted on December 9th, 2019. The survey was distributed on December 23, 2019 to 22 participants from C level randomly at the School of Foreign Languages so as to receive their feedback on the items. In addition, they were asked to rate their opinions in relation to the statements in the survey. However, as one student did not complete the whole survey, that student was removed during the process of data cleaning. In total, the pilot study was conducted with 21 students. The reason for the selection of participants from C level for piloting is that because their English competency is lower than other two levels (A and B) it would help the researcher to find out such problematic issues that could arise from the complexity and the difficulty level of the items.

Via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v.24), reliability analysis was done with the purpose of measuring internal consistency from which Cronbach Alpha Coefficients are expected to be over .70 so as to claim that the test is internally consistent (Muijs, 2004, p. 73). With regard to corrected item-total

correlation value (CITCV), it should not be negative or smaller than .30 (Cristobal, Flavian, & Guinaliu, 2007; Field, 2005; Everitt & Skrondal, 2010).

As for the items related to the *awareness* construct, it can be seen from Table 4 that they are internally consistent and reliable.

Table 4

Internal Consistency and Reliability Analyses of the Items Pertaining to the Construct of *Awareness*

Awareness	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTICV (>. 30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	.76	✓
Edmodo (Q3/1-2-3)	.78	✓
Quizlet (Q4/1-2-3)	.81	✓
Canva (Q5/1-2-3)	.76	✓

The internal consistency and reliability analyses of the items regarding the construct of *actual system usage* can be seen in Table 5. According to the table, only the items with regard to Edmodo were found questionable with the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient being .61. However, the reason for this low Cronbach Alpha Coefficient could stem from the fact that there were only two items on Edmodo; therefore, these items were still maintained by the researcher.

Table 5

Internal Consistency and Reliability Analyses of the Items Pertaining to the Construct of Actual System Usage

Actual System Usage	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTICV (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	.71	✓
Edmodo (Q6/1, Q7/1)	.61	✓
Quizlet (Q6/2, Q7/2)	.80	✓
Canva (Q6/3, Q7/3)	.76	✓

As demonstrated by Table 6, the items germane to *perceived usefulness* construct were found highly reliable and internally consistent regarding Cronbach Alpha Coefficients both as the whole trio of Web 2.0 tools and as individual tools.

Table 6

Internal Consistency and Reliability Analyses of the Items Pertaining to the Construct of Perceived Usefulness

Perceived Usefulness	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTICV (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	.89	✓
Edmodo (Q8/1-2-3-4-5-6)	.93	✓
Quizlet (Q10/1-2-3-4-5-6)	.91	✓
Canva (Q9/1-2-3-4-5-6)	.95	✓

When the construct of *attitude towards use* is considered, all the three Web 2.0 tools and each Web 2.0 tool separately were found highly reliable and internally consistent as Table 7 demonstrates below.

Table 7

Internal Consistency and Reliability Analyses of the Items with Regard to the Construct of Attitude towards Use

Attitudes Towards Use	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTICV (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	.96	✓
Edmodo (Q11, 12, 14, 15)	.97	✓
Quizlet (Q21, 22, 24, 25)	.97	✓
Canva (Q16, 17, 19, 20)	.98	✓

Considering the items related to the construct of *perceived ease of use*, as can be seen from Table 8 below, internal consistency and reliability analyses proved to be acceptable.

Table 8

Internal Consistency and Reliability Analyses of the Items with Regard to the Construct of Perceived Ease of Use

Perceived Ease of Use	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTICV (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	.76	✓
Edmodo (Q13)	.77	✓

Table 8 (cont'd)

Internal Consistency and Reliability Analyses of the Items with Regard to the Construct of Perceived Ease of Use

Perceived Ease of Use	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTICV (> .30)
Quizlet (Q23)	.90	✓
Canva (Q18)	.96	✓

Method of Data Collection

The piloting stage and the actual process of data collection were initiated after the official permission from the administration of the School of Foreign Languages. Having finalized the survey after the piloting, the items of the online survey were refitted correspondingly. The website link for the survey on Qualtrics platform was provided to the instructors that conducted laboratory classes in A, B, and C levels so that they could provide the link for their students through their virtual classes on Edmodo. In this way, their students could do the survey in the last fifteen minutes of the second laboratory class hour on the 16th week of the fall term of 2019-2020 academic year which corresponds to 6-10 January 2020, meaning that the process of data collection was conducted through single sitting/session because the students in A, B, and C levels had their laboratory classes on different days of the week. The reason for selecting this week in particular for administration of data collection was because of the fact that it was only one week before the 16th week that the students in C level made use of Quizlet in their laboratory classes. Another

reason is the fact that in the 17th week final examination for all levels were administered in the School of Foreign Languages.

Through the link in their virtual classes on Edmodo, the students reached the online survey. Before they started answering the survey, a consent form in both Turkish and English (See Appendix C) that included the details of the study was provided. In this consent form, it was also underlined that the information the participants would be providing would remain confidential and that under no circumstances would their identifiable information be used or shared with the third parties. Furthermore, it was guaranteed that their grades would not be affected. Moreover, it was emphasized that the study would cause no psychological or physical harm to the participants.

Security precautions were taken so as to maintain the confidentiality of the data collected. For this reason, the data were kept in a password protected PC and on Qualtrics platform which requires an account and a password to see and download the data. Thus, only the researcher and the supervisor had access to the data.

Method of Data Analysis

Before proceeding with the data analysis, normality of the data needs to be checked because the choice made for the statistical analysis test (i.e., parametric or nonparametric tests) depends on the normality of the data so as to draw reliable results (Pallant, 2011). First, skewness and kurtosis values were checked for each research question data, and z-scores were calculated by dividing skewness to skewness error value as well as dividing kurtosis value to kurtosis error value. Kim (2013) stated, "for medium-sized samples ($50 < n < 300$), reject the null hypothesis at absolute z-value over 3.29, which corresponds with an alpha level 0.05, and conclude the distribution of the sample is non-normal" (p. 53). Since the sample size

was 90, and the z-scores for each research question variables were within the range (i.e., below 3.29), the data were found to be normal. Also, boxplots were checked for outliers, and then the mean value and the 5% trimmed mean value differences were calculated whether there were any outliers observed in the boxplots. According to Pallant (2011), if the 5% trimmed mean value and the general mean values are very different, the data points have to be examined further. However, given this fact, the values were not too different from the remaining distribution. Therefore, all of the statistical tests for answering the research questions were found to be parametric tests.

Furthermore, descriptive and inferential statistics were used in order for the research questions to be answered in the study. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v.24) was used in order to convert the quantitative data that was received from the Qualtrics platform. In addition, inferential statistics were employed via one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). On the other hand, for the last two research questions, single regression analysis was employed so as to predict whether the constructs of awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could predict the perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools.

Conclusion

This chapter sheds light on the information regarding the design of the research, setting, sampling participants, instrumentation for the data collection, the process of data collection and, last, the analysis of the data from the study. The following chapter will explicate the results of the study.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

This study focuses on the investigation of tertiary level English preparatory school EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, awareness, and actual system usage and their attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) within the framework of TAM. In addition, in this study, it is examined if there are any statistically significant differences among the different levels of EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools. In addition, whether the perceptions of EFL learners on the awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools is also looked into in this study. To this end, the following research questions are addressed as follow:

1. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
    a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?
    b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
    c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

2. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?
3. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of theWeb 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?

c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

4. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools?

b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?

c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

5. What are A, B, and C level EFL perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools?

b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

6. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?
7. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?

The data were obtained through an online survey on Qualtrics platform. All of the survey items were adapted from Selevičiene and Burkšatiene (2015) excepting the items pertaining to demographic information that were prepared by the researcher.

The consent form both in Turkish and English was integrated into the survey which embodied five constructs that are *awareness*, *actual system usage*, *perceived usefulness*, *attitude towards use*, and *perceived ease of use*. SPSS v.24 was employed for the data analysis via operating descriptive and inferential statistics tests.

Results of the Study

Item Reliability Analysis of the Study

After cleaning the missing data from the survey, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and Corrected Total-Item Correlation (CTIC) levels for the five

constructs in the survey were analysed for the actual survey and are demonstrated below. In Table 9, the item reliability analysis for the construct awareness for the actual study survey is provided below.

Table 9

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and CTIC Levels for the Construct Awareness for the Survey Used in the Actual Study

Awareness	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTIC (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	0.89	✓
Edmodo (Q3/1-2-3)	0.77	✓
Quizlet (Q4/1-2-3)	0.86	✓
Canva (Q5/1-2-3)	0.85	✓

In Table 10, the item reliability analysis for the construct actual system usage for the actual study survey is provided below.

Table 10

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and CTIC Levels for the Construct Actual System Usage for the Survey Used in the Actual Study

Actual System Usage	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTIC (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	0.80	✓
Edmodo (Q6/1, Q7/1)	0.72	✓
Quizlet (Q6/2, Q7/2)	0.80	✓

Table 10 (cont'd)

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and CTIC Levels for the Construct Actual System Usage for the Survey Used in the Actual Study

Actual System Usage	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTIC (> .30)
Canva (Q6/3, Q7/3)	0.85	✓

In Table 11, the item reliability analysis for the construct perceived usefulness for the actual study survey is provided below.

Table 11

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and CTIC Levels for the Construct Perceived Usefulness for the Survey Used in the Actual Study

Perceived Usefulness	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTIC (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	0.89	✓
Edmodo (Q8/1-2-3-4-5-6)	0.90	✓
Quizlet (Q9/1-2-3-4-5-6)	0.90	✓
Canva (Q10/1-2-3-4-5-6)	0.84	✓

In In Table 12, the item reliability analysis for the construct attitude towards use for the actual study survey is provided below.

Table 12

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and CTIC Levels for the Construct Attitude towards Use for the Survey Used in the Actual Study

Attitude Towards Use	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTIC (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	0.95	✓
Edmodo (Q11, 12, 14, 15)	0.94	✓
Quizlet (Q21, 22, 24, 25)	0.94	✓
Canva (Q16, 17, 19, 20)	0.96	✓

In Table 13, the item reliability analysis for the construct perceived ease of use for the actual study survey is provided below.

Table 13

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and CTIC Levels for the Construct Perceived Ease of Use for the Survey Used in the Actual Study

Perceived Ease of Use	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients	CTIC (> .30)
All the three Web 2.0 tools	0.80	✓
Edmodo (Q13/1-2-3)	0.83	✓
Quizlet (Q23/1-2-3)	0.92	✓
Canva (Q18/1-2-3)	0.92	✓

Following the reliability analysis of the items, composite scores were formed for each construct so as to continue with inferential statistics. Nonetheless,

descriptive statistics were run as well with the aim of a better understanding of the data.

EFL learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Before seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were met (p = .733; see Appendix D). It was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As the results from Table 14 indicate, there was not a statistically significant mean difference between A, B, and C levels ($F_{(2, 83)}$ = 1.564, p = .215) pertaining to the participants' perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva). Then, to find out which levels of learners differed from each other, multiple comparison was conducted. Bonferroni results show that the participants in none of the three levels (M_A = 2.98, SD = 0.66), (M_B = 3.28, SD = 0.*585*) and (M_C = 3.29, SD = 0.608) statistically significantly differed (See Appendix E).

Table 14

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Perceived Usefulness of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1,df2*	*F*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
The Web 2.0 tools	86	1.148	.574	2, 83	1.564	.215	.036	.013	.323

Table 14 (cont'd)

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Perceived Usefulness of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1, df2*	*F*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
Edmodo	88	7.155	3.578	2, 85	5.410	.006	.113	.092	.833
Quizlet	88	.112	.056	2, 85	.106	.899	.002	-.021	.066
Canva	88	1.595	.797	2, 85	.933	.397	.021	-.002	.207

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of Edmodo. Prior to looking for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were met (p = .183; see Appendix F). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. According to the results, there was a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels ($F(2, 85) = 5.41$, p = .006) with regard to the participants' perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo. Then, multiple comparison was looked into so as to find out which levels differed from each other. Bonferroni results indicate that the participants in A level (M_A = 2.82, SD = 0.95) statistically significantly differed from the participants in B level (M_B = 3.42, SD = 0.755) and C level (M_C = 3.67, SD = 0.824). The participants in B level (M_B = 3.42, SD = 0.755) did not differ from the participants in C level (M_C = 3.67, SD = 0.824) (See Appendix G).

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of Quizlet. Before searching for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Quizlet through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were satisfied (p=.118; see Appendix H). It was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As demonstrated by the results, there was not a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels (F(2, 85) =0.106, p = .899) with regard to the participants' perceptions on the usefulness of Quizlet. Then, multiple comparison was employed so as to find out which levels differed from each other. Bonferroni results show that the participants in none of the three levels (M_A=3.54, SD=0.502), (M_B=3.48, SD=0.723) and (M_C=3.44, SD=0.818) statistically significantly differed (See Appendix I).

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of Canva. Before seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were satisfied (p=.858; see Appendix J). It was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As shown by the results, there was not a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels (F(2, 85) =.933, p = .397) regarding the participants' perceptions on the usefulness of Canva. Then, to find out which levels differed from each other, multiple comparison was done. According to Bonferroni results, the participants in none of the three levels (M_A=2.57, SD=0.904), (M_B=2.93, SD=0.869) and (M_C=2.92, SD=1.008) statistically significantly differed. (See Appendix K).

EFL Learners' Attitudes towards the Use of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Before seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were met (p=.855; see Appendix L). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. The results from Table 15 suggest that there was not a statistically significant mean difference between A, B, and C levels (F(2, 84)= 1.194, p = .308) regarding the participants' attitudes towards the use of the Web 2 tools. Based on the information obtained from multiple comparisons through Bonferroni results (see Appendix M), the participants in none of the three levels (M_A = 3.97, SD = 0.718), (M_B = 4.21, SD = 0.626) and (M_C = 4.27, SD = 0.855) statistically significantly differed.

Table 15

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Attitudes towards the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Attitudes towards the Use of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1, df2*	*F*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
The Web 2.0 tools	87	.974	.487	2, 84	1.194	.308	.028	.004	.255
Edmodo	88	1.137	.569	2, 85	1.400	.252	.032	.009	.293
Quizlet	89	.112	.056	2, 86	.126	.882	.003	-.020	.069

Table 15 (cont'd)

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Attitudes towards the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Attitudes towards the Use of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1, df2*	*F*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
Canva	88	1.878	.939	2, 85	1.236	.296	.028	.005	.263

EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of Edmodo. Prior to looking for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the attitudes towards the use of Edmodo) through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p=.660; see Appendix N). After that, it was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. According to the results, there was not a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels (F(2, 85) = 1.40, p = .252) with respect to the participants' attitudes towards the use of Edmodo. Then, multiple comparisons were conducted so as to find out which levels differed from each other. Bonferroni results indicate that the participants in none of the three levels (M_A = 3.45, SD = 0.62), (M_B = 3.70, SD = 0.59), and (M_C = 3.79, SD = 0.708) statistically significantly differed (see Appendix O).

EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of Quizlet. Previous to seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

(homogeneity of variances) criteria were met (p =.148; see Appendix P). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As the results suggest, there was not a statistically significant difference between the levels of A, B, and C (F(2, 86) = 1.26, p = 0.882) regarding the participants' attitudes towards the use of Quizlet. Then, multiple comparison was employed in order to find out which levels differed from each other. Based on Bonferroni results, (see Appendix Q), the participants in none of the three levels (M_A = 3.77, SD = 0.539), (M_B = 3.86, SD = 0.636) and (M_C = 3.81, SD = 0.754) statistically significantly differed.

EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of Canva. Anterior to searching for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Canva through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were met (p = .991; see Appendix R). After that, it was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As illustrated by the results, there was not a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels ($F_{(2, 85)}$ = 1.236, p = .296) in regard to the participants' attitudes towards the use of Canva. Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from each other. According to Bonferroni results, (see Appendix S), the participants in none of the three levels (M_A = 2.98, SD = 0.914), (M_B = 3.27, SD = 0.866) and (M_C = 3.41, SD = 0.859), statistically significantly differed.

EFL learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Ease of Use of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Previous to seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet,

Canva) through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were met (p = .934; See Appendix T). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. According to the results shown in Table 16, there was not a statistically significant difference between the levels of A, B, and C ($F(2, 86) = 2.249$, p = .112) pertaining to the participants' perceived ease of use of all the three Web 2.0 tools. Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from each other. As Bonferroni results indicate, (see Appendix U), the participants in none of the three levels (M_A = 3.29, SD = 0.539), (M_B = 3.58, SD = 0.582) and (M_C = 3.67, SD = 0.549) statistically significantly differed.

Table 16

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Ease of Use of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Perceived Ease of Use of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1, df2*	*F*	p	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
The Web 2.0 tools	89	1.470	.735	2, 86	2.249	.112	.050	.028	.447
Edmodo	89	2.214	1.107	2, 86	1.777	.175	.040	.017	.363
Quizlet	89	.013	.007	2, 86	.012	.988	.000	-.023	.052
Canva	89	4.652	2.236	2, 86	2.434	.094	.054	.032	.478

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo.

Before looking for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the

perceived ease of use of Edmodo through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were satisfied (p = .916, See Appendix V). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. It can be understood from the results that there was not a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels ($F(2, 86) = 1.777$, $p = .175$) with regard to the participants' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo. Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from each other. As Bonferroni results demonstrate, (see Appendix W), the participants in none of the three levels ($M_A = 3.31$, $SD = 0.771$), ($M_B = 3.71$, $SD = 0.809$) and ($M_C = 3.75$, $SD = 0.770$) statistically significantly differed.

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet. Previous to search for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .076, See Appendix X). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects Table. As can be seen from the results, there was not a statistically significant difference between the levels of A, B, and C ($F(2, 86) = .012$, $p = 0.988$) regarding the participants' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet. Then, multiple comparison was employed in order to find out which levels differed from each other. Based on Bonferroni results, (see Appendix Y), the participants in none of the three levels ($M_A = 3.89$, $SD = 0.482$), ($M_B = 3.88$, $SD = 0.724$) and ($M_C = 3.90$, $SD = 0.853$) statistically significantly differed.

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva. Before looking for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean

difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .604; See Appendix Z). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As the results demonstrate, there was not a statistically significant difference between the levels of A, B, and C ($F(2, 86) = 2.434$, p = .094) regarding the participants' perceived ease of use of Canva. Then, multiple comparison was done so as to find out which levels differed from each other. According to Bonferroni results, (see Appendix AA), the participants in none of the three levels ($M_A = 2.67$, $SD = 0.917$) ($M_B = 3.15$, $SD = 1.027$) and ($M_C = 3.34$, $SD = 0.993$) statistically significantly differed.

EFL learners' Perceptions on the Awareness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Previous to searching for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p =.477, See Appendix BB). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As the results demonstrated in Table 17, there was a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels ($F(2, 85) = 10.972$, $p = 0.000$) regarding the participants' perceptions on the awareness of all the three Web 2.0 tools. The participants in C level had the highest mean score ($M_C = 4.16$, $SD = 0.543$) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of ($M_B = 3.67$, $SD = 0.648$). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score ($M_A = 3.23$, $SD = 0.847$). Then, multiple comparison was done so as to

find out which levels differed from each other. Based on the information from Bonferroni results (See Appendix CC), the participants in C level (M_C = 4.16) statistically significantly differed from the participants in B level (M_B = 3.67) and A level (M_A = 3.23). The participants in B level (M_B = 3.67) did not differ from the participants in A level (M_A = 3.23).

Table 17

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Awareness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Awareness of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1, df2*	*F*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
The Web 2.0 tools	88	9.356	4.678	2, 85	10.972	.000	.205	.186	.989
Edmodo	89	6.786	3.393	2, 86	7.880	.001	.155	.135	.947
Quizlet	88	5.749	2.875	2, 85	3.937	.023	.085	.063	.694
Canva	89	17.914	8.957	2, 86	11.167	.000	.206	.188	.990

EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo. Prior to seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .623, See Appendix DD). Then, it was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. According to the results, there was a statistically significant mean difference between the levels of A, B, and C levels (F(2, 86) = 7.880, p = .001) regarding the participants' perceptions

on the awareness of Edmodo. The participants in C level had the highest mean score (M_C = 4.29, *SD* = 0.637) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of (M_B = 3.81, *SD* = 0.587). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score (M_A = 3.56, *SD* = 0.861). Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from one another. As Bonferroni results demonstrate (see Appendix EE), the participants in C level (M_C = 4.29) statistically significantly differed from the participants in B level (M_B = 3.81) and A level (M_A = 3.56). The participants in B level (M_B = 3.81) did not differ from the participants in A level (M_A = 3.56).

EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet. Before looking for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .288, See Appendix FF). Then, it was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As can be understood from the results, there was a statistically significant mean difference between the levels of A, B, and C ($F(2, 85) = 3.937$, p = .023) pertaining to the participants' perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet. The participants in C level had the highest mean score (M_C = 4.09, *SD* = 0.678) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of (M_B = 3.67, *SD* = 0.907). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score (M_A = 3.38, *SD* = 1.207). Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from one another. Based on the information from Bonferroni results (See Appendix GG), the participants in C level (M_C = 4.09) statistically significantly differed from the participants in A level (M_A =

3.38). The participants in B level (M_B = 3. 67) did not differ from the participants in A level (M_A = 3.38) and C level (M_C = 4.09).

EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of Canva. Prior to seeking the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Canva through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .555, See Appendix HH). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects Table. As can be understood from the results, there was a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels ($F_{(2, 86)}$ = 11.167, p = 0.000) respecting the participants' perceptions on the awareness of Canva. The participants in C level had the highest mean score (M_C = 4.08, SD = 0.876) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of (M_B = 3.53, SD = 0.840). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score (M_A = 2.76, SD = 1.080). Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from one another. As indicated from Bonferroni results (See Appendix II), the participants in all levels (M_A = 2.76), (M_B = 3.53), (M_C = 4.08) statistically significantly differed from each other.

EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Actual System Usage of Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Previous to searching for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .137, See Appendix JJ). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. According to the results

demonstrated in Table 18, there was a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels ($F(2, 86) = 9.130$, $p = 0.000$) in relation to the participants' perceptions on the actual system usage of all the three Web 2.0 tools. The participants in C level had the highest mean score ($M_C = 3.79$, $SD = 0.590$) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of ($M_B = 3.45$, $SD = 0.631$). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score ($M_A = 2.91$, $SD = 0.840$). Then, multiple comparison was conducted in order to find out which levels differed from one another. As Bonferroni results indicate (See Appendix KK), the participants in A level ($M_A = 2.91$) statistically significantly differed from the participants in B level ($M_B = 3.45$) and C level ($M_C = 3.79$). The participants in B level ($M_B = 3.45$) did not differ from the participants in C level ($M_C = 3.79$).

Table 18

One-Way ANOVA Results for EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Actual System Usage of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

Actual System Usage of	*N*	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*df1, df2*	*F*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Observed Power
The Web 2.0 tools	89	7.870	3.935	2, 86	9.130	.000	.175	.156	.972
Edmodo	89	8.161	4.081	2, 86	6.594	.002	.133	.113	.902
Quizlet	89	6.705	3.353	2, 86	5.121	.008	.106	.086	.811
Canva	89	11.557	5.779	2, 86	5.555	.005	.114	.094	.843

EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo. Prior to searching for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual

system usage of Edmodo through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .413, see Appendix LL). After that, it was proceeded with Tests of between-Subjects Effects Table. As can be inferred from the results, there was a statistically significant difference between the levels of A, B, and C levels ($F(2, 86) = 6.594$, $p = 0.002$) regarding the participants' perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo. The participants in C level had the highest mean score ($M_C = 3.95$, $SD = 0.699$) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of ($M_B = 3.56$, $SD = 0.796$). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score ($M_A = 3.07$, $SD = 0.923$). Then, multiple comparison was employed so as to find out which levels differed from one another. As Bonferroni results indicate (See Appendix MM), the participants in A level ($M_A = 3.07$) statistically significantly differed from the participants in C level ($M_C = 3.95$). The participants in B level (MB=3. 56) did not differ from the participants in C level ($M_C = 3.95$). Besides, the participants in A level ($M_A = 3.07$) did not differ from the participants in B level ($M_B = 3.56$).

EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet. Before looking for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were fulfilled (p = .653, see Appendix NN). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As can be deduced from the results, there was a statistically significant difference between the levels of A, B, and C ($F(2, 86) = 5.121$, $p = .008$) regarding the participants' perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet. The participants in C level had the highest mean score ($M_C = 3.92$, $SD = 0.765$) followed by the

participants in B level with a mean score of (M_B = 3.88, SD = 0.793). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score (M_A = 3.17, SD = 0.939). Then, multiple comparison was done in order to find out which levels differed from one another. According to Bonferroni results (See Appendix OO), the participants in A level (M_A = 3.17) statistically significantly differed from the participants in B level (M_B = 3.88) and C level (M_C = 3.92). The participants in B level (M_B = 3.88) did not differ from the participants in C level (M_C = 3.92).

EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva. Anterior to searching for the answer for whether there was a statistically significant difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva through one-way ANOVA, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (homogeneity of variances) criteria were complied (p = .890, see Appendix PP). After that, it was continued with Tests of between-Subjects Effects. As can be understood from the results, there was a statistically significant difference between A, B, and C levels (F(2, 86) = 5.555, p = .005) with regard to the participants' perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva. The participants in C level had the highest mean score (M_C = 3.50, SD = 0.983) followed by the participants in B level with a mean score of (M_B = 2.92, SD = 1.040). The participants in A level had the lowest mean score (M_A = 2.50, SD = 1.035). Then, multiple comparison was done in order to find out which levels differed from one another. As Bonferroni results demonstrate (See Appendix QQ), the participants in A level (M_A = 2.50) statistically significantly differed from the participants in C level (M_C = 3.50). The participants in B level (M_B = 2.92) did not differ from the participants in C level (M_C = 3.50) and A level (M_A = 2.50).

Prediction of EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) by EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Awareness of the Web 2.0 Tools

Single regression was run so as to analyze whether EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools could predict their perceptions on the usefulness of Web 2.0 tools. The results indicate that EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (N = 86, M = 3.74, SD = 0.723, r = .475) might slightly predict EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva (F(1,85) = 24.529, p = .000).

Table 19

Simple Regression Analysis pertaining to EFL learners' perceptions on the Awareness of the Web 2.0 tools Prediction on EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools

Construct	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Correlation	*F*	*df1, df2*	*P*	R^2	Adjusted R^2
Perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools	86	3.24	.610	.475	24.529	1, 85	.000	.226	.217

Prediction of EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) by EFL learners' Perceptions on the Actual System Usage of the Web 2.0 Tools

Single regression was conducted so as to analyze whether EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could predict their perceptions on the usefulness of Web 2.0 tools. As indicated by the results in Table

20, EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (N = 87, M = 3.47, SD = 0.718, r = .651) could moderately predict EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva ($F(1,86) = 62.576$, $p = .000$).

Table 20

Simple Regression Analysis regarding EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Actual System Usage Prediction on EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools

Construct	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Correlation	*F*	*df1, df2*	*p*	R^2	Adjusted R^2
Perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools	87	3.23	.607	.651	62.576	1, 86	.000	.424	.417

Conclusion

In this study, tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions on and attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) within the framework of TAM modified by Arshad et al. (2012) were investigated. In this chapter, the results based on quantitative data gathered through an online survey were presented. In the next chapter, the discussion and conclusion of these results, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research will be provided.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter begins with an overview of the study. The sections in this chapter concentrate on the discussion of the results pertaining to tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) within the framework of TAM in light of related literature. Then, the implications for practice and limitations of the research study are discussed. Last, suggestions for further research are provided.

Overview of the study

This non-experimental quantitative study concentrated on the examination of the perceptions of tertiary level English preparatory school EFL learners with regard to the perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, awareness, and actual system usage and their attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva). The study also examined whether there were any statistically significant mean differences among different levels of EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of Web 2.0 tools within TAM. The study also looked into whether EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could predict their perceptions on the usefulness of Web 2.0 tools. For this purpose, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
    a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?

b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?

c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

2. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools?

b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?

c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

3. What are A, B and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?

a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of theWeb 2.0 tools?
b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

4. What are A, B, and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
    a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools?
    b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
    c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?

   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the awareness of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?

5. What are A, B, and C level EFL perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)?
   a. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools?
   b. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo as a Web 2.0 tool?
   c. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet as a Web 2.0 tool?
   d. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva as a Web 2.0 tool?
6. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?
7. Do EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools predict their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools?

In this study, 90 tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva were investigated. TAM framework that was modified by Arshad et al. (2012) was utilized.

In the light of the aforementioned research questions, the discussion of major findings is provided below.

Discussion of Major Findings

Referring to the overall descriptive and inferential statistics results, it may be possible to make assumptions on tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions on and attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva within the framework of TAM. However, to the best knowledge of the researcher, since there appears to be no similar studies that were conducted in terms of investigating the perceptions and attitudes of EFL learners with regard to the use of these specific Web 2.0 technologies that are Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva within TAM framework, only some similarities and differences between the results of this study and others could be pointed out.

EFL learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Use of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

In research question 1, EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e., Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva) were examined. Although it was found that there was not a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools, the results from a total of 86 participants showed that the mean scores of the participants from B and C level were very close and possibly indicated that they were mostly neutral about the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools altogether. The results are at variance with previous studies (Arshad et al., 2012; Aşıksoy, 2018). Regarding the perceptions of the participants from A level, it can be seen that they seemed to have more negative opinions about the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools. These results could be regarded as contradictory to the epithets such as "Digital Natives" (Prensky,

2001, p. 2) that are attributed to today's learners in that these labels might falsely assume that these learners would automatically view the Web technologies as a useful service for their learning quests then, since these learners have born into technology and make use of these technologies in their everyday life quite a lot. However, as suggested by the mean results, there was not a strong inclination for the EFL learners to hold onto positive opinions regarding the usefulness of these Web 2.0 technologies. One possible reason could lie in the learning style and preferences of the learners in that "not all students want to use technology" in their learning journey as asserted by Oblinger (2008, p. 18).

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the use of Edmodo. In question 1b, it was investigated whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 88) in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo. As the results demonstrated, having the lowest mean score, the participants from A level have statistically significantly differed from the other two levels. Whereas B and C level EFL learners possessed moderately positive opinions on the usefulness of Edmodo for their language learning, A level EFL learners were hesitant to provide a more clear-cut opinion and therefore appeared to have neutral opinions. The reason might stem from the fact that the A level students used Edmodo only one time as a curricular activity as can be seen from the A level Language Laboratory Lessons Syllabus (See Appendix) and thus they did not have the opportunity to see and reflect on the possible useful impact of using Edmodo for their language learning. On the other hand, as another reason, because there might be some A level students who failed last spring term and thus once again have repeated the same level, it is highly probable that those repeat A level students were also exposed to the use of Edmodo

in their previous classes repeatedly. Therefore, it might have led to the overuse of Edmodo by those students. Consequently, they might have felt oversaturated as highlighted by Reynard (2009) and Hulburt (2008).

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the use of Quizlet. The research question 1c focused on whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 88) in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Edmodo. Although there was not a statistically significant mean difference among the levels, the descriptive statistics show that EFL learners from all the three levels have appeared to share moderately positive opinions pertaining to the perceived usefulness of Quizlet. This result is moderately in alignment with other studies from the relevant literature (Binh Minh, 2018; Phỉ et al., 2016).

Another interesting result lies in the perceptions of the participants from A level on the usefulness of Quizlet. With regard to the perceived usefulness among the three Web 2.0 tools, it was only for the perceived usefulness of Quizlet that A level students had greater mean scores than the students from the other two levels. It means that the participants from A level were reported to have more positive opinions than the other participants from B and C level. One possible explanation may lie within the fact that because A level students' language competency, their vocabulary knowledge and lexical capacity were higher than the ones in the other two levels, Quizlet may have served more useful for A level students. For instance, when they made use of the features of Quizlet such as preparing sets of interactive flashcards, vocabulary tests, scatter and race modes for vocabulary retention purposes and benefits, their higher lexical competency may have served as a leverage

to experiment with the features and benefits offered by the tool in a more diverse and richer manner.

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the use of Canva. In the research question 1d, it was looked into whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 88) in terms of their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva. Despite the fact that there was not a significant mean difference among the levels, the descriptive statistics suggest that EFL learners from all the three levels have had the tendency to possess neutral opinions. To a certain extent, this result diverged from what previous studies found out. For instance, the perceptions of EFL learners on the perceived usefulness of Canva were generally positive (Manowong, 2017; Yundayani et al., 2019). One possible explanation for this contradiction might be the ill-implementation of the Web 2.0 tool in terms of the content of the assignments to be done via Canva. As Valerio and Valenzuela (2013) posit, the integration of the Web 2.0 tools into learning activities such as tasks or assignments should be carried out as appealing as possible for learners to be engaged in or else the value and the useful potential of the technologies would be injured.

Another possible reason may lie within the EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of the use of Canva, which will be discussed in the following sections. Students' opinions on whether they consider using the tool easy or not might have an influence on their thoughts about the usefulness of the tool as well. This may be because if they found using the tool as time consuming, not practical and difficult to navigate through, the potential usefulness of the tool to be offered to the learners may be damaged. Therefore, it might have left the learners in frustration.

Also, it may have created a lack of interest for students in using the tool for their educational endeavors.

EFL learners' Attitudes towards the Use of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

The research question 2 focused on EFL learners' attitudes towards the Web 2.0 tools, specifically Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva. Even though it was found that there was not a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools, it was seen from the results of a total of 87 participants that the participants from all three levels had quite positive attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools and found these Web 2.0 technologies helpful to interact with their teachers and peers. They also agreed on the collaboration opportunities offered by these Web technologies. Furthermore, the participants also agreed that when compared to traditional classroom learning, the usage of the Web 2.0 tools made their learning more entertaining, diverse, comfortable, and less stressful. They also agreed that the Web 2.0 technologies enabled them to be more creative. Furthermore, the participants thought that the advantages of using Web 2.0 tools for their language learning endeavors were more than the drawbacks of using Web 2.0 tools, thus believing in the importance of using Web 2.0 technologies for their learning. In addition, through the use of the Web 2.0 tools, the participants agreed that they became more active rather than passive learners.

These results are in alignment with the literature in terms of interaction and collaboration potentials offered by the use of Web 2.0 technologies, enabling students to take more active role in their own learning, helping students to unleash their creativity more (Ajjan & Hartshorne, 2008; Erstad, 2008; Grosseck, 2009;

Kutlutürk & Akbayrak, 2010; Wolcott, 2007) as well as making the learning environment less threatening and intimidating (Loveless, 2002).

In addition, to the best knowledge of the researcher, although there is not a similar research study which focused on the perceptions and attitudes of EFL learners regarding to the usage of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva altogether or separately within the framework of TAM, there are other studies whose results are in alignment with this current research study with regard to EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of other Web 2.0 tools within the framework of TAM (Arshad et al., 2012; Aşıksoy, 2018; Çakır & Solak, 2014).

EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of Edmodo. In the research question 2b, it was investigated whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 88) in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Edmodo. Despite the fact that there was not a statistically significant mean difference among the levels, the results suggested that EFL learners from all the three levels had the tendency to possess positive attitudes. The results are moderately in agreement with the results of previous studies (Al-Naibi et al., 2018; Al-Ruheili & Al-Saidi, 2015).

EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of Quizlet. The research question 2c focused on whether there was a statistically significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 89) in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet. Although there was not a significant mean difference among the levels, as suggested by results, EFL learners from all the three levels showed a strong inclination to have positive attitudes. Among these levels, the participants from B level had the most positive attitudes with a higher mean score than the participants from the other two levels. The results are in alignment with previously conducted

studies (Anjaniputra & Salsaliba, 2018; Binh Minh, 2018; Phi et al., 2016) in terms of reporting positive attitudes of EFL learners in terms of helpfulness of the Web 2.0 tool for their language learning, creating an enjoyable and engaging learning atmosphere through serving as a fun tool to experiment with.

EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of Canva. In the research question 2d, it was sought whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 88) in terms of their attitudes towards the use of Quizlet. Whilst there was not a significant mean difference among the levels, the results suggested that the attitudes of EFL learners from all the three levels appeared to be neutral. This result contradicts with the results and findings from previous studies. For instance, EFL learners were reported to have positive attitudes in terms of the use of Canva for enhancing student creativity (Manowong, 2017; Yundayani et. al., 2019), providing useful contribution to their learning and making their learning more enjoyable (Manowong, 2017). One possible reason for this discrepancy might lie within A, B, and C level EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva, which will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

EFL learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Ease of Use of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

The research question 3 concentrated on EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e., Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva). Despite the fact that it there was not a significance mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools, the results from a total of 89 participants showed that the participants from all three levels had the tendency to view the Web 2.0 tools as slightly easy to use in general, which contrasts with the literature within the framework of TAM

(Arshad et al., 2012). This result is interesting considering how today's learners are taken for granted as 'tech-savvy' because they are born into a world in which fast-paced technological developments happen and influence every aspect of life. However, it may not be always the case, as reflected by the aforementioned results, because as Oblinger (2008) warns, not every single learner is a skillful user of Web 2.0 technologies with much experience or practice in his/her background to take with him/her into the classroom setting.

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo. In the research question 3b, it was examined whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 89) in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Edmodo. In spite of the fact that there was not a significant mean difference among the levels, the descriptive statistics suggested that EFL learners from all the three levels had the tendency to be closer to have positive opinions on the ease of use of Edmodo. A similar result was found from a study by Ali (2015). In her study, it was reported that the participants thought that their language learning process was eased through the use of Edmodo, and it was easy to use Edmodo for their language learning.

The reason for the participants of this current study to possess positive opinions on the perceived ease of the use of Edmodo might be thanks to the uncomplicated interface of Edmodo and being free of ads, thus allowing the users to navigate through the tool without being distracted. Also, thanks to such aid tools as Quick Guide or Frequently Asked Questions that the tool provides, the perceptions of the participants might have been positively shaped.

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet. In the research question 3c, it was looked into whether there was a significant mean

difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N = 89) in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Quizlet. Even though there was not a significant mean difference among the levels, the results indicated that EFL learners from all the three levels reported positive opinions with very close mean scores. As the results suggested, among the three Web 2.0 tools, it was Quizlet that seemed to be easier to use for the participants than the other two tools. Similar results were obtained from other studies regarding the perceptions of EFL learners' on the ease of use of Quizlet (Anjaniputra & Salsaliba, 2018; Binh Minh, 2018; Chien, 2015; Phỉ et al., 2016).

EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use of Canva. In the research question 3d, it was delved into whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level EFL learners (N=89) in terms of their perceptions on the perceived ease of the use of Canva. In spite of the fact that there was not a significant mean difference among the levels, it was interesting that the Web 2.0 tool Canva anchored the lowest mean scores for the participants from each level with regard to EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived ease of use.

This result contradicts with previous studies. For instance, in the study conducted by Manowong (2018), it was stated that the participants did not experience much difficulty during creating their infographics although it was their first time using Canva. The reason behind this discrepancy might emerge from the lack of sufficient scaffolding and guidance that should have been provided by their teachers in terms of demonstrations or instructions for the assignments. Therefore, this lack of sufficient teacher support may have resulted in the neutral opinion formation for the EFL learners regarding the perceived ease of the use of Canva. Consequently, their perceptions on the usefulness of Canva and attitudes towards the

use of Canva could have been negatively affected referring to the results and discussions for the research questions 1d and 2d above.

EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Awareness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

The research question 4 concentrated on A, B, and C level students' (N = 88) perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e., Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva). Although there is not a study that focused on investigating the perceptions of EFL learners on the awareness of these three Web 2.0 tools specifically, to the best knowledge of the researcher, still a few of assumptions can be made out of the results from this study.

To start with, the results showed that among the three levels, the participants from C level had the highest mean score and they had positive opinions on their awareness of the existence and the usage of the Web 2.0 tools. Also, they held positive thoughts that they were knowledgeable of the fact that they could learn English by using the Web 2.0 tools while the participants from B level were inclined to slightly agree that they were knowledgeable of the existence and the usage of the Web 2.0 tools and that they somehow agreed on their awareness that through the use of the Web 2.0 tools, they could learn English.

However, the opinions of the participants from A level tended to be neutral about their awareness of the existence and usage of the Web 2.0 tools. They also were neutral about their being knowledgeable that they could learn English by using the Web 2.0 tools. These results are in alignment with previous studies (Arshad et al., 2012).

C level participants' perceptions significantly differed from the other two levels. Considering the mean scores of each of the levels, the reason for this

difference could be because of the fact that since C level students had lower English proficiency when compared to the other two levels, they might have put conscious effort and attention to raise their awareness so as to use these Web 2.0 tools to catch up with the higher level students. Also, they may have thought these Web 2.0 tools as facilitators for their language learning. Therefore, they might have found the use of the Web 2.0 tools as an investment for their journey in English learning.

Also, another possible reason could be attributed to the teachers in C level in that those teachers may have raised their students' awareness by reminding them of the fact that in order to accelerate or facilitate their language learning process, it would be a good idea for the students to make use of the Web 2.0 tools. Consequently, this reminder could have served as an encouraging and motivating push for the students to be knowledgeable of the existence and the usage of the Web 2.0 tools and be aware that it is possible for them to learn English via using these technologies. This possible explanation might be seen as a reflection of what Bennett, Bishop, Dalgarno, Waycott, and Kennedy (2012) emphasize: the importance of the impact of language teachers who undertake efforts to help and encourage their students to realize the value of Web 2.0 technologies for their language learning endeavors.

EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo. The research question 4b focused on whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level participants' (N = 89) perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo. The results revealed that the participants from C level significantly differed from the participants from A and B levels, having the highest mean score. Therefore, it can be deduced that C level students agreed that they were aware of the existence and the

usage of Edmodo. In addition, they reported that they were knowledgeable that via Edmodo they could learn English.

The same possibilities to account for this significant mean difference might be explained in the same manner. The students from C level might be seeing Edmodo as an aid for their EFL learning through the motivation and encouragement provided by their teachers to be aware of the use of Edmodo. Therefore, the more they become knowledgeable of their current language level and how to develop it with the help of their teachers, the more they might become aware that their language proficiency could be boosted through the use of Edmodo.

As for the other two levels, they did not significantly differ from each other. Also, it can be suggested that the participants from both levels seemed to agree on their awareness of the existence and the usage of Edmodo. They also appeared to agree that the usage of Edmodo could assist them in their English learning.

EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet. The research question 4c focused on whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level participants' (N = 89) perceptions on the awareness of Quizlet. The results demonstrated that the participants from C level significantly differed from the participants from A level. One possible reason for this could be the fact that because C level students are aware or made aware by their teachers that their spelling and pronunciation accuracy as well as vocabulary range is rather naturally lower than compared to the other two levels, they may have realized that the usage of Quizlet could be helpful for their abovementioned areas to be improved. It may be thanks to the features of Quizlet that might have played a significant role in this realization. To illustrate, Quizlet provides its users interactive flashcards that include visual, audial and verbal representation of the target vocabulary item; spelling games. It also

allows users to create their own vocabulary sets so that they can test themselves and compete against their classmates. Therefore, through the interaction and experimenting with these offered features, students may have become firstly aware of the usage of Quizlet and then this awareness could have led them to become knowledgeable that they can learn English via using Quizlet.

The participants from B level tended to be between neutral and in agreement with regard to their perceptions on their awareness of Quizlet while the participants from A level tend to have neutral opinions. A possible explanation for these opinions may arise from the fact that because the students from B and A level were most probably exposed to the usage of the Web 2.0 tool in their previous levels either as repeat students or not, the process of the repetitive usage of the Web 2.0 tool might have become automatic. Therefore, it may have caused the students to be unable to keep their awareness fresh.

EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of Canva. In the research question 4d, it was investigated whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level participants' (N = 89) perceptions on the awareness of Canva. The results were rather interesting. According to the results, the participants from all the three levels significantly differed from one another. Having the highest mean score, C level students agreed that they were aware of the existence and the usage of Canva in addition to being knowledgeable that by using Canva they could learn English. It may be again because their awareness was raised by their teachers so that they could recognize and consciously put effort to practice their English. For instance, with the encouragements and reminders from their teachers, the students could practice their language production through forming sentences writing on the infographics on Canva. This way, they may have realized that they could practice

their English via Canva, and thus they could learn English as highlighted from the results of the mean scores among the levels of the participants.

However, the participants from A level reported that they did not agree that they were aware of the existence and the usage of Canva and the fact that they could learn English through the use of Canva. It might be because of the lack of adequate guidance to be provided by their teachers who might be thinking that because these students are supposed to have higher language competency, they might also be expected to direct their own language learning through free experimenting without the direction from a teacher. However, this assumption might lead to fallacy in that if these students did not have any previous experience with the Web 2.0 tool except for the actual laboratory classroom hours, they probably would not be able to be knowledgeable about the existence and usage of such a tool. Therefore, the lack of awareness of the usage of the tool would likely lead them to be unaware of the fact that the Web 2.0 tool could actually be used for their language learning.

EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Actual System Usage of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)

The research question 5 concentrated on A, B, and C level students' (N = 89) perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva. Although there is not a study that focused on investigating the perceptions of EFL learners on the actual system usage of these three Web 2.0 tools specifically, to the best knowledge of the researcher, it is possible to discuss the results and come up with possible explanations with previous studies which made use of TAM.

To start with, as the results indicated, among the three levels, the participants from C level had the highest mean score and they were inclined to agree that they

actively use these three Web 2.0 tools to learn English. This result aligned with their perceptions on the awareness of the usage of the three Web 2.0 tools probably because their teacher could have raised their knowledge on the possibility that they can learn and improve their English through using the Web 2.0 tools. Therefore, with this encouragement and motivation in their minds, the students' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could have been positively influenced in that they may have seen these tools as an investment in their language learning journey. Therefore, they might have believed that they could improve their language competency and thus took active part in actually employing these tools while learning English. In this way, they might have thought that they could close the language competency level gap between them and the students from the other two higher levels.

Another interesting result indicated that the participants from A level possessed neutral opinions which were in agreement with the results from previous studies (Arshad et al., 2012). The participants from A level also significantly differed from the other two levels in terms of their perceptions on the actual system usage of the three tools. There might be two possible scenarios behind the reason.

First, it is possible that A level students, especially if these students repeated the same level in the previous academic term, used to have these three Web 2.0 tools in their former levels. Consequently, the repetitive exposure of the students to the tools may have resulted in reluctance for them to use these tools in their learning endeavors. Second, because their English proficiency level is higher than the other level students, they might have opted for other resources, be it Web technologies or conventional sources, to benefit from.

EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo. The research question 5b focused on whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level participants' (N = 89) perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo. Again, the participants in C level had the highest mean score and they almost agreed that they actively used Edmodo to learn English. We can suggest that the positive perceptions of C level students are in parallel with their perceptions on the awareness of Edmodo. One possible explanation for this parallelism could be the direction and encouragement they received from their teachers because of their lower language competency. It means that they have already been or made aware of the existence of Edmodo and the possibility that they can learn English through using Edmodo. Consequently, they might have started to use Edmodo actively to learn English. As a result, their perceptions on the actual system usage of Edmodo may have been shaped more positively than the participants from A level who reported neutral opinions on their actual system usage of Edmodo.

The results also indicated that the participants from A level significantly differed from the participants from C level. Similarly, the same reasons discussed in the previous section might account for this discrepancy. If A level students, specifically the repeat students, used Edmodo in their previous classes in the school of foreign languages, they could have felt oversaturated and reluctant to further use Edmodo actively. Also, because their competency is higher than the other two level students, they may have felt the urge to look for other resources to make use of for their language learning without having to be directed by their teachers.

EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of Quizlet. In the research question 5c, it was looked into whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level participants' (N = 89) perceptions on the

awareness of Quizlet. To start with, as suggested by the results, the participants from C and B level reported very similar opinions. The participants from both levels were inclined to agree that they actively used Quizlet to learn English. However, the participants from A level had neutral opinions.

The results also demonstrated that the participants in A level significantly differed from the participants in the other two levels. One possible explanation for this discrepancy might stem from the fact that because the language competency levels of the students in C and B level are lower than the ones in A level, the learners in C and B level might need direction from their teachers in terms of recommendation such as which sources, for instance Web 2.0 tools, they should be aware of and make use of for their language learning. To illustrate, the students from C and B levels may want to actively use Quizlet to practice their vocabulary retention, spelling and pronunciation skills in their language learning process.

On the other hand, because A level students are more proficient in English and are more able to locate, examine and then experiment with other Web 2.0 technologies, they might direct themselves to different Web 2.0 tool sources without having to wait for guidance or direction from their teachers. They might also prefer to use those newly located and experimented Web 2.0 tools more actively for the same purpose of C and B level students.

EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of Canva. The research question 5c focused on whether there was a significant mean difference among A, B, and C level participants' (N = 89) perceptions on the awareness of Canva. To start with, it can be seen from the results that the most negative opinions regarding the actual system usage of Canva belong to A level students. They did not agree that they actively used Canva to learn English. In addition, they did not think

using Canva could be helpful for their language competency. As for B level students, they were inclined to be neutral about their opinions while C level students tended to have slightly positive thoughts about their active usage of Canva for learning English.

It was also revealed from the results that A level students significantly differed from the students in C level. One possible reason for this contrast may lie within the notion that because A level students have higher language competency, they might expect to be challenged when practicing English. However, because Canva does not provide such challenges in terms of grammatical, lexical, receptive, and productive activities that are pre-structured and ready to use, A level students can only use their own language capacity and knowledge to create such challenging tasks. Therefore, they may have thought that using Canva was not as useful as they expected, and thus they may have not used it actively. Therefore, it might have resulted in negative perceptions on their actual system usage of Canva considering the fact that A level students reported also negative opinions with regard to the perceived usefulness of Canva.

Prediction of EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) by EFL learners' Perceptions on the Awareness of the Web 2.0 Tools

In the research question 6, it was investigated if EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e., Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva) was a predictive factor for EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of these Web 2.0 tools. The result of this current research study differed in the direction of the prediction found out in a previous study (Arshad et al., 2012). In their study, it

was found that perceptions on the perceived usefulness could affect the perceptions on awareness of Web 2.0 tools.

However, the results of this current research study suggested that EFL learners' perceptions on their awareness of the Web 2.0 technologies might have been slightly influential in predicting their perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the tools. To illustrate, the more the students were aware of the existence and the usage of the Web 2.0 tools and the notion that they could learn English through the use of Web 2.0 tools, the more they could consider the use of the Web 2.0 tools useful for their English learning. Looking back to the results, this proposition is especially in parallel with the participants from C level in that they were the ones who appeared to report more positive opinions on their awareness and also the usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools. It may be related to the encouragement and reinforcement that their teachers provided to them in terms of awareness raising by highlighting their lower language competency than the other students in the other two higher levels. Therefore, the more C level learners became knowledgeable about the potentials offered by the use of the Web 2.0 tools in terms of developing their English, the more their thoughts on the usefulness of the Web 2.0 technologies might have been reflected in a positive direction.

Prediction of EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Perceived Usefulness of the Web 2.0 Tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva) by EFL Learners' Perceptions on the Actual System Usage of the Web 2.0 Tools

In the research question 7, it was examined if EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e., Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva) was a predictive factor for EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of these Web 2.0 tools. The result of this current research study diverged from the direction

of the prediction found out in the previous literature (Arshad et. al., 2012). According to the previous study, perceptions on the perceived usefulness might affect the perceptions on actual system usage of Web 2.0 tools. However, the results of this current research study suggest the other way around such that EFL learners' perceptions on their actual system usage of the Web 2.0 technologies could be moderately influential in predicting their perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the tools.

To illustrate, it is possible that the more these learners make use of the Web 2.0 tools actively, the more they believe that they can develop their language competency through using these tools. Therefore, it may lead to a more positive learner perception on the usefulness of these Web 2.0 tools. Accordingly, these Web 2.0 tools could possibly be regarded by the learners as an investment in their pursuit of reaching out the desired language competency level, as can be inferred specially with the results of the perceptions of C level students.

These students might consider these tools as a novel asset already provided to bridge the gap in terms of language development with the other higher level students. However, as for learners of higher levels such as A level, because they most probably have had the experience of using these three tools in a repetitive fashion in their previous levels (especially the repeat students), they might seek out other Web 2.0 sources to benefit from. Considering their higher English level, it might have been easier for them to browse and experiment with other sources that are not already prescribed and integrated into the curriculum by the teachers. Therefore, it might have affected their perceptions of actual system usage of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva in a more negative or neutral manner.

However, because there are not any previous studies that investigated these specific three tools individually or altogether within the framework of TAM, to the best knowledge of the researcher, it should be noted that these are assumptions and should be approached with caution in terms of making generalizations out of the results of this study.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study indicate important pedagogical and practical implications. First, as indicated by the results of this current research study, the repetitive and continuous usage of these three specific Web 2.0 tools in all levels could yield oversaturation and, therefore, reluctance for the learners, as was implied from the results of the perceptions of especially A level learners. Therefore, it could be helpful for instructors in curriculum and technology units to take other Web 2.0 technologies in consideration as a substitution or reinforcement for the already used Web 2.0 tools when it comes to implementation of Web technologies into language tasks to be done by the students in language laboratory lessons.

Second, it would also be a good idea to involve the students from each level into the selection process of the topics, contents and the Web 2.0 tool(s) to be used for the language task(s) by distributing a survey or having a focus-group interview. According to the results and findings from the survey and/or interview, the curriculum and technology units could prepare a language laboratory lesson syllabus for each level. In this way, because the learners would feel that their opinions and preferences were sought and taken into consideration as much as possible in terms of implementation of the use of Web 2.0 technologies for their language learning, their perceptions of the awareness and actual system usage of Web 2.0 tools could become more positive. Consequently, it might be positively influential in forming their

perceptions (especially for higher level students) on the usefulness of those Web 2.0 tools for their language learning.

Similar to the abovementioned recommendation, a survey or a focus-group interview can be conducted with the learners on their perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of the specific Web 2.0 tools within TAM framework after the completion of each academic term. This recommendation was also in line with what Aşıksoy (2018) proposed in that taking the perceptions and attitudes of EFL learners into account could provide a more healthy and detailed panorama for future implementation of the use of Web 2.0 technologies into ELT and EFL setting.

Regarding the repeat students, instead of the implementation of the same Web 2.0 tools in a recurrent manner, a whole different choice of Web 2.0 tools could be employed to alleviate their reluctance to use these technologies in their language assignments for their learning. Hence, it would be possible for their perceptions on the awareness, actual system usage and usefulness of the Web 2.0 technologies to be shaped positively.

Last, as understood from the results, higher level students such as the ones in A level have neutral or negative opinions regarding their perceptions on the usefulness, awareness and actual system usage of *Canva*. Similar opinions were also reported by C and B level students as well. Therefore, excluding *Canva* and then replacing it with another tool such as *Storyboardthat*, a tool that is also regarded as a content creation and sharing tool functioning as digital story telling through comic strip templates (Saxena, 2014), might be also an idea to refresh learners' usage of Web 2.0 tools in language laboratory lessons.

Limitations

As with many studies, there are a number of limitations that this research study possesses. Therefore, the results of this study should be approached with caution. Among these limitations, the most important one lies in the sample size (N = 90) of this research study. Because the online survey had to be distributed to the students only one week before their final examinations, it most probably affected the number of participants who took their time to complete the survey instead of focusing on studying for their finals. Thus, it led to a small sample size. It poses a serious limitation especially considering only 15 students from A level took the survey. Consequently, the results, especially from those of A level students, cannot be generalized to a larger population.

Another limitation is related to the exclusion of D level students from sampling as they did not make use of Canva in their language laboratory lessons. Therefore, their perceptions regarding the use of the Web 2.0 tools within the framework of TAM could not be investigated. Moreover, as another limitation, because an online survey was employed in this research study, "the sample size who respond are not representative of the population at large" (Moore, McCabe, & Craig, 2009, p. 199) in online surveys as results may change in different contexts and settings.

Furthermore, the quantitative research design of this study can be regarded as another limitation because A, B, and C level EFL learners' perceptions pertaining to the use of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva within the framework of TAM may not have been deeply investigated although the opinions of the participants were rated from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

As another limitation, the lack of sufficient focus on the literature made it difficult to support the results of this study, thus, the results of this research study could not be reinforced more with relevant previous literature. Some possible explanations were provided; nonetheless, it is not enough to generalize the results.

Implications for Further Research

With regard to the limitations of the current study, a number of suggestions can be made for further research. To start with, a sample size that is as large as possible should be obtained so as to be able to generalize the results to a larger population. Also, the students from D levels can be included to replicate this study in the same institution to have an idea on their perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of the Web 2.0 tools so that more exhaustive information can be gathered. Similarly, another replication study with bigger sample size could be conducted to come up with generalizations through different contexts.

Furthermore, instead of using surveys only, triangulating the data through interviews or changing the design into a mixed-methods design could be preferred to reach out a more in depth and detailed explanation for the perceptions and attitudes of the EFL learners with regard to the use of the Web 2.0 tools.

To the best of the knowledge of the researcher, no studies have concentrated on EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva either individually or altogether within the framework of TAM in the literature. Therefore, in order to have more in depth conclusions, a replication of this study could be administered at different institutions.

Conclusion

This quantitative design non-experimental study focused on the examination of tertiary level EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes pertaining to the use of the

Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, and Canva) within the framework of TAM modified by Arshad et al. (2012). The study focused also on whether EFL learners' perceptions on the awareness and actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools could predict their perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools. The results of the study demonstrated that the participants from C level reported generally more positive perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of the Web 2.0 tools individually or altogether while the participants from A level tended to have negative or neutral opinions within the framework of TAM. The use of Canva was found the least useful for learning English while the use of Quizlet the most according to the opinions from participants from all the three levels.

Also, all the participants from the three levels appeared to have positive attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools in general and tended to have moderately positive opinions on the ease of the use of the Web 2.0 tools in general. With regard to EFL learners' perceptions on their awareness of the Web 2.0 tools, C level students significantly differed from the students in the other two levels which was the same scenario for their perceptions on their awareness of Edmodo and Quizlet whereas all the participants from all the levels significantly differed from one another with their perceptions on the awareness of Canva.

Regarding EFL learners' perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools, A level participants significantly differed from the other two levels. When it comes to EFL learners' perceptions on their actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools individually, it was found that A level participants significantly differed from the participants from C level with regard to their perceptions on their actual system usage of Edmodo and Canva. However, as for the actual system usage of Quizlet, the participants in A level differed from both B and C levels. Generally, the participants

in C level appeared to have more positive opinions than the ones in the other two levels, especially than the participants in A level.

Last, EFL learners' perceptions on the perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools could be slightly predicted by their perceptions on the awareness of the Web 2.0 tools and could be moderately predicted by their perceptions on the actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools

REFERENCES

Adebanjo, D., & Michaelides, R. (2010). Analysis of Web 2.0 enabled e-clusters: A case study. *Technovation, 30*(4), 238-248. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2009.09.001

Ajjan, H., & Hartshorne, R. (2008). Investigating faculty decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: Theory and empirical tests. *The Internet and Higher Education, 11*(2), 71-80. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2008.05.002

Ali, Z. (2015). A case study of tertiary students' experiences using Edmodo in language learning. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics (IJLEAL), 2*, 39-48. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290883766_A_Case_Study_of_Tertiary_Students_Experiences_Using_Edmodo_in_Language_Learning

Al-Kathiri, F. (2015). Beyond the classroom walls: Edmodo in Saudi secondary school EFL instruction, attitudes and challenges. *English Language Teaching Journal, 8*(1), 189-204. doi:10.5539/elt.v8n1p189

Al-Naibi, I., Al-Jabri, M., & Al-Kalbani, I. (2018). Promoting students' paragraph writing using Edmodo: An action research. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET), 17*(1), 130-143. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1165747

Al-Ruheili, H. S., & Al-Saidi, A. A. (2015). Students' perceptions on the effectiveness of using Edmodo in EFL classes. *GAI İstanbul International Academic Conference Proceedings*, 1-9. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/19779963/Students_Perceptions_on_the_Effectiveness_of_Using_Edmodo_in_EFL_Classes

Alexander, B. (2006). Web 2.0: A new wave of innovation for teaching and learning? *Educause Review*, *41*(2), 32. Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/-/media/files/article-downloads/erm0621.pdf

Alsmari, N. A. (2019). Fostering EFL students' paragraph writing using Edmodo. *English Language Teaching, 12*(10), 44-54. doi:10.5539/elt.v12n10p44

Alshalawi, A. S. (2013). How do learning management systems enhance higher education? *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, *2*(10), 1004-1007. doi:10.12816/0002965

Altıok, S., Yükseltürk, E., & Üçgül, M. (2017). Web 2.0 eğitimine yönelik gerçekleştirilen bilimsel bir etkinliğin derğerlendirilmesi: Katılımcı görüşleri. *Journal of Instructional Technologies & Teacher Education, 6*(1), 1-8. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/35394972/Web_2.0_Eğitimine_Yönelik_Gerçekleştirilen_Bilimsel_Bir_Etkinliğin_Değerlendirilmesi

An, Y. J., Aworuwa, B., Ballard, G., & Williams, K. (2009). Teaching with Web 2.0 technologies: Benefits, barriers and best practices. In M. Simmonson (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 1-7), Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Retrieved from *https://members.aect.org/pdf/Proceedings/proceedings09/2009/09_1.pdf*

Anbe, G. (2013). Using Edmodo to incorporate WICOR strategies in the AVID classroom. *TCC 2013 Conference* (pp. 1-9). Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/10600374.pdf

Anderson, P. (2007). What is Web 2.0? Ideas, technologies and implications for education. *JISC Technology and Standards Watch*, 1-64. Retrieved from

https://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20140613220103/http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/techwatch/tsw0701b.pdf

Anjaniputra, A. G., & Salsabila, V. A. (2018). The merits of Quizlet for vocabulary learning at tertiary level. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, *4*(2), 1-11. doi:10.25134/ieflj.v4i2.1370.

Arshad, A., Hoon, T. B., & Hashim, A. (2012). Tertiary students' application of Web 2.0 for English language learning. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *8*(2), 21-37. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/27dc/fdaeade64fe171e7a9fadcd3c015007a47ac.pdf

Ary, D. J., Jacobs, L., Razavieh, A. A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont, CA: Cengage.

Ashcroft, R. J., & Imrie, A. C. (2014). Learning vocabulary with digital flashcards. In R. Chartrand (Ed.), *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 639-646). Tokyo, Japan: JALT. Retrieved from https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/jalt2013_064.pdf

Aşıksoy, G. (2018). ELT students' attitudes and awareness towards the use of Web 2.0 technologies for language learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *14*(2), 240-251. Retrieved from https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/952

Baird, D. E., & Fisher, M. (2006). Neomillennial user experience design strategies: Utilizing social networking media to support 'Always On' learning styles. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 34*(1), 5-32. doi:10.2190/6WMW-47L0-M81Q-12G1

Balcı, A. (2004). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma, teknik ve ilkeler* (4. baskı). Ankara,

Turkey: Pegema Yayıncılık.

Balula, A., & Moreira, A. (2014). *Evaluation of online higher education- Learning, interaction and technology.* S. Verlag (Ed.). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-05425-4

Balula, A., Martins, C., & Marques, F. (2014). Enhancing business terminology through concept mapping. In L. G. Chova, A. L. Martinez, & I. C. Torres (Eds.), *Proceedings of the EDULEARN14 Conference* (pp. 2355-2362). IATED. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265907542_Enhancing_Business_English_Terminology_Through_Concept_Mapping

Bañados, E. (2006). A blended-learning pedagogical model for teaching and learning EFL successfully through an online interactive multimedia environment. *CALICO Journal*, *23*(3), 533-550. doi:10.1558/cj.v23i3.533-550

Bayne, G. A. (n.d). Asynchronous communication tools. Retrieved from http://gailalleynebayne.weebly.com/uploads/2/3/5/2/23521060/module_4-asynchronous_communication.pdf

Barr, B. W. B. (2016). Checking the effectiveness of Quizlet as a tool for vocabulary learning. *The Center of EFL Journal*, *1*(2), 36–48. doi:10.15045/ELF_0020104.

Başal, A. (2016). The use of Web 2.0 tools in ELT. In İ. Yaman, E. Ekmekçi, & M Şenel (Eds.). *Current trends in ELT* (pp. 152-168). Ankara, Turkey: Nüans.

Bax, S. (2003). CALL – past, present and future. *System*, *31*(1), 13–28. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00071-4

Beatty, K. (2003). *Teaching and researching computer-assisted language learning*. New York, NY: Longman.

Bennett, S., Bishop, A. G., Dalgarno, B., Waycott, J., & Kennedy, G. E. (2012). Implementing Web 2.0 technologies in higher education: A collective case study. *Computers & Education*, *59*(2), 524-534. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2011.12.022

Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The 'digital natives' debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(5), 775-786. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x

Biçen, H., & Çavuş, N. (2010). The most preferred social network sites by students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 5864-5869. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.958

Binh Minh, L. N. (2018, August). *The effects of Quizlet on students' vocabulary acquisition in ESP classrooms: An experimental research at Hanoi Law University*. Poster session presented at the 9th International Conference on TESOL SEAMEO RETRAC, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Retrieved from http://www.vnseameo.org/TESOLConference2018/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/La_Nguyen_Binh_Minh-poster_7.pdf

Brandl, K. (2012). Effects of required and optional exchange tasks in online language learning environments. *ReCALL*, *24*(1), 85-107. doi:10.1017/S0958344011000309

Briggs, S. (2014). 20 Things educators need to know about digital literacy skills. Retrieved from http://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/features/digital-literacy-skills/

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Buzzetto-More, N. (2015). Student attitudes towards the integration of Youtube in

online, hybrid, and web-assisted course: An examination of the impact of course modality on perception. *Merlot Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *11*(1), 55-73. Retrieved from https://jolt.merlot.org/vol11no1/Buzzetto-More_0315.pdf

Canva Pro - An Online Graphic Design Tool: Try Canva Pro Free. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.canva.com/pro/

Chang, C. W., Pearman, C., & Farha, N. (2012). Second language acquisition: Implications of Web 2.0 and beyond. *Critical Questions in Education, 3*(2), 52-64. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1047008.pdf

Chapelle, C. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing, and research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Charoenwet, S., & Christensen, A. (2016). The effect of Edmodo learning network on students' perception, self-regulated learning behaviors and learning performance. *Proceedings of the International Multi-Conference on Society, Cybernetics and Informatics (ICMSI 2016), USA, 10,* 297- 300. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/37ae/11c94c362de0c09debea8822bb00a9b99afb.pdf?_ga=2.124380493.692972214.1580206041-1573434697.1563520482

Chien, C. W. (2015). Analysis the effectiveness of three online vocabulary flashcard websites on L2 learners' level of lexical knowledge. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(5), 111-121. doi:10.5539/elt.v8n5p111

Chun, D. M., & Plass, J. L. (2000). Networked multimedia environments for second language acquisition. In M. Warschauer and R. Kern (Eds.), *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice* (pp. 151-170). Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524735.009

Claypole, M. (2010). *Controversies in ELT. What you always wanted to know about teaching English but were afraid to ask.* Norderstedt, Germany: LinguaBooks/BoD.

Consalvo, M. (2005). Rule sets, cheating, and magic circles: Studying games and ethics. *International Review of Information Ethics, 4*, 7-12. Retrieved from http://fiz1.fh-potsdam.de/volltext/ijie/06136.pdf

Cristobal, E., Flavian, C., & Guinaliu, M. (2007). Perceived e-service quality (PesQ): Measurement validation and effects on consumer satisfaction and web site loyalty. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 17*(3), 317-340. doi:10.1108/09604520710744326

Crook, C. (2008). Web 2.0 technologies for learning: Landscape- opportunities, challenges and tensions. *Becta*, 1-72. Retrieved from https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1474/1/becta_2008_web2_currentlandscape_litrev.pdf

Cullimore, D. (1999). The use of new technologies in mentorship for teacher training. *Management in Education, 13*(5), 24-26. doi:10.1177/089202069901300508

Çakır, R., & Solak, E. (2014). Exploring the factors influencing e-learning of Turkish EFL learners through TAM. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET), 13*(3), 79-87. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1034230

Çobanoğlu, A., & Yücel, Z. E. (2017). İngilizce okutmanlarının teknoloji kullanımları ve eğitimde bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerine yönelik tutumları. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, *7*(3), 1-9. doi:10.5961/jhes.2017.222

Daşkın, Z. (2017). *A study of faculty members' and instructors' awareness and use*

of Web 2.0 tools in foreign language teaching (Masters' thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from http://www.openaccess.hacettepe.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11655/3901/Zehra%20Daşkın_YL_30397.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Davis, F. D. (1993). User acceptance of information technology: System characteristics, user perceptions and behavioral impacts. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies, 38*(3), 475-487. doi:10.1006/imms.1993.1022

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology, *MIS Quarterly*, *13*(3) 319-340. doi:10.2307/249008

Davis, M., & Quinn, D. (2013). Visualizing text: The new literacy of infographics. *Reading Today, 31*(3), 16-18. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/5615673/Visualizing_Text_The_New_Literacy_of_Infographics

Devine, R. (2019, October 17). Canva founder Melanie Perkins turned idea into billion-dollar business. Retrieved from https://www.theceomagazine.com/business/coverstory/canva-melanie-perkins/

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys*: The tailored design method (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Dizon, G. (2016). Quizlet in the EFL classroom: Enhancing academic vocabulary acquisition of Japanese university students. *Teaching English with Technology, 16*(2), 40-56. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135913.pdf

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Spain: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). Questionnaires in second language research construction, administration and processing (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dudeney, G, & Hockly, N. (2012). ICT in ELT: How did we get here and where are we going?. *ELT Journal, 66*(4), 533-542. doi:10.1093/elt/ccs050

Egbert, J. (2005). *CALL essentials: Principles and practice in CALL classrooms*. Alexandra, VA: TESOL.

Ekici, G., Abide, Ö. F., Canbolat, Y., & Öztürk, A. (2017). Analysis of resources on 21st century skills. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, 6*(1), 124-134. Retrieved from http://www.jret.org/FileUpload/ks281142/File/12.gulay_ekici.pdf

Ellis, R. K. (2009). *A Field guide to learning management systems*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD.

Emiroğlu, B. G. (2019). Investigating faculty members' perceived usability of Edmodo learning management system. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Journal of Educational Sciences, 9*(1), 158-175. doi:10.17984/adyuebd.533131

Emre, S. (2019). *Webinars for teaching English as a foreign language and for professional development: Teacher perceptions* (Master's thesis). İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from http://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/handle/11693/48252

Envisioncu (2016). Technology review: Quizlet. Retrieved from https://www.envisioncu.com/posts/technology-review-quizlet/

Eren, Ö. (2015). Vocabulary learning on learner-created content by using Web 2.0

tools. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 6*(4), 281-300. doi:10.30935/cedtech/6155

Ersoy Özer, Y., & Koçoğlu, Z. (2017). The use of Quizlet flashcard software and its effects on vocabulary learning. *Dil Dergisi, 168*(1), 61-81. doi:10.1501/dilder_0000000238

Erstad, O. (2008). Trajectories of remixing: Digital literacies, media production and schooling. In C. Lankshear and M. Knobel (Eds.), *Digital literacies: Concepts, policies and practices* (pp.172-202). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Everitt, B. S., & Skrondal, A. (2010). *The Cambridge dictionary of statistics* (4th ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Farkas, M. G. (2012). Participatory technologies, pedagogy 2.0 and information literacy. *Library Hi Tech*, (1), 82-94. doi:10.1108/07378831211213229

Ferdig, R. E. (2007). Editorial: Examining social software in teacher education. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 15*(1), 5-10. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255566895_Editorial_Examining_Social_Software_in_Teacher_Education

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Retrieved from http://people.umass.edu/aizen/f&a1975.html

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Fowler, K. (2015). For the Love of Infographics. *Science Scope*, *38*(7), 42-48.

doi:10.2505/4/ss15_038_07_42

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Getting, B. (2007, April 18). Basic definitions: Web 1.0, Web 2.0, Web 3.0: What do they mean, and how do they impact my ecommerce business? *Practical Ecommerce.* Retrieved October 29, 2019, from http://www.practicalecommerce.com/articles/464/Basic-Definitions- Web-10-Web-20-Web-30/

Gonglewski, M. R. (1999). Linking the internet to the national standards for foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, *32*(3), 348-362. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1999.tb01346.x

Granito, M., & Chernobilsky, E. (2012). The effect of technology on a student's motivation and knowledge retention. *NERA Conference Proceedings*, 17, 1-22. Retrieved from https://opencommons.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=nera_2012

Greenhow, C., Walker, J. D., & Kim, S. (2010). Millennial learners and Net-Savvy teens? Examining Internet use among low-income students authors. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education 26*(2), 63-68. doi:10.1080/10402454.2009.10784634

Greenhow, C., Robelia, B., & Hughes, J. E. (2009). Learning, teaching, and scholarship in a digital age. Web 2.0 and classroom research: What path should we take now? *Educational Researcher, 38*(4), 246-259. doi:10.3102/0013189X09336671

Grosseck, G. (2009). To use or not to use Web 2.0 in higher education? *Procedia*

Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1, 478-482. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.087

Gulley, J., & Thomas, J. (n.d). Using Web 2.0 tools to engage learners. Retrieved from https://www.collegestar.org/modules/using-web-2-0-tools-to-engage-learners?feedback=false#benefits-of-web-2-0-tools

Hakim, A. R., & Kodriyah, L. (2015). Edmodo: An effective solution to blended learning for EFL learners. In M. Z. Miftah, & S. Erliana (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on English Language Teaching (NACELT)* (pp. 22-32). Central Kalimantan, Indonesia: State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Karya_Ilmiah_Tadris_Bahasa_Inggris/publication/311571022_EDMODO_AN_EFFECTIVE_SOLUTION_TO_BLENDED_LEARNING_FOR_EFL_LEARNERS/links/584d78ee08aecb6bd8c93bdb/EDMODO-AN-EFFECTIVE-SOLUTION-TO-BLENDED-LEARNING-FOR-EFL-LEARNERS.pdf

Hammonds, L., Matherson, L. H., Wilson, E. K., & Wright, V. H. (2013). Gateway tools: Five tools to allow teachers to overcome barriers to technology integration. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *80*(1), 36-40. Retrieved from http://emtechconsulting.weebly.com/uploads/1/2/7/4/12747024/gateway_tools_delta_kappa_gamma_2013.pdf

Hernández-Ramos, J. P., Martínez-Abad, F., Garcia Penalvo, F.J., Esperanza Herrera Garcia, M., & Rodríguez-Conde, M. J. (2014). Teachers' attitude regarding the use of ICT. A factor reliability and validity study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31, 509-516. doi:10/10/j.chb.2013.04.039

Howland, J. L., & Moore, J. L. (2002). Student perceptions as distance learners in

Internet-based courses. *Distance Education, 23*(2), 183-195. doi:10.1080/0158791022000009196

Hsu, C., & Park, H. W. (2011). Sociology of hyperlink networks of Web 1.0, Web 2.0, and Twitter: A case study of South Korea. *Social Science Computer Review, 29*(3), 354-368. doi:10.1177/0894439310382517

Hubbard, P. (2016). Unit 2- Foundations of CALL. In *An invitation to CALL*. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/~efs/callcourse2/Invitation-to-CALL-Unit2.pdf

Hubbard, P., & Levy, M. (2016). Theory in computer assisted language learning research and practice. In F. Farr, and L. Murray. (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language learning and technology* (pp. 24–38). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hurlburt, S. (2008). Defining tools for a new learning space: Writing and reading class blogs. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 4*(2), 182-189. Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol4no2/hurlburt0608.pdf.

Igi-global (2019).. What is Web 2.0 technologies (n.d). Retrieved from https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/integrated-evaluation-approach-learning-systems/32199

İnce, H. G. (2015). *EFL learners' perceptions of educational podcasting* (Master's thesis). İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2f22/f57af173a167eea0051d728a961ad050ddcc.pdf

Januszewski, A., & Molenda, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Educational technology: A definition with commentary*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jeng, W., He, D., Jiang, J., & Zhang, Y. (2012). Groups in Mendeley: Owners'

descriptions and group outcomes. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 49*(1), 1-4. doi:10.1002/meet.14504901256

Johns, T., & King, P. (Eds.). (1991). *Classroom concordancing. English Language Research Journal, 4*, 71-103.

Jones, C., Ramanau, R., Cross, S., & Healing, G. (2010). Net generation or digital natives: Is there a distinct generation entering university? *Computers & Education, 54*(3), 722-732. doi:1016/j.compedu.2009.09.022

Kálecký, R. (2016). *Quizlet vs. vocabulary notebook: The impact of different methods of storing and revising vocabulary on students' progress, retention, and autonomy* (Master's thesis). Masaryk University, Czech Republic. Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/th/qzvxl/Roman_Kalecky_-_Quizlet_vs.pdf

Kapp, K. M., & O'Driscoll, T. (2010). *Learning in 3D: Adding a new dimension to enterprise learning and collaboration*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Kaufman, K. J. (2013). 21 ways to 21st century skills: Why students need them and ideas for practical implementation. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 49*(2), 78-83. doi:10.1080/00228958.2013.786594

Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B., Bennett, S., Gray, K., Waycott, J., Judd, T., Bishop, A., Maton, K., Krause, K-L., & Chang, R. (2009). *Educating the Net generation: A handbook of findings for practice and policy.* Australia: University of Melbourne Press.

Kern, R. (2006). Perspectives on technology in learning and teaching languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 183-210. doi:10.2307/40264516

Kern, R., & Warschauer, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kessler, G. (2007). Formal and informal CALL preparation and teacher attitude toward technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *20*(2), 173-188. doi:10.1080/09588220701331394

Khany, R., & Boghayeri, M. (2013). The use of Web 2.0 tools in language pedagogy: An Iranian EFL teachers' attitude. In M. Basri, K. Abd Rahman, M. S. Mohd Salleh, & N. Salleh (Eds.), *Proceeding of the Global Summit on Education* (pp. 151-159). Malaysia: worldconferences.net Retrieved from https://worldconferences.net/proceedings/gse2013/papers_gse2013/062%20Reza%20Khany%20&%20Mahnaz%20Boghayeri.pdf

Kim, H.-Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *The Korean Academy of Conservative Dentistry, 38*(1):52. doi:10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52

Kongchan, C. (2013). How Edmodo and Google Docs can change traditional classrooms. *Proceedings of ECLL IAFOR 2013*, Japan, 629-637. Retrieved from http://papers.iafor.org/wp-content/uploads/conference-proceedings/ECLL/ECLL2013_proceedings.pdf

Köse, T., Çimen, E., & Mede, E. (2016). Perceptions of EFL learners about using an online tool for vocabulary learning in EL classrooms: A pilot project in Turkey. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 362-372. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.051

Krasne, A. (2009). What is Web 2.0 anyway? Retrieved from http://repository.the-ceomagazine.com/articles/what-web-20-anyway.html

Krauss, J. (2012). More than words can say: Infographics. *Learning & Leading with Technology, 39*(5), 10-14. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ982831

Kung, S. C. (2002). A framework for successful key-pal programs in language

learning. *CALL-EJ Online, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://callej.org/journal/3-2/sckung.html

Kutlutürk, L., & Akbayrak, E. H. (2013). Akademik araştırmalarda Web 2.0 etkisi. *ÜNAK 2013 Konferansı: Bilgi Sistemleri, Platformlar, Mimariler ve Teknolojiler*. Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul. Retrieved from http://ww2.lib.metu.edu.tr/help/Akademik%20Arastirmalarda%20Web%202.0%20Etkisi.pdf

Lander, B. (2016). Quizlet: What the students think – a qualitative data analysis. In S. Papadima-Sophocleous, L. Bradley, & S. Thouësny (Eds.), CALL communities and culture – short papers from EUROCALL 2016 (pp. 254-259). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED572208.pdf

Lee, M. J. W., & McLoughlin, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Web 2.0-based e-learning: Applying social informatics for tertiary teaching.* Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.

Lee, Y., Kozar, K. A., Larsen, K. R. T. (2003). The technology acceptance model: Past, present, and future. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems (CAIS), 12*(1), 752-780. doi:10.17705/1cais.01250

Lessig, L. (2008). *Remix: Making art and commerce: Thrive in the hybrid economy*, London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Levy, M. (1997). Computer-assisted language learning: Context and conceptualization. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Levy, M. (2000). Scope, goals and methods in CALL research: Questions of coherence and autonomy. *ReCALL, 12*(2), 170–195. doi:10.1017/S0958344000000525

Lindsay, P., & Norman, D. A. (1977). *Human information processing: An*

introduction to psychology. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Liu, M., Kalk, D., Kinney, L., & Orr, G. (2012). Web 2.0 and its use in higher education from 2007-2009: A review of literature. *International Journal on E-Learning, 11*(2), 153-179. Retrieved from https://blog.associati.e.kuleuven.be/mco2013/files/2013/11/Liu_Kalk_Kinney_Orr_Web2.0andItsUseinHigherEducation.pdf

Loveless, A. M. (2002). *FutureLab report: Literature review in creativity, new technologies and learning* (Report No. 4). Retrieved from https://telearn.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00190439/document

Luke, C. L., & Britten, J. S. (2007). The expanding role of technology in foreign language teacher education programs. *CALICO Journal*, *24*(2), 253–267. doi:10.1558/cj.v24i2. 253-268.

Luo, T. (2013). Web 2.0 for language learning: Benefits and challenges for educators. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching, 3*(3), 1-17. doi:10.4018/jcallt.2013070101.

Ma'azi, H., & Janfeshan, K. (2018). The effect of Edmodo social learning network on Iranian EFL learners writing skill. *Cogent Education,* 5, 1-17. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2018.1536312

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Manowong, S. (2017). Incorporating online tools to promote English reading for EFL leaners: An action research study. *Pasaa Paritat Journal, 32*, 98-124. Retrieved from http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/Publicationsonline/files/article2/Uz8VwjDfrZMon32902.pdf

Mason, R., & Rennie, F. (2007). Using Web 2.0 for learning in the community. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *10*(3), 196-203. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.06.003

Maton, K., & Bennett, S. (2010) The role of ICTs at the University of Sydney: A report on the experiences of students and teaching staff. Office of the DVC(E), University of Sydney, Sydney. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1058331/The_Role_of_ICTs_at_the_University_of_Sydney_A_report_on_the_experiences_and_expectations_of_students_and_teaching_staff

McBride, K. (2009). Social-networking sites in foreign language classes: Opportunities for re-creation. In L. Lomicka & G. Lord (Eds.), *The next generation: Social networking and online collaboration in foreign language learning* (pp. 35-58). Texas: CALICO. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2072765/Social-networking_sites_in_foreign_language_classes_Opportunities_for_re-creation

McLeod, J., & Vasinda, S. (2008). Critical literacy and Web 2.0: Exercising and negotiating power. *Computers in the Schools*, *25*(3-4), 259-274. doi:10.1080/07380560802394815

Meerts, J. (2003). Course management systems. *EDUCAUSE Evolving Technologies Committee*, 1-5. Retrieved from https://library.educause.edu/-/media/files/library/2003/1/dec0302-pdf.pdf

Monalisa, M. & Ardi, H. (2013). Using Edmodo educational social network in teaching English for high school students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 220-225. Retrieved from

http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/2609

Moore, D. S., McCabe, G. P., & Craig, B. A. (2009). *Introduction to the practice of statistics*. *New York* (6th ed.). New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Motteram G., & Sharma, P. (2009). Blending learning in a Web 2.0 world. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies & Society. 7*(2), 83-96. Retrieved from http://ictaugustine.pbworks.com/f/Blending+Learning+in+a+Web+2+World.pdf

Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Nation, I. S. P. (2013*). Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524759

Neltner, H. (2015). Using Canva and Powtoon to promote your library program. *School Librarian's Workshop, 35*(5), 24-25. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=7&sid=0f14bb29-cc64-467c-8709-3cef10a72cc8%40sdc-v-sessmgr01

Oblinger, D. G. (2008). Growing up with Google: What it means to education. *Emerging Technologies for Learning*, 3, 11-29. Retrieved from http://www.mmiweb.org.uk/publications/ict/emerging_tech03.pdf

Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). Is it age or IT: First steps toward understanding the Net Generation. In D. G. Oblinger & J. L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the new generation* (pp. 1-17). Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/pub7101.pdf

Oliver, M. & Trigwell K. (2005). Can ''Blended Learning'' be redeemed? *E-learning*. *2*(1), 17–26. doi:10.2304/elea.2005.2.1.2

O'Reilly, T. (2007). What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communications & Strategies*, *1*(1), 17-37. Retrieved from http://www-public.imtbs-tsp.eu/~gibson/Teaching/Teaching-ReadingMaterial/OReilly07.pdf

Özel, A. (2013). *The use of the Internet and Web 2.0 tools among EFL instructors* (Master's thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.

Özerbaş, M. A., & Mart, Ö. A. (2017). İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının Web 2.0 kullanımına ilişkin görüş ve kullanım düzeyleri. Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, *18*(3), 1152-1167. doi:10.29299/kefad.2017.18.3.058

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.). Crows Nest, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Paramskas, D. M. (1999). The shape of computer-mediated-communication. In Keith Cameron (Ed.), *CALL Media design and applications* (pp. 13-34). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Phỉ, T. T., Thơ, V. Đ., Thành, N. L. H., Khanh, H. Đ. P., & Khanh, P. T. (2016). Application of Quizlet.com to teaching and learning business English vocabulary at the University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City. In C. Intaraprasert (Ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Language Development: ICLD 2016* (pp. 230-238). Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam: Ton Duc Thang University. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/33407963/APPLICATION_OF_QUIZLET.COM_TO_TEACHING_AND_LEARNING_BUSINESS_ENGLISH_VOCABULARY_AT_THE_UNIVERSITY_OF_ECONOMICS_HO_CHI_MINH_CITY

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 1-12. doi:10.1108/10748120110424816

Quizlet. (2019). Retrieved from https://quizlet.com/mission

Reiser, R. A. (1987). Instructional technology: A history. In R.M. Gagne (Ed.) *Instructional technology: Foundations* (pp. 11-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Reynard, R. (2009). 3 Challenges to wiki use in instruction. *Campus technology.* Retrieved from https://campustechnology.com/articles/2009/02/11/3-challenges-to-wiki-use-in-instruction.aspx

Richardson, W. (2010). *Blogs, wikis, podcasts, and other powerful web tools for classrooms* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Robertson, C. E. (2008). Integration of Moodle course management system (CMS) into an EFL writing class. *The JALT CALL Journal*, *4*(1), 53-59. Retrieved from https://journal.jaltcall.org/articles/54

Saettler, P. (1990). *A history of instructional technology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill

Salaway, G., & Caruso, J. (2007). *The ECAR study of undergraduate students and technology*. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE. Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/-/media/files/articles/2008/8/ers0706w.pdf?la=en&hash=B58D6709B30353FFF0E2A34FD104B941BA964F27

Saxena,S. (2014, June 22). Storyboard That :Online Storyboard Creator. Retrieved from http://edtechreview.in/reviews/1291-storyboard-that-online-storyboard-creator

Selevičienė, E., & Burkšaitienė, N. (2015). University students' attitudes towards the usage of Web 2.0 tools for learning ESP: A preliminary investigation. *Socialinių mokslų studijos/Societal Studies, 7*(2), 270–291.

doi:10.13165/SMS-15-7-2-07

Selwyn, N. (2008). An investigation of differences in undergraduates' academic use of the Internet. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 9, 11-22. doi:10.1177/1469787407086744

Sharma, P. (2010). Key concepts in ELT: Blended learning. *ELT Journal, 64*(4), 456-458. doi:10.1093/elt/ccq043

Singh, P., Mallan, K., & Giardina, N. (2008, November). *Just Google it! Students constructing knowledge through Internet travel*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27477291_Just_Google_It_Students_constructing_knowledge_through_Internet_travel

Smaldino, S. E., Lowther, D. L., Mims, C., & Russell, J. D. (2015). *Instructional technology and media for learning*. New York, NY: Pearson.

Son, J. B. (2007). Learner experiences in web-based language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*(1), 21-36. doi:10.1080/09588220601118495

Soper, D. (n.d.). Calculator: A-priori sample size for student t-tests. Retrieved from https://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc/calculator.aspx?id=47

Stauffer, B. (2019). Pros & cons of using Quizlet in your classroom. Retrieved from https://www.aeseducation.com/blog/quizlet-pros-cons.

Stokes, A. (1997). Making a success of CALL. *English Teaching Professional, 4,* 20-21.

Stroud, C. (2010). *Edmodo: A white paper.* Wintrop University. Retrieved from https://internal.masd.k12.wi.us/cms/0.Classroom.Connections/Documents/Edmodo-White-Paper.pdf

Şahin Kızıl, A. (2017). Exploring EFL learners' use of Web 2.0 tools: Preliminary

findings. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 27, 28-40. doi:10.5505/pausbed.2017.71602

Tapscott, D. (2008). *Grown-up digital: How the Net generation is changing the world.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill

Tarhini, A., Hassouna, M., Abbasi, M. S., & Orozco, J. (2015). Towards the acceptance of RSS to support learning: An empirical study to validate the Technology Acceptance Model in Lebanon. *Electronic Journal of E-learning, 13*(1), 30-41. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271853376_Towards_the_Acceptance_of_RSS_to_Support_Learning_An_empirical_study_to_validate_the_Technology_Acceptance_Model_in_Lebanon

Thieman, G. Y, (2008). Using technology as a tool for learning and developing 21st century citizenship skills: An examination of the NETS and technology use by preservice teachers with their K-12 students. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 8*(4), 342-366. Retrieved from https://www.citejournal.org/volume-8/issue-4-08/social-studies/using-technology-as-a-tool-for-learning-and-developing-21st-century-citizenship-skills-an-examination-of-the-nets-and-technology-use-by-preservice-teachers-with-their-k-12-students/

Toy, F. (2019). *The effects of Quizlet on students' and EFL teachers' perceptions on vocabulary learning/teaching* (Master's thesis). Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey. Retrieved from http://tez.sdu.edu.tr/Tezler/TS03074.pdf

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Ursavaş Ö. F., & Reisoğlu İ. (2017). The effects of cognitive style on Edmodo users' behavior: A structural equation modeling-based multi-group analysis. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 34*, 31-50. doi:10.1108/ijilt-06-2016-0019

Valerio, G., & Valenzuela, R. (2013). Implications of implementing Web 2.0 on education. *International Association for Development of the Information Society (IADIS) Conference*, 451-454. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED562347.pdf

Wahyuni, E., & Thohiriyah. (2018). Infographic: Avoiding monotony in presenting teaching materials. *Proceedings of 2nd English Language Learning and Literature International Conference (ELLiC), 2*, 280-283. Retrieved from https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/3548

Wang, S. & Vasquez, C. (2012). Web 2.0 and second language learning: What does the research tell us? *CALICO Journal*, *29*(3), 412-430. doi:10.11139/cj.29.3.412-430

Warschauer, M. (1996). Computer assisted language learning: An introduction. In S. Fotos (Ed.), *Multimedia Language Teaching* (pp. 3-20). Tokyo, Japan: Logos International. Retrieved from http://www.ict4lt.org/en/warschauer.htm

Warschauer, M. (2002). A developmental perspective on technology in language education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(3), 453-475. doi:10.2307/3588421

Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2007). Audience, authorship, and artifact: The emergent semiotics of Web 2.0. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. 27*, 1-23. doi:10.1017/s0267190508070013

Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language Teaching*, *31*(2), 57-71.

doi:10.1017/s0261444800012970

Wertz, J., & Saine, P. (2014). Using digital technology to complement close reading of complex texts. *New England Reading Association Journal, 50*(1), 78-82. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=0f14bb29-cc64-467c-8709-3cef10a72cc8%40sdc-v-sessmgr01

West, J. A., & West, M. L. (2009). *Using Wikis for online collaboration: The power of the read-write Web.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Wolcott, M. (2007). What is Web 2.0? *BNet*. Retrieved October 28, 2019 from http://www.bnet.com/2403-13241_23-66094.html

World Economic Forum, (2015). *New vision for education: Unlocking the potential of technology*. British Columbia Teachers' Federation. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEFUSA_NewVisionforEducation_Report2015.pdf

Wright, B. A. (2016). Transforming vocabulary learning with Quizlet. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education*. Tokyo, Japan: JALT. Retrieved from https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/jalt2016-pcp-057.pdf

Yadav, A. K. S., & Patwardhan, A. A. (2016). Use of impact of Web 2.0 tools in higher education: Literature review. In S. Parmar, & A. K. Siwach (Eds.) *Academic Libraries in Electronic Environment* (pp. 218-246). India: Intellectual Foundation. doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.2748.6965/1

Yağız, O., Aydın, B., & Akdemir. A. S. (2016). ELT research in Turkey: A content analysis of selected features of published articles. *Journal of Language and*

Linguistic Studies, *12*(2), 117-134. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/440698

Yundayani, A., Susilawati, S., & Chairunnisa, C. (2019). Investigating the effect of Canva on students' writing skills. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *7*(2), 169-176. doi:10.25134/erjee.v7i2.1800.

Yusuf, Q., Yusuf, Y. Q., Erdiana, N., & Pratama, A. R. (2018). Engaging with EDMODO to teach English writing of narrative texts to EFL students. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, *76*(3), 333-349. Retrieved from http://www.scientiasocialis.lt/pec/node/files/pdf/vol76/333-349.Yusuf_Vol.76-3_PEC.pdf

Zaidieh, A. J. Y. (2012). The use of social networking in education: Challenges and opportunities. *World of Computer Science and Information Technology Journal (WCSIT), 2*(1), 18-21. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/76e2/1d0c5cc14238463a09eec33d5d06573a32d2.pdf

Zimmer, M. (2008). Preface: Critical perspective on Web 2.0. *First Monday*, *13(3)*. doi:10.5210/fm.v13i3.2137

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

2019-2020 Academic Term Language Laboratory Classes Syllabi for A, B and C Levels at English Preparatory School

2019-2020 FALL TERM A LEVEL LAB SYLLABUS		
WEEKS	**First Hour**	**Second Hour**
Week 1 September 23– 27, 2019	**1. Introduction to the course (Share the LabSyllabus on Edmodo) 2. Creating accounts for *Edmodo* and *MySpeakOutLab* 3. Practice on *MySpeakOutLab*, if time availableCreating 4. Becoming a member of *Hazırlık 2017-2018 on Facebook* 5. Becoming a follower of *our school blog***	
Week 2 September 30 - October 4, 2019	**Guided Practice on My English Lab Unit 1.1. All Exercises**	**Guided Practice on MyenglishLab Unit 1.2 All Exercises**
Week 3 October 7– 11, 2019	**Lab Task 1 *Useful Websites For Studying English- Discussion on EDMODO***	Lab Task 1 continues
Week 4 October 14 – 18, 2019	**Lab Task 2 Prepare a poster introducing 5 useful websites for English Learners using CANVA (Group Work)**	Lab Task 2 continues
Week 5 October 21 – 25, 2019	**Lab Task 3 Strategies for Learning New Words & Quizlet**	Lab Task 3 continues
Week 6 October 28– November 1, 2019 October 29	**MyEnglishLab Review 1 & Check**	**MyEnglishLab Review 2 Unit 3&4**
Week 7 November 4 – 8, 2019	**Lab Task 4 Using Online Dictionaries &Kahoot Game **(*Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*	Lab Task 4 continues
Week 8 November 11 – 15, 2019	**MyEnglishLab Review 3 Unit 5&6**	*Revision Quiz for Midterm Test (Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*
Week 9 November 18-22, 2019	**MIDTERM EXAMS**	
Week 10 November 25 – 29, 2019	**MyEnglishLab Unit 7.1 All Exercises**	**MyEnglishLab Unit 7.2 All Exercises**

Week 11 **December** **2 – 6, 2019**	**Lab Task 5** ***Read the article "Top 10 Liveable Cities in the US" and prepare a poster comparing two of these cities using CANVA.***	Lab Task 5 continues
Week 12 **December** **9– 13, 2019**	**MyEnglishLab** **Unit 8.1 & 8.2 All Exercises**	**MyEnglishLab** **Unit 8.1 & 8.2 All Exercises**
Week 13 **December** **16 – 20, 2019**	**Lab Task 6** **WHAT IF ? (Writing answers for different scenarios using Microsoft Word)**	Lab Task 6 continues **MyEnglishLab** **Unit 8 BBC Interviews**
Week 14 **December** **23 – 27, 2019**	**Lab Task 7** **Planning your semester break vacation**	Lab Task 7 continues **MyEnglishLab** **Review 4 Units 7&8**
Week 15 **December 30 – January 3, 2020** **January 1**	**MyEnglish Lab** **Unit 9.1 & 9.2 All Exerices**	**MyEnglishLab** **Unit 9.1 & 9.2 All Exerices**
Week 16 **January** **6 –10, 2020**	**MyEnglishLab** **Review 5 Units 9&10** ***Assign the tests on MEL as homework for practice before final exams.**	*Revision Quiz for Final Test (Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*
Week 17 **January 13-17, 2020**	**FINAL EXAMS**	

2019-2020 FALL TERM B LEVEL LAB SYLLABUS		
WEEKS	**First Hour**	**Second Hour**
Week 1 **September** **23 – 27, 2019**	**1. Introduction to the course (Share the LabSyllabus on Edmodo)** **2. Creating accounts for *Edmodo* and *MySpeakOutLab*** **3. Practice on *MySpeakOutLab* (if time available)** **4. Becoming a member of *Hazırlık 2019-2020 on Facebook*** **5. Becoming a follower of *our school blog*** **6. Becoming a follower of our school Instagram account**	
Week 2 **September 30 - October 5, 2019**	**MEL** **Unit 1** BBC Interview • **Creating accounts for Turnitin**	**MEL Practice**
Week 3 **October** **7 – 11, 2019**	**LAB TASK 1** *Useful Websites For Studying English-Discussion on EDMODO*	**MEL** **Unit 2** BBC Interview

Week 4 **October** **14 – 18, 2019**	**LAB TASK 2** *Read a news story and write your comment about it on EDMODO.*	**LAB TASK 2 continues**
Week 5 **October** **21 – 25, 2019**	**LAB TASK 3** *Prepare a poster about being a good language learner on CANVA or POWERPOINT.*	**LAB TASK 3 continues**
Week 6 **October 28 – November 1, 2019** **Oct 28-29**	**MEL** **Unit 3** BBC Interview	**MEL** **Unit 4** BBC Interview
Week 7 **November 4 – 8, 2019**	**LAB TASK 4** *Use an online dictionary and prepare a vocabulary file using QUIZLET*	**LAB TASK 4 continues**
Week 8 **November 11 – 15, 2019**	**MEL** **Unit 5** BBC Interview **MEL** **Review 1 & 2**	*Revision Quiz for Midterm Test (Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*
Week 9 **November 18-22, 2019**	**MIDTERM EXAMS**	
Week 10 **November** **25 – 29, 2019**	**LAB TASK 5** *Watch MyEnglishLab Unit 6 BBC Interview and write a comment about yourself on Edmodo*	**MEL Practice**
Week 11 **December** **2 – 6, 2019**	**MEL** **Unit 7** BBC Interview	**MEL Practice**
Week 12 **December** **9 – 13, 2019**	**LAB TASK 6** *Prepare a poster comparing two things on Canva or PowerPoint*	**LAB TASK 6 continues**
Week 13 **December** **16 – 20, 2019**	**MEL** **Unit 8** BBC Interview	**MEL** **Unit 9** BBC Interview
Week 14 **December** **23 – 27, 2019**	**LAB TASK 7** *Writing a story (real or imagined) about an adventure in nature using MS WORD.*	**LAB TASK 7 continues**
Week 15 **December 30 – January 3, 2020** **January 1**	**LAB TASK 8** *Record your comment about the video.*	**MEL Practice**
Week 16 **January** **6 –10, 2020**	**MEL** **Unit 10** BBC Interview **Unit 11** BBC Interview **Review 3 & 4**	*Revision Quiz for Final Test (Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*

Week 17 **January 13-17, 2020**	**FINAL EXAMS**

2019-2020 FALL TERM C LEVEL LAB SYLLABUS		
WEEKS	**First Hour**	**Second Hour**
Week 1 **September** **23 – 27, 2019**	**1. Introduction to the course (Share the LabSyllabus on Edmodo)** **2. Creating accounts for *Edmodo* and *MySpeakOutLab*** **3. Practice on *MySpeakOutLab*, if time available** **4. Becoming a member of *Hazırlık 2019-2020 on Facebook*** **5. Becoming a follower of *our school blog*** **6. Becoming a follower of our school Instagram account**	
Week 2 **October** **30 September – 4 October, 2019**	**MyEnglishLab** **GUIDED PRACTICE WITH STUDENTS** **Unit 1 All exercises** • **Creating accounts for Turnitin**	**MyEnglishLab** **GUIDED PRACTICE WITH STUDENTS** **Unit 1 BBC Interview**
Week 3 **October** **7 – 11, 2019**	Lab Task 1 **Prepare a presentation on 'What's in my luggage?' by using *Canva or Powerpoint***	Lab Task 1 continues
Week 4 **October** **14 – 18, 2019**	Lab Task 2 **Prepare a presentation about your new home by using *Canva***	MyEnglishLab **Unit 2-3 BBC Interviews**
Week 5 **October** **21 – 25, 2019**	Lab Task 2 continues	My EnglishLab **Unit 4 BBC Interviews**
Week 6 **October 28 – November 1,2019 (October 29)**	Lab Task 3 **Prepare a story about your childhood by using Powerpoint/Canva** • **Video for Presentation Techniques**	Lab Task 3 continues
Week 7 **November 4 – 8, 2019**	Lab Task 4 **Prepare a presentation about a journey by using *Canva***	MyEnglishLab **Unit 5-6 BBC Interviews**
Week 8 **November 11-15, 2019**	MyEnglishLab **Unit 7-8 BBC Interviews**	KAHOOT: *Revision Quiz for Midterm Test* *(Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*
Week 9 **November 18-22, 2019**	**MIDTERM EXAMS**	
Week 10 **November**	MyEnglishLab **Unit 9 BBC Interviews**	Lab Task 5

25 – 29, 2019		**Prepare a presentation about your dream Prep-School by using *Canva***
Week 11 December 2 –6, 2019	MyEnglishLab **Unit 10 BBC Interviews**	Lab Task 5 continues
Week 12 December 9 – 13, 2019	**PRE-INT Lab Task 6 Write a comment about the best&worst things about the Prep-School on *Edmodo***	Lab Task 6 continues
Week 13 December 16 – 20, 2019	MyEnglishLab **Unit 11-12 BBC Interviews**	Lab Task 7 **Prepare a poster introducing 5 useful websites for English Learners using CANVA or PowerPoint (Group Work)**
Week 14 December 23 – 27, 2019	MyEnglishLab **Unit 1-2 BBC Interviews**	Lab Task 7 continues
Week 15 December 30 – January 3, 2020 January 1	Lab Task 8 **Prepare a word set by using Quizlet**	Lab Task 8 continues
Week 16 January 6–10, 2020	MyEnglishLab **Unit 3-4-5 BBC Interviews** *assign extra exercises if necessary.	*KAHOOT*: *Revision Quiz for Final Test (Ed-Tech Integration Unit prepares the quiz)*
Week 17 January 13-17, 2020	**FINAL EXAMS**	

APPENDIX B

Qualtrics Survey

Q2 The following statements ask about your opinions and your attitudes towards the use of Web 2.0 tools that are Edmodo, Quizlet and Canva. Please rate each statement that best reflects your opinion using the scale below. Please answer open and honestly, there are no right or wrong answers.

Q3 I am aware of.....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
the existence of *Edmodo*	○	○	○	○	○
the usage of *Edmodo*	○	○	○	○	○
the fact that I can learn English language by using *Edmodo*	○	○	○	○	○

Q4 I am aware of .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
the existence of *Quizlet*	○	○	○	○	○
the usage of *Quizlet*	○	○	○	○	○
the fact that I can learn English language by using *Quizlet*	○	○	○	○	○

Q5 I am aware of .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
the existence of *Canva*	○	○	○	○	○
the usage of *Canva*	○	○	○	○	○
the fact that I can learn English language by using *Canva*	○	○	○	○	○

Q6 I always use .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Edmodo to learn English	○	○	○	○	○
Quizlet to learn English	○	○	○	○	○
Canva to learn English	○	○	○	○	○

Q7 I believe that using .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Edmodo can improve my language competency	○	○	○	○	○
Quizlet can improve my language competency	○	○	○	○	○
Canva can improve my language competency	○	○	○	○	○

Q8 The use of *Edmodo* helped me to improve my .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
reading skills	○	○	○	○	○
writing skills	○	○	○	○	○
speaking skills	○	○	○	○	○
listening skills	○	○	○	○	○
vocabulary	○	○	○	○	○
grammar	○	○	○	○	○

Q9 The use of *Canva* helped me to improve my .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
reading skills	○	○	○	○	○
writing skills	○	○	○	○	○
speaking skills	○	○	○	○	○
listening skills	○	○	○	○	○
vocabulary	○	○	○	○	○
grammar	○	○	○	○	○

Q10 The use of *Quizlet* helped me to improve my .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
reading skills	○	○	○	○	○
writing skills	○	○	○	○	○
speaking skills	○	○	○	○	○
listening skills	○	○	○	○	○
vocabulary	○	○	○	○	○
grammar	○	○	○	○	○

Q11 The use of *Edmodo is* .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
useful for my studies	○	○	○	○	○
useful to work together with my classmates	○	○	○	○	○
a good strategy in learning English	○	○	○	○	○
important for learning English	○	○	○	○	○
useful to interact with my classmates	○	○	○	○	○
useful to interact with my teacher	○	○	○	○	○

Q12 When compared to traditional classroom learning, the use of *Edmodo made my learning* .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
more entertaining	○	○	○	○	○
less stressful	○	○	○	○	○
more comfortable	○	○	○	○	○
more diverse	○	○	○	○	○
more creative	○	○	○	○	○
more effective	○	○	○	○	○

Q13 For me, it is easy .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
to learn English through *Edmodo*	○	○	○	○	○
to use *Edmodo*	○	○	○	○	○
to become skillful in using *Edmodo*	○	○	○	○	○

Q14 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
The advantages of using *Edmodo* outweighs the disadvantages of using it	○	○	○	○	○

Q15 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Edmodo helped me be more active in learning English	○	○	○	○	○

Q16 The use of *Canva* is .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
useful for my studies	○	○	○	○	○
useful to work together with my classmates	○	○	○	○	○
a good strategy in learning English	○	○	○	○	○
important for learning English	○	○	○	○	○
useful to interact with my classmates	○	○	○	○	○
useful to interact with my teacher	○	○	○	○	○

Q17 When compared to traditional classroom learning, the use of *Canva* made my learning .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
more entertaining	○	○	○	○	○
less stressful	○	○	○	○	○
more comfortable	○	○	○	○	○
more diverse	○	○	○	○	○
more creative	○	○	○	○	○
more effective	○	○	○	○	○

Q18 For me, it is easy .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
to learn English through *Canva*	○	○	○	○	○
to use *Canva*	○	○	○	○	○
to become skillful in using *Canva*	○	○	○	○	○

Q19 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
The advantages of using *Canva* overweighs the disadvantages of using it	○	○	○	○	○

Q20 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Canva helped me be more active in learning English	○	○	○	○	○

Q21 The use of *Quizlet* is .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
useful for my studies	○	○	○	○	○
useful to work together with my classmates	○	○	○	○	○
a good strategy in learning English	○	○	○	○	○
important for learning English	○	○	○	○	○
useful to interact with my classmates	○	○	○	○	○
useful to interact with my teacher	○	○	○	○	○

Q22 When compared to traditional classroom learning, the use of *Quizlet* made my learning .....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
more entertaining	○	○	○	○	○
less stressful	○	○	○	○	○
more comfortable	○	○	○	○	○
more diverse	○	○	○	○	○
more creative	○	○	○	○	○
more effective	○	○	○	○	○

Q23 For me, it is easy.....

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
to learn English through *Quizlet*	○	○	○	○	○
to use *Quizlet*	○	○	○	○	○
to become skilful in using *Quizlet*	○	○	○	○	○

Q24 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
The advantages of using *Quizlet* overweighs the disadvantages of using it	○	○	○	○	○

Q25 Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statement

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Quizlet helped me be more active in learning English	○	○	○	○	○

Q26 What is your gender?

- ○ Male
- ○ Female
- ○ Other

Q27 What is your age?

- ○ 17-23
- ○ 24-30
- ○ 31 or more

Q28 What is your level of English in the school of foreign languages?

- ○ A
- ○ B
- ○ C

Q29 This is my ..... in the school of foreign languages

- ○ 1st year
- ○ 2nd year (repeat)

Q30 Please indicate your years of experience of learning English

- ○ 1-5
- ○ 6-10
- ○ 11-15
- ○ 16 or more

Q31 What is your nationality?

- ○ Turkish
- ○ Other (Please specify) _____

APPENDIX C

Consent Form for the Qualtrics Survey (in English & Turkish)

Dear Student, my name is Gözem Çeçen. I work as a lecturer of English as a Foreign Language at your school of foreign languages. I am currently doing my master's on Teaching English as a Foreign Language at Bilkent University. Currently, I am in the process of data collection for my thesis research. The purpose of this research study is to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of the students from A, B, and C levels in the English preparatory school on the use of Web 2.0 tools in language laboratory lessons for their improvement of language learning. I would like to invite you to participate in this survey in order to help me collect data. To that end, your careful completion of the survey will contribute greatly to obtaining real data, which is crucial for more accurate findings. I guarantee that all the responses and the information that you will provide will be strictly confidential and will not be shared with others in ways that your individual responses could be identified. Furthermore, your responses will merely reflect your perceptions and will not affect your grades or scores in your lessons in any way, shape or form. Additionally, in all presented and published data resulting from this research, your responses will be aggregated with responses from the other participants to assure protection of your identity. Your name or identity will not be used anywhere. The study does not pose any psychological or physical harm to the participants. Please be informed that participation in this study is voluntary. You can discontinue your participation at any time without giving any explanation. If you would like to get more information about my research, please feel free to contact me or my supervisor through the e-mail addresses below. If you agree to participate in this study, please click on the option **"Yes, I agree, begin the questionnaire"** button below. Thank you for your invaluable time and cooperation. Gözem Çeçen MA TEFL Student Graduate School of Education Bikent University Ankara
gozem.cecen@bilkent.edu.tr & hilal.peker@bilkent.edu.tr

Sevgili Öğrenci, ismim Gözem Çeçen. Eğitim aldığınız Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'unda İngilizce okutmanı olarak çalışıyorum. Şu anda ise Bilkent Üniversitesi'nde Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce Öğretimi programında yüksek lisans yapmaktayım. Tez çalışmam için bilimsel bir çalışma yürütmekteyim. Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen ve Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu A, B ve

C kurunda olan İngilizce hazırlık öğrencilerinin dil laboratuvarı derslerinde kullandıkları Web 2.0. araçlarının yabancı dil becerilerini geliştirmedeki algıları ve Web 2.0. araçlarının kullanımına olan yaklaşımlarının incelenmesidir. Araştırmamda bana yardımcı olmanız için sizleri bu anket çalışmasına katılmaya davet ediyorum. Bu doğrultuda, anketi dikkatle cevaplamanız gerçek veriye ulaşmak için büyük bir katkıda bulunacaktır. Çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz takdirde, verdiğiniz yanıtlar ve sağlayacağınız tüm bilgiler kesinlikle gizli kalacak ve sadece araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır. Bunun yanında vereceğiniz yanıtlar sadece sizin algılarınız ile alakalı olup hiçbir şekilde hiçbir derste alacağınız notu etkilemeyecektir. Ayrıca araştırma sonuçlarından elde edilen, sunulacak ve yayınlanacak verilerde hiçbir şekilde kimliğinizi ve bireysel yanıtlarınızı ortaya çıkaracak paylaşımlar yapılmayacaktır. Ek olarak, bu anket katılımcılar için psikolojik veya fizyolojik herhangi bir risk veya tehlike teşkil etmemektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen isteğe bağlıdır. Katıldığınız takdirde çalışmanın herhangi bir aşamasında herhangi bir sebep göstermeden çalışmayı terk etme hakkına sahipsiniz. Çalışmam hakkında ek bilgi almak istediğiniz takdirde lütfen benimle veya danışmanımla aşaıdaki e-posta adreslerinden iletişime geçiniz. Yukarıdaki bilgileri okuduktan sonra çalışmaya katılmak isterseniz lütfen**"Yes, I agree, begin the questionnaire"**seçeneğini tıklayınız. Değerli zamanınız ve işbirliğiniz için çok teşekkür ederim. Gözem Çeçen Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Programı Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Bilkent Üniversitesi, Ankara
gozem.cecen@bilkent.edu.tr & hilal.peker@bilkent.edu.tr

Appendix D

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	2	83	.311	.733

Appendix E

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived usefulness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	A	B	-.30	.182	.316
		C	-.31	.194	.328
	B	A	.30	.182	.316
		C	-.02	.147	1.000
	C	A	.31	.194	.328
		B	.02	.147	1.000

Appendix F

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived usefulness of Edmodo	2	85	1.735	.183

Appendix G

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived usefulness of Edmodo	A	B	-.60	.244	.050
		C	-.84	.257	.004
	B	A	.60	.244	.050
		C	-.25	.193	.610
	C	A	.84	.257	.004
		B	.25	.193	.610

Appendix H

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived usefulness of Quizlet	2	85	2.194	.118

Appendix I

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived usefulness of Quizlet	A	B	.06	.218	1.000
		C	.11	.230	1.000
	B	A	-.06	.218	1.000
		C	.04	.173	1.000
	C	A	-.11	.230	1.000
		B	-.04	.173	1.000

Appendix J

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived usefulness of Canva	2	85	.153	.858

Appendix K

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived usefulness of Quizlet	A	B	-.36	.277	.594
		C	-.36	.292	.682
	B	A	.36	.277	.594
		C	.00	.220	1.000
	C	A	.36	.292	.682
		B	.00	.220	1.000

Appendix L

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	2	84	.157	.855

Appendix M

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	A	B	-.25	.192	.608
		C	-.31	.203	.402
	B	A	.25	.192	.608
		C	-.06	.153	1.000
	C	A	.31	.203	.402
		B	.06	.153	1.000

Appendix N

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of Edmodo	2	85	.417	.660

Appendix O

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of Edmodo	A	B	-.25	.191	.609
		C	-.34	.202	.298
	B	A	.25	.191	.609
		C	-.09	.152	1.000
	C	A	.34	.202	.298
		B	.09	.152	1.000

Appendix P

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of Quizlet	2	86	1.954	.148

Appendix Q

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of Quizlet	A	B	-.09	.200	1.000
		C	-.04	.209	1.000
	B	A	.09	.200	1.000
		C	.05	.157	1.000
	C	A	.04	.209	1.000
		B	-.05	.157	1.000

Appendix R

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of Canva	2	85	.009	.991

Appendix S

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Attitudes towards the use of Canva	A	B	-.29	.261	.789
		C	-.43	.276	.359
	B	A	.29	.261	.789
		C	-.14	.207	1.000
	C	A	.43	.276	.359
		B	.14	.207	1.000

Appendix T

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	2	86	.068	.934

Appendix U

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived ease of use of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	A	B	-.29	.171	.283
		C	-.38	.180	.116
	B	A	.29	.171	.283
		C	-.09	.135	1.000
	C	A	.38	.180	.116
		B	.09	.135	1.000

AppendixV

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived ease of use of Edmodo	2	86	.088	.916

Appendix W

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived ease of use of Edmodo	A	B	-.40	.237	.279
		C	-.44	.248	.236
	B	A	.40	.237	.279
		C	-.04	.186	1.000
	C	A	.44	.248	.236
		B	.04	.186	1.000

Appendix X

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived ease of use of Quizlet	2	86	2.654	.076

Appendix Y

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived ease of use of Quizlet	A	B	.01	.222	1.000
		C	-.01	.233	1.000
	B	A	-.01	.222	1.000
		C	-.03	.174	1.000
	C	A	.01	.233	1.000
		B	.03	.174	1.000

Appendix Z

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Perceived ease of use of Canva	2	86	.507	.604

Appendix AA

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Perceived ease of use of Canva	A	B	-.48	.293	.314
		C	-.68	.307	.091
	B	A	.48	.293	.314
		C	-.20	.230	1.000
	C	A	.68	.307	.091
		B	.20	.230	1.000

Appendix BB

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	2	85	.747	.477

Appendix CC

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Awareness of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	A	B	-.44	.196	.082
		C	-.93	.206	.000
	B	A	.44	.196	.082
		C	-.49	.155	.007
	C	A	.93	.206	.000
		B	.49	.155	.007

Appendix DD

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Awareness of Edmodo	2	86	.476	.623

Appendix EE

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Awareness of Edmodo	A	B	-.25	.197	.619
		C	-.73	.206	.002
	B	A	.25	.197	.619
		C	-.48	.155	.007
	C	A	.73	.206	.002
		B	.48	.155	.007

Appendix FF

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Awareness of Quizlet	2	85	1.262	.288

Appendix GG

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Awareness of Quizlet	A	B	-.30	.256	.751
		C	-.71	.270	.030
	B	A	.30	.256	.751
		C	-.41	.203	.134
	C	A	.71	.270	.030
		B	.41	.203	.134

Appendix HH

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Awareness of Canva	2	86	5.92	.555

Appendix II

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Awareness of Canva	A	B	-.77	.269	.015
		C	-1.32	.282	.000
	B	A	.77	.269	.015
		C	-.55	.211	.033
	C	A	1.32	.282	.000
		B	.55	.211	.033

Appendix JJ

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	2	86	2.035	.137

Appendix KK

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Actual system usage of the Web 2.0 tools (i.e. Edmodo, Quizlet, Canva)	A	B	-.54	.197	.021
		C	-.88	.206	.000
	B	A	.54	.197	.021
		C	-.34	.155	.097
	C	A	.88	.206	.000
		B	.34	.155	.097

Appendix LL

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Actual system usage of Edmodo	2	86	.894	.413

Appendix MM

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Actual system usage of Edmodo	A	B	-.49	.236	.121
		C	-.88	.247	.002
	B	A	.49	.236	.121
		C	-.39	.185	.110
	C	A	.88	.247	.002
		B	.39	.185	.110

Appendix NN

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Actual system usage of Quizlet	2	86	.429	.653

Appendix OO

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Actual system usage of Quizlet	A	B	-.72	.243	.012
		C	-.75	.254	.012
	B	A	.72	.243	.012
		C	-.04	.191	1.000
	C	A	.75	.254	.012
		B	.04	.191	1.000

Appendix PP

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent variable	*df1*	*df2*	*F*	*p*
Actual system usage of Canva	2	86	.116	.890

Appendix QQ

Multiple Comparison Table (Bonferroni Results)

Dependent Variable	Level of English	Level of English	Mean Difference	Standard Error	*p*
Actual system usage of Canva	A	B	-.419	.306	.524
		C	-1.000	.321	.007
	B	A	.419	.306	.524
		C	-.581	.240	.053
	C	A	1.000	.321	.007
		B	.581	.240	.053