

## The Effects of Web 2.0 Tools on Foundation English Students` Success Rates at A Private University in Iraq

Saban Kara<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq  
Correspondence: Saban Kara, Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq  
Email: [saban.kara@tiu.edu.iq](mailto:saban.kara@tiu.edu.iq)

Doi: 10.23918/ijsses.v10i1p22

**Abstract:** Web 2.0 tools have had a profound impact on people`s lives in the last 20 years in parallel to the advancements in technology. Web 2.0 tools have transformed many fields as well as education. Web 2.0 tools allow users to create the content and interact with others on the internet rather than only receiving information. To this aim, the effects of Zip Grade and Padlet applications on Foundation English students` success rates and motivation at a private university in Erbil, Iraq were investigated meticulously in this study by employing a mixed methods design. In this regard, a survey, a questionnaire and an interview were used to gather qualitative data, while quantitative data were collected by two exams. MAXQDA software program was used to transcribe the interview. Additionally, descriptive analysis was used to analyze the results of the exams via independent samples t test and paired samples t test. The findings revealed that Zip Grade and Padlet increased students` success rates and motivation significantly. Also, it was observed that Zip Grade and Padlet increased interaction among students. The interpretations based on the findings in this study may have some implications to integrate Web 2.0 tools into education successfully on a global scale.

**Keywords:** Web 2.0 Tools, Zip Grade, Padlet, Motivation, Success

### 1. Introduction

Humanity has witnessed many developments in technology and science in this century. The effects of the developments in these fields can easily be noticed in people`s lives (Daskan & Yildiz, 2020). To illustrate, advancements in electronic devices have facilitated household duties at home with robot mops, washing machines and refrigerators. Likewise, planes and high-speed trains have ensured that the journeys last shorter than before. Additionally, there are many means of communication such as mobile phones, laptops, tablets and PCs, so people can communicate with each other at ease. In terms of scientific developments, a growing number of medications have been produced to recover and be healthy again. Additionally, modern devices have been invented to use in health care systems. Moreover, robots have been used actively in factories, houses and workplaces. In parallel to the developments in technology, some terms have emerged to describe the gaps between different generations. It is unsubtle that there are stark differences between generations in terms of digital literacy (Bozatzi, 2021). Digital literacy refers to being

Received: November 4, 2022

Accepted: December 27, 2022

Kara, S. (2023). The Effects of Web 2.0 Tools on Foundation English Students` Success Rates at A Private University in Iraq. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies*, 10(1), 22-36.

equipped with required skills to communicate with people successfully in the digital age.

Additionally, digital literacy refers to commanding the means of communication precisely, so people can benefit from it to carry out daily tasks, develop professionally and handle any issues (Pardede, 2012; Altun, 2015). In this regard, digital native and digital immigrant terms stand out. While the former refers to someone who was born in the information age, the latter one describes someone who was born before the information age. In other words, digital natives are capable of adapting to new technologies and trends because they were born after the 1980s (Basal, 2013; Kara & Yildiz, 2022). On the other hand, digital immigrants were born prior to the 1980s, so they were not familiar with the new technologies and trends. Digital natives are known to receive information quickly and carry out multiple tasks simultaneously, whereas digital immigrants can prefer focusing on a specific task and managing it gradually. Significant differences can be noticed about the attitudes of digital natives and digital immigrants towards new technological tools.

A ground-breaking evolution has been prevalent in World Wide Web (WWW hereafter). Three stages of WWW have been introduced so far (Alaghbary, 2021) Web 1.0 refers to the first phase which allowed users solely to read and get information. Users were not allowed to create content or edit in Web 1.0. Web 1.0 tools were known as the earliest examples of the internet which could be exemplified with earliest forms of Internet Explorer, Yahoo, Google, Msn. However, Web 2.0 has been known as the current form of the internet. Users are able to create content, comment, watch, interact and share knowledge in multiple formats. Web 2.0 has been created to offer more features for users. Users can both read and contribute to the content in Web 2.0. Updated forms of web browsers, YouTube, Facebook, WhatsApp, Viber, Twitter, Instagram and Snapchat can be given as pioneering examples of Web 2.0. The third phase in the evolution of the internet is Web 3.0 which is characterized as using artificial intelligence. Web 3.0 has been invented to integrate and analyze large chunks of data with the help of artificial intelligence, so more realistic, trustable, suitable and feasible results can be gathered. In other words, Web 3.0 technologies help users to get personalized data (Aghaei et al., 2012). Social media companies and web browsers have been actively using them to recognize the users and offer the best services.

Web 2.0 tools have many implications in all fields particularly in educational institutions. In other words, Web 2.0 tools have enriched the classroom atmosphere tremendously. Web 2.0 tools foster a collaborative learning atmosphere, so retention rate can increase considerably if traditional teaching methods are merged with Web 2.0 tools (Celik et al., 2022). To illustrate, an automated grading system Zip Grade has converted a time-consuming grading activity into a time-saver one. It helped educators to create exams and grade within seconds with the help of Zip Grade application on portable gadgets. Additionally, it allows the teachers to get statistical analysis for each student and question respectively. Moreover, it allows users to take the exams as paper-based or online. Apart from Zip Grade, Kahoot application supports the teachers to have more engaging classes and break the monotony in the classes (Wang & Tahir, 2020; Senel & Akman, 2016). Kahoot is a quiz application to revise any topics in English. Teachers can fetch another teacher's previous quizzes or create their own quizzes based on their choices. Students can learn how to race against time and click on the right option. Additionally, it allows the users to take it multiple times until they grasp all details. The questions can be enriched by the videos and images to appeal to students' varied learning channels which are auditory, visual, kinesthetic and tactile. Learners are able to expand

their level of comprehension and successfully accomplish activities with the assistance of these channels (Yildiz & Celik, 2020). Subsequently, Padlet application helps teachers to receive writing submissions and give valuable feedback online (Fuchs, 2014). It helps students to exchange their ideas and learn from each other.

## 2. Literature Review

The features of WWW have expanded a lot since the advent of it by Tim Berner`s Lee in 1990. The digital transformation has been at dizzying speed in the last 30 years. Although the websites used to serve people only to read in Web 1.0, nowadays users can read, create and execute with the help of Web 2.0 and 3.0 tools. Accordingly, the number of rival companies increase to meet the needs of users in different fields. Web 2.0 tools have received much attention globally on grounds that they are more accessible, convenient and practical compared to Web 1.0 and 3.0 tools. Ucar and Yazici (2021) attest that there are two main functions to use Web 2.0 tools which are interacting with others and creating a content for others. In other words, people can interact with other people via Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, or they create a content for others via YouTube, Tik Tok or Instagram. Meanwhile, there is no distinction between these web 2.0 tools to interact with others and create content. Most Web 2.0 tools allow the members to create content or watch the created content simultaneously.

Web 2.0 tools have affected the whole world considerably in many aspects. It cannot be contemplated that these tools will not have some reflections in education. Apart from their influence in different fields, the educational institutions have also taken the initiative to integrate Web 2.0 tools into the classrooms. In this respect, Zip Grade, Kahoot and Padlet have received much attention from the stakeholders of education because they have pledged to save time and increase the interaction and collaboration in classes. These tools are used not only conduct exams but also enrich learning as revision activities. Considering the popularity of innovative software companies, a wealth of research has been conducted on the effects of them in educational institutions with various implications. Previous studies on the effects of Web 2.0 tools on students` success rates have revealed that they affect students` success rates positively. To illustrate, Ozpinar (2020) conducted a study in Turkey on pre-service maths teacher which revealed that pre-service teachers implemented Kahoot, Plicker, Edmodo and Zip Grade received positive feedbacks in their classes where they undertook an intensive training period before being an in-service teacher. They also postulated that students were more eager to learn and join the activities when the lessons were enriched by technology. It was also observed that student and parent satisfaction rates increased substantially when pre-service teachers integrated Web 2.0 tools into their lessons effectively. The study acknowledged that all bodies took advantage of Web 2.0 tools considering their positive views. Subsequently, Wagstaff et al. (2019) conducted a study in the USA on 12 teachers from multiple areas of study about the effectiveness of automated grading systems which uncovered that automated grading systems were feasible to manage many exam papers within minutes. However, they hinted that some modifications could be helpful to grade them by setting aside less time compared to current practices. In addition, Konstantinidis et al. (2013) carried out a study in Greece on teachers which displayed that Web 2.0 tools offer many opportunities to implement blended learning in classes, so integrating Web 2.0 tools including Google Forms, Kahoot, Zip Grade and Padlet could be of greatest importance to raise the standards in education. Furthermore, Fuchs (2014) conducted a study in the USA on college students about Padlet which revealed that students`

motivation and writing exam scores increased when they had a chance to write on a virtual wall. Students reiterated that it was fun, engaging and informative to write on the wall, see other students' works and comments. They also attested that getting online feedback from the teacher and resubmitting were more preferable in the information age. Additionally, Ellis (2015) carried out a study in the UK on university students about Padlet which culminated in positive reactions. Students stated that the lectures were more engaging; expressing online comments reduced their stress for public speaking; exchanging ideas increased by peer- feedback activities on Padlet.

Some drawbacks can arise if students and teachers are not guided well about conducting Web 2.0 tools-based education successfully. For instance, Nasrullah (2021) carried out a study on English teachers in Indonesia which revealed that teachers were aware of the positive influence of Zip Grade exams but reluctant to prepare exams on grounds that it was difficult to create and grade them. They also contend that students were likely to make some mistakes while filling the correct option appropriately, so it was not reasonable to conduct Zip Grade exams before informing students in workshops. Additionally, Mahmud et al. (2019) conducted a study on ESL students in an Academic Writing course in Indonesia. The study revealed that Padlet offers many benefits, but it was not enough to accommodate all the needs of ESL students. They opted in a writing application which can offer corrections and grade their works automatically. Subsequently, Saetra and Skaug (2021) conducted a study in Norway on university students about the efficiency of Padlet. The study revealed that receiving feedback only from the teacher can be a demotivating factor. Peer feedback, setting the rules in advance to prevent irrelevant conversations could be the norms in Padlet enriched classes. Moreover, Wang and Tahir (2020) conducted a meta-analysis on 1232 articles related to Kahoot. Although many positive aspects were included, some studies revealed that frequent internet outages, having difficulty reading and answering questions on a bright screen, stressful time pressure to answer on time, unable to change answers after the submission were some adverse effects of Kahoot. It can be stated that planning and monitoring the process meticulously can increase positive gains of Web 2.0 tools.

### **2.1 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

This study aimed to pinpoint the effects of Web 2.0 tools particularly Zip Grade and Padlet on Foundation English students' success rates. To this end, questionnaires, surveys, interviews and exams were used to collect and analyze data. Based on this framework, the following research questions were formulated as follows:

- Are Web 2.0 tools particularly Zip Grade and Padlet helpful to increase Foundation English students' success rates?
- Do Zip Grade and Padlet have an influence on increasing students' motivation?

### **3. Methodology**

A mixed method design was used in this study to combine qualitative data with quantitative data. A mixed methods design was preferred to classify and cross-check the data (Palinkas et al., 2011). Apart from the questionnaire, survey and interview analyzed by SPSS 26. and MAXQDA, the descriptive analysis was used to interpret statistical analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to describe basic features of the data

and make interpretations accordingly (Kemp et al., 2018). SPSS 26. was used to get descriptive analysis by independent samples t test and paired samples t test.

### 3.1 Participants, Setting and Sampling Procedure

Foundation English course students who took intensive language learning lessons at a private university in 2021-2022 Academic Year in Erbil, Iraq comprised the population in this study. 30 students were chosen out of 300 Foundation English students. Stratified random sampling method was used to choose the sample which necessitated the researcher to split the population into 10 sub-groups and choose 3 members in each group randomly. The setting was chosen a private university on purpose because the medium of instruction has been 100 % English, and diverse communities have received their education in a peaceful atmosphere. Moreover, students have been familiar with learning English via Web 2.0 tools such as YouTube, Kahoot, Padlet and Google Form, as using the latest technology in each class has been common. Additionally, the university has qualified instructors from different nationalities. Moreover, the university administration encourages academics to enrich the lessons with Web 2.0 tools. Foundation English students have been placed in this section to sharpen their English throughout the year, so they can adapt to all other lessons in their departments. In this regard, the students` curriculum was designed to accommodate their needs in 4 skills, so they can improve their English substantially once they are successful in the course as freshman students.

Participants` ages and genders were given in Table 1.

Table 1: Participants` frequency in terms of gender and age

Variable(s)	Option	F	%
Gender	Female	12	40
	Male	18	60
Age	18-21	24	80
	22+	6	20
Total		30	100

Once Table 1 was examined, it was seen that male students (60 %) were higher than female ones (40 %). In addition to the gender, the participants ages were illustrated in detail which displayed that 80 % of the students were between 18 and 21 years old, whereas 20 % of the students were 22 years old or older.

### 3.2 Data Collection Procedure

The study was initiated and finalized within 12 weeks, so the researcher informed the participants in detail, got their consent forms, organized workshops and collected data by defined research instruments. Scope 1 published by Oxford was used as the primary coursebook to collect data in this study. The researcher initiated the study with a pre-test to measure their current level in English. In this respect, Midterm exam results were used as pre-test. According to the average of each group, it was observed that the levels were close to each other prior to main study. Subsequently, they kept learning from Scope 1 within 8 weeks. During this period, control group students studied the units in a traditional format by following the pages

in an order. On the other hand, experimental group students took unit revision tests by Zip Grade. The exams comprised sections related to reading, listening, grammar and vocabulary. In addition, experimental group students left their writing submissions on Padlet. Zip Grade exams were conducted biweekly as students completed each unit in 2 weeks. Likewise, they needed to leave their writing works on Padlet on a biweekly basis. Zip Grade exams were analyzed within the class, while Padlet submissions were graded by peers, or the instructors based on the pre-defined plan. The students took the Final Exam 8 weeks later, and this exam was used as post-test. The results were fetched and transferred to SPSS to get detailed analysis. In the next 4 weeks, the researcher conducted the survey, the questionnaire and the interview to pinpoint whether quantitative results in SPSS were consistent with the findings in qualitative research instruments.

#### 4. Findings

Findings of this study were classified under 4 headings which were the questionnaire, the survey, the interview and descriptive analysis, so each instrument was elaborated to get detailed analysis and make interpretations accordingly.

##### 4.1. The Analysis of the Questionnaire

Table 2 shed light on students` opinions in the questionnaire.

Table 2: Students` opinion on ICT tools, zip grade and padlet

ITEMS	Mean	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f
1. I am in favor of integrating ICT tools into lessons.	4,86	87 %	26	13 %	4	0%	0	0 %	0	0 %	0
2. It is easy to use Zip Grade	2,96	23 %	7	14 %	4	23 %	7	17 %	5	23 %	7
3. It is easy to share a post and see comments on Padlet.	4,7	84 %	25	3 %	1	13 %	4	0 %	0	0 %	0
4. Using Zip Grade and Padlet increased my motivation to learn more.	4,86	93 %	28	0 %	0	7%	2	0 %	0	0 %	0

5. Using Zip Grade and Padlet boosted my overall performance and marks in English classes.	4,53	53 %	16	47 %	14	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0
6. I wish I had been instructed by Zip Grade and Padlet previously.	5	100 %	30	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0

The participants responded to 6 questions to pinpoint their genuine opinions on the implementation of Padlet and Zip Grade enriched program.

Item 1 was related to using ICT tools in classes which revealed that the majority of the students took side with enriching lessons with ICT tools. 87 % (26) students chose strongly agree, while 13 % (4) students chose agree options. On the other hand, no student chose neutral, disagree or strongly disagree options which confirmed that students had positive views on ICT tools.

Item 2 indulged in the convenience of Zip Grade which uncovered that it was tough to adapt to Zip Grade within a limited time. 23 % (7) respondents chose strongly agree, while 13 % (4) respondents opted in agree options. Additionally, 23 % (7), 17 % (5), 23 % (7) students chose neutral, disagree or strongly disagree options. These gathered data show that some workshops can help students figure out some tips to take Zip Grade exams successfully.

Item 3 was related to using the features of Padlet at ease which revealed that more than three quarters of the respondents opted in strongly agree. Only 1 (3%) and 4 (13 %) chose agree and neutral respectively. Additionally, no student chose neither disagree nor strongly disagree. These gathered data show that Padlet was feasible and user-friendly for most of the students.

Item 4 was designed whether students` motivation increased once they used Zip Grade and Padlet. The results uncovered that 93 % (28) of the students opted in strongly agree which implied that their motivation increased without any hesitation. However, only (7 %) 2 students chose neutral. The results hinted that Zip Grade and Padlet were regarded as instruments to increase students` motivation tremendously.

Once item 5 was analyzed, students had varied views to increase their overall marks with the help of Zip Grade and Padlet. 16 (53 %) students chose strongly agree, while 14 (47 %) students took side with agree option. It can be argued that more than the satisfaction rate to increase their overall marks via Padlet and Zip Grade was quite high.

Item 6 was designed to figure out whether they regret not having joined such a program earlier. The results revealed that all students wanted to join such a program earlier considering its benefits. It can be stated that program outcomes were met successfully at the end of the study.

Considering all items, it can be concluded that students had mostly positive views during the study except some points which need to be improved.

#### 4.2 The Analysis of the Survey

Table 3: Participants` opinions on favorite features of zip grade

	Categories	Frequency	%
1	Accurate, Organized	25	83
2	Instant Feedback	30	100
3	Flexible	26	87
4	Environmentally Friendly	23	76.7
5	User Friendly	24	80
6	Item Analysis	30	100

According to the survey results in Table 3, it was noticed that Zip Grade had some points to improve in terms of being user-friendly and environmentally friendly. On the other hand, instant feedback and item analysis were the most appreciated features of Zip Grade.

Table 4: Participants` opinions on favorite features of padlet

	Categories	Frequency	%
1	Visually Appealing	30	100
2	User Friendly	26	87
3	Environmentally Friendly	29	97
4	Interactive	28	93
5	Flexible	30	100
6	Peer or teacher feedback	30	100

Based on the survey results in Table 4, nearly all the students were satisfied with the Padlet. All features of Padlet were favored by 87 % or more. It can be stated that Padlet is more successful to meet the needs of users in given aspects.

#### 4.3 The Analysis of the Interview

I had some prior experience and knowledge about Zip Grade during my high school period. However, I had never been exposed to a writing instruction model with Padlet before. Throughout the study, I mastered English in 4 skills. I improved my listening and reading via Zip Grade activities. After that, we analyzed



our mistakes in cooperation. Additionally, I improved my writing and speaking skills on Padlet because we wrote our ideas, discussed about them, brainstormed to learn from our mistakes and write mistake-free ideas in the following weeks as much as we could. I have witnessed once more that Web 2.0 tools particularly Zip Grade and Padlet can transform the education and increase learning rates of the students. (Student 2)

I am accustomed to using some applications to have fun and expand my knowledge. However, I did not have much information about Zip Grade and Padlet. I figured out my mistakes when my teacher displayed common mistakes on the smart board. In addition, my teacher sent me detailed analysis of my exam via Zip Grade, so I learned a lot. Moreover, Padlet application was great to write and exchange ideas in a collaborative learning atmosphere. Now, I am more willing and confident to learn English with the help of Web 2.0 tools. (Student 6)

My instructor used to spend much time to form and grade exams, but now s/he saves a lot of time and energy via Padlet and Zip Grade. Zip Grade exams were graded automatically, and Padlet helped my instructor provide online feedback. Thus, we were able to organize some extra-curricular activities with my instructor. We organized many trips to have fun and learn. (Student 7)

I could not take advantage of learning during this study for some reasons. To begin with, my internet was not stable. Additionally, I was very careless while filling the options on Zip Grade answer sheet. I filled one question wrongly which resulted in taking only 20 in one exam. Moreover, racing against time increased my anxiety, so taking the exams traditionally was my first choice. I wish my internet had been more trustable and I had not been careless, so I could benefit from this program as much as my friends. (Student 10)

Padlet application was so practical to make a submission and observe the feedbacks and the marks. Writing classes were so monotonous and tiring for me, but now I am eager to write and send electronically. Moreover, I learned how to manage my time rationally in the Zip Grade exams. I reap the fruits of being a digital native who is good at using technology. (Student 13)

Zip Grade application was so convenient for us because our instructor allowed us to take the exams electronically with our Zip Grade accounts as students. Initially, we took the exams on the paper in class. Subsequently, we did the same exam online at home. Taking the same exam twice increased our learning and motivation. Likewise, writing on virtual Padlet walls increased our productivity and reduced our anxiety. We regained our self-confidence towards writing. I wish I had joined such a great program before. (Student 19)

This program was beneficial for me in many aspects. To begin with, I learn better if I am exposed to visual materials. Zip Grade and Padlet helped me to learn by visual instruments. Additionally, getting statistical analysis for each student and question via Zip Grade was a ground-breaking feature for me. Likewise, my instructor provided precious feedback for my works timely on Padlet, so I could have a chance to fix my chronic mistakes in writing. I hope this study can spread to all stages at university, so other students could benefit. (Student 23)

Having 2 detailed workshops about the study helped me a lot to be clarified. I learned how to take the exams successfully on Zip Grade and make a submission on Padlet. Our instructors shed light on each point prior to exam, so I could increase my productivity in this program. (Student 28)

#### 4.4 Descriptive Data Analysis

Independent samples t test and paired samples t test were employed to measure whether there was a significant statistical difference. Paired samples t test was run to compare the means of two measurements between two time points as pre-test and post-test, whereas independent samples t test was used widely to compare the means of two independent groups (Derrick et al., 2017). In other words, independent samples t test was run by considering the values of both control and experimental group, whereas paired samples t test was used to compare each group's difference within itself. Independent samples t test analysis was illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Independent samples T test analysis

Variables	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig
Pre-test	Control	15	53	12,364			
Pre-test	Experimental	15	54	9,673	-.247	28	.807
Post-test	Control	15	59	7,528			
Post-test	Experimental	15	73	9,599	-4,339	28	.000

Note.  $P < 0.05$

Based on the values of pre-test in Table 5, there was no significant difference between each group because it was measured as .807 which was greater than 0.05. Additionally, there was not a significant difference between each group in terms of mean scores which were 53 in control group and 54 in experimental group. It can be stated that a significant difference was not measured in the initial step. On the other hand, when the p values were analyzed in terms of post-test results, it was measured as .000 which was highly significant. Based on the post-test results, it can be attested that experimental group outperformed. However, control group's improvement was not as noticeable as experimental group. Paired samples t test analysis in control group was illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: Paired samples T test analysis in control group

Paired Samples Test								
	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Control Pre- test Post-test	-6.333	9.904	2.557	-11.818	-.849	-2.477	14	.027

Paired samples test was run to measure whether there was a significant difference in each group separately by comparing means of pre-test and post-test. Based on the observed values in control group in Table 6, p value was measured as .027 which was greater than 0.05, so no significant difference was pinpointed. Additionally, mean score, standard deviation, standard error mean, t value and degrees of freedom were observed as -6.333, 9.904, 2.557 and 14 respectively. These figures were also in line with independent samples t test results.

Paired samples t test analysis in experimental group was illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7: Paired samples T test analysis in experimental group

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	S (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Experimental	Pre-test Post-test	-19.000	13.784	3.559	-26.633	-11.367	-5.339	14	.000

The same procedure was conducted in experimental group as well in Table 7. P-value was measured as .000 which was less than 0.05. The gathered data show that there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test in terms of experimental group. Moreover, mean score, standard deviation, standard error mean, t value and degrees of freedom were noted as -19.000, 13.784, 3.559, -5.339 and 14 respectively. These figures also support the gathered data in independent samples t test which revealed that there was a considerable difference in experimental group.

## 5. Discussion

How can a teacher judge student learning? Which assessments are best? Teachers' answers may vary. It is vital to increase instructors' awareness of existing assessment procedures and train them to choose the most effective ways of assessing their students' learning objectives (Ulker & Yildiz, 2021). Currently, it's rare to find extremely motivated and oriented kids because they're largely interested in social media, which makes them introverts. Low motivation to study spoken English leads to poor oral English (Yildiz, 2019). This study investigated the effects of Web 2.0 tools on Foundation English course students' end of the year marks and motivation rates. Based on the cross-checked data, some points were explored in detail. The first noticeable point was the adaptation of students for new technologies in education. The majority of the students took side with learning by ICT tools as stated by Elam and Nesbit (2012). They argue that ICT tools convert a monotonous lesson into a fun and interactive activity. In addition, students who were exposed to Web 2.0 based instruction via Zip Grade and Padlet outperformed based on the post-test results. Web 2.0 tools foster learning as they offer a welcoming atmosphere to learn by cooperation (Ruder et al., 2021). Also, Turpin (2018) states that Web 2.0 tools are feasible to realize blended learning in education. Subsequently, it was observed that students' motivation and enthusiasm increased when they learned by Web 2.0 tools as postulated by Sadaf et al. (2012). Furthermore, item analysis and instant grading were the most appreciated features of Zip Grade exams as it was in line with Ningsih and Mulyono's (2019) statements. Likewise, being interactive, user-friendly and environmentally friendly were the advantages of Padlet application. Deni and Zainal (2018) attest that Padlet can be used widely as an educational tool for its varied benefits. The findings of the study also hinted that some workshops had to be organized to realize the expected outcomes of Web 2.0 tools as stated by Cirit (2015). Some weaknesses of Zip Grade were stated which were related to being user friendly and environmentally friendly. It was noticed that the questions and answer sheets were mostly printed, so it had some adverse effects on forests. Online versions of the exam enriched by CALL can be encouraged to eliminate such issues and save the environment (Al-Hattami, 2020). Additionally, the possibility of filling the wrong option on the answer sheet increased the anxiety of students. Some measures can be taken to relieve the stress of the students. For instance, the number of questions or the frequency of taking exams can be reduced. Taking a limited number of revision exams by Zip Grade can be beneficial to increase students' self-confidence, so they can take them successfully without feeling stressed. Considering all mentioned points, it can be stated that Zip Grade and Padlet had profound effects on students' success rates and motivation except some minor weaknesses which can be eliminated with meticulous planning.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study investigated the effects of Web 2.0 tools particularly Zip Grade and Padlet on students' achievement rates and motivation. The exams, the questionnaire, the survey and the interview results were consistent. The gathered data showed that students would rather have known Web 2.0 technologies previously. Additionally, students were enthusiastic to adapt to new technologies in education as they were digital natives. Moreover, the students who were exposed to Web 2.0 tools enriched education earned far better marks in the post-test. Furthermore, their motivation was boosted considerably. After that, the positive atmosphere spread to other classes to learn by cooperation. Subsequently, peer feedback was considered as a revolutionary practice to allow students to exchange their ideas and neutralize their

mistakes as much as they can in the following weeks. Afterwards, some essential suggestions were expressed for the betterment of the given applications, so they will be more feasible and user-friendly in the future.

Some recommendations can be made for stakeholders of education who are keen on integrating technology into their educational institutions and researchers. This study examined the effects of Padlet and Zip Grade together. The effects of Zip Grade and Padlet can be studied separately in the future studies. Additionally, only two Web 2.0 tools were included in this study which can be enriched with other Web 2.0 tools in further studies. Additionally, only 30 freshman students comprised the sample which can be increased with more students in different stages. Finally, only a private university was the population which can be increased by including other public and private universities in the region to get a more comprehensive perspective about the habits of students to use Web 2.0 tools.

## References

- Aghaei, S., Nematbakhsh, M. A., & Farsani, H. K. (2012). Evolution of the world wide web: From WEB 1.0 TO WEB 4.0. *International Journal of Web & Semantic Technology*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Alaghbary, G. S. (2021). Integrating technology with Bloom's revised taxonomy: Web 2.0-enabled learning designs for online learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(1), 10-37
- Al-Hattami, A. A. (2020). E-Assessment of Students Performance During the E-Teaching and Learning. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(8), 1537-1547.
- Altun, M. (2015). The integration of technology into foreign language teaching. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 6(1), 29-34.
- Başal, A., & Education, L. (2013). ELT teachers as online material developers. *The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning*, 1(2), 8-12.
- Bozatzi, A. (2021). The Process Writing Approach: Integrating Padlet and Web 2.0 Tools in the ELT Writing Classroom. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 5(24).
- Celik, B., Bilgin, R., & Yildiz, Y. (2022). The views of instructors in foreign language teaching with distance education model during the Covid 19 pandemic process: A study at Tishk International University in Erbil, Iraq. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 9(1), 148-176.
- Cirit, N. C. (2015). Assessing ELT Pre-Service Teachers via Web 2.0 Tools: Perceptions toward Traditional, Online and Alternative Assessment. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 14(3), 9-19.
- Daskan, A., & Yildiz, Y. (2020). Blended learning: A potential approach to promote learning outcomes. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 7(4), 103-108.
- Deni, A. R. M., & Zainal, Z. I. (2018, October). Padlet as an educational tool: Pedagogical considerations and lessons learnt. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Education Technology and Computers* (pp. 156-162).
- Derrick, B., Russ, B., Toher, D., & White, P. (2017). Test statistics for the comparison of means for two samples that include both paired and independent observations. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, 16(1), 9.

- Elam, J. R., & Nesbit, B. (2012). The effectiveness of project-based learning utilizing Web 2. 0 tools in EFL. *Jaltcall Journal*, 8(2), 113-127.
- Ellis, D. (2015, October). Using Padlet to increase student engagement in lectures. In *14th european conference on e-learning: ECEL2015* (pp. 195-198).
- Fuchs, B. (2014). The writing is on the wall: using Padlet for whole-class engagement. *Loex Quarterly*, 40(4), 7.
- Kara, S., & Yildiz, Y. (2022). From a commodity to addiction: Are mobile phones valuable commodities or sources of addiction for freshman students?. *Amazonia Investiga*, 11(56), 196-209.
- Kemp, S. E., Ng, M., Hollowood, T., & Hort, J. (2018). Introduction to descriptive analysis. *Descriptive analysis in sensory evaluation*, 1.
- Konstantinidis, A., Theodosiadou, D., & Pappos, C. (2013). Web 2.0 tools for supporting teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 14(4), 287-295.
- Mahmud, M. Z. (2019). Students' perceptions of using padlet as a learning tool for English writing. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching (CPLT)*, 7(2), 29-39.
- Nasrullah, N. (2021, January). Pre-service and in-service English teachers' outlook in the use of online learning. In *UAD TEFL International Conference* (Vol. 2, pp. 54-61).
- Ningsih, S., & Mulyono, H. (2019). Digital assessment resources in primary and secondary school classrooms: Teachers' use and perceptions.
- Özpinar, İ. (2020). Preservice teachers' use of web 2.0 tools and perspectives on their use in real classroom environments. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 11(3), 814-841.
- Palinkas, L. A., Aarons, G. A., Horwitz, S., Chamberlain, P., Hurlburt, M., & Landsverk, J. (2011). Mixed method designs in implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 38(1), 44-53.
- Pardede, P. (2012). Blended Learning for ELT. *Online Submission*, 2(3), 165-178.
- Ruder, P., Maier, M. H., & Simkins, S. P. (2021). Getting started with team-based learning (TBL): An introduction. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 52(3), 220-230.
- Sadaf, A., Newby, T. J., & Ertmer, P. A. (2012). Exploring pre-service teachers' beliefs about using Web 2.0 technologies in K-12 classroom. *Computers & Education*, 59(3), 937-945.
- Sætra, Henrik Skaug. "Using Padlet to enable online collaborative mediation and scaffolding in a statistics course." *Education Sciences* 11, no. 5 (2021): 219.
- Şenel, M., & AKMAN, D. B. (2016). Fun teaching! Fun tech-ing! Interactive educational games for young learners. *Participatory Educational Research*, 3(4), 12-21.
- Turpin, C. M. (2018). *Blended Learning And Its Effect On Student Achievement: An Action Research Study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina).
- Uçar, S., & Yazici, Y. (2021). AN EXPLORATORY RESEARCH: ELT AND ELL STUDENTS'TENDENCIES TOWARDS WEB 2.0 TOOLS. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 8(12).
- Ulker, V., & Yildiz, Y. (2021). The implementation of the authentic assessment in EFL classes in Erbil. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 8(2), 206-221.

- Wagstaff, B., Lu, C., & Chen, X. A. (2019, March). Automatic exam grading by a mobile camera: Snap a picture to grade your tests. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces: Companion* (pp. 3-4).
- Wang, A. I., & Tahir, R. (2020). The effect of using Kahoot! for learning—A literature review. *Computers & Education*, 149, 103818.
- Yildiz, Y. (2019). EFL learners' needs in preparatory schools and supplementary techniques to improve their language proficiency. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(1), 586-596.
- Yildiz, Y., & Celik, B. (2020). The use of scaffolding techniques in language learning: Extending the level of understanding. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 7(3), 148-153.