

TARTU UNIVERSITY NARVA COLLEGE

DIVISION of FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Kirill Vassiljev

USE OF WEB 2.0 TOOLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING: A NOVELTY OR  
A MUST?

(on the example of the academic staff and students of Narva College of the University of  
Tartu)

Bachelor's thesis

Supervisor: A. Golubeva, MA

NARVA 2013

## **PREFACE**

The 21<sup>st</sup> century, especially the wide use of the Internet, has brought a substantial number of changes into major aspects of life: shopping, working, communicating; the educational process is not an exception either, which includes, as a rule, learning of languages. Today one of the most popular, spoken and used languages on the Internet is English – 55.3 % of all the websites (W3Techs 2013: para. 2), and in the world in general – 380 million native speakers (EnglishLanguageGuide 2013: para. 1) plus over 700 million people (Ibid.: para. 5). But can the Internet environment help students learn the English language? The present paper attempts to study the awareness of the students and academic staff of Narva College of the University of Tartu about the opportunities of using Web 2.0 tools for English language learning and to justify the use of these tools.

The first aim of the thesis paper is to explore what kinds of Web 2.0 tools are used for learning English, the ways and necessity of using these tools as well as their accessibility for learners of the language. The second aim is to make clear whether it is a novelty or a must, how Web 2.0 is implemented in the educational process and to find out whether these tools are used for English language learning in Narva College of the University of Tartu.

The paper falls into four parts: the Introduction, two core chapters, and the Conclusion. The Introduction provides an overview of the Web 2.0 technology and also considers the historical background of the phenomenon. Chapter I, which is the theoretical part of the paper, analyses the use of Web 2.0 tools in English language learning. Chapter II presents the results of the survey conducted among the members of the academic staff and students of Narva College of the University of Tartu. The Conclusion sums up and discusses the results of the research and comments on the hypotheses.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	2
<i>Contents</i>	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	5
<b>From Web 1.0 to Web 2.0</b> .....	5
<b>Web 2.0 in Education</b> .....	8
<b>1. CHAPTER I. WEB 2.0 TOOLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING</b> .....	10
<b>1.1 Computer, the Internet, and Web 2.0 Tools in the Educational Process</b> ....	10
<b>1.2 Use of Web 2.0 Tools from the Perspective of Development of Different Language Skills</b> .....	14
1.2.1. Reading.....	16
1.2.2. Writing.....	17
1.2.3. Developing of Grammar Skill and Expanding Vocabulary.....	18
1.2.4. Listening.....	18
1.2.5. Development of Speaking Skills.....	19
1.2.6. Other Skills.....	19
<b>1.3 Web 2.0 Tools in Learning – a Novelty or a Must?</b> .....	20
<b>1.4. Web 2.0 Tools in English Learning</b> .....	21
1.4.1. E-mail.....	22
1.4.2. WebQuests.....	23
1.4.3. Weblogs or Blogs.....	25
1.4.4. Wikis.....	26
1.4.5. Podcasting or Voice Recording.....	27
1.4.6. Video.....	29
<b>1.5. Conclusions on the Theoretical Material</b> .....	30
<b>2. CHAPTER II. USE OF WEB 2.0 TOOLS IN NARVA COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TARTU</b> .....	31
<b>2.1. Survey</b> .....	31
<b>2.2. Presentation</b> .....	32
<b>2.3. Feedback and Results</b> .....	33
<b>2.4. Conclusions on the Practical Part</b> .....	37
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	39

<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	41
<b>KOKKUVÕTE</b> .....	45
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	46

## INTRODUCTION

### From Web 1.0 to Web 2.0

First of all, before discussing Web 2.0, its tools and English language learning by means of these tools, the terms connected with this field should be clearly and fully understood. For example, two terms the ‘Internet’ and ‘WWW’, or ‘Web’, may be used as synonyms meaning one phenomenon and replacing one another. However, they are not the same; both have a number of different by its nature definitions.

The first one – the Internet – can be described as “cyberspace, the information superhighway, the online community, the electronic library and the digital revolution”, or, in other words, a more concrete definition is, the Net (the Internet) is “a network of people and information, linked together” (Gray & Teeler 2001: 1).

The second term – the World Wide Web that was originally a client program – is “a multimedia resource and communications tool based on hypertext, a system of clickable links. When you click on a highlighted word or picture you are magically transported to that location” (Ibid.: 5). To simplify, the Web is a way people access the information on the Internet; or another explanation of the WWW (World Wide Web) by its creator Tim Berners-Lee is “an information space through which people can communicate, but communicate in a special way: communicate by sharing their knowledge in a pool. /.../ The idea was that everybody would be putting their ideas in, as well as taking them out” (Berners-Lee 1999: para. 4).

It is challenging to define properly what exactly ‘Web 2.0’ is since the technology is constantly changing and evolving. One of the most accurate definitions of Web 2 was given by Tim O’Reilly at the conference held in 2005:

Web 2.0 is the network as platform, spanning all connected devices; Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform: delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an “architecture of participation,” and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences. (O’Reilly 2005: para.1)

Here is another, a more recent definition:

A Web 2.0 site allows users to interact and collaborate with each other in a social media environment, as consumers of user-generated content in a virtual community. This contrasts with Web sites, which limit users to viewing content that they create and control. Examples of Web 2.0 include social networking sites, blogs, wikis, video sharing sites, hosted services, Web applications, and ‘folksonomies’ (folk taxonomies) [, or social tagging]. (Cooke 2011: para. 1)

Thus, it is logical to conclude that Web 2.0 tools are anything what the engine of Web 2 is capable of and allows the users to do. Basically, these tools are the features and possibilities of the technology and include all Web 2.0 applications and sites. There is a

significant number and variety of them: starting from Flickr (a photo sharing site), Dropbox (a file sharing site), Microsoft Office, Wikipedia and ending with Twitter, YouTube, Facebook, and Skype. All those are considered to be very popular and are used by millions of people today. For example, “more than 1 billion unique users visit YouTube each month” (2013: para. 1) as the official site illustrates, or, according to the statistics, “total number of Skype users as of Jan. 2012 [is] 31 million” (StatisticBrain 2012: para. 2).

There is no doubt that if there is Web 2.0, then Web 1.0 should come before that and so it does. However, the fact is that these two terms appeared nearly at the same time – in the article “Fragmented Future” published in 1999 – and became widely used only after the first Web 2 (Web 2.0) conference in 2004 when the Internet technology of the second generation was compared with the technology of the first one. Web 1.0 is an older version of the World Wide Web that is, according to Brian Getting (2007: para. 3), mainly used as a source of information since it only allows the users to search and read from the Internet. Web 1 (Web 1.0) is also known as the read-only web (Ibid.), it is like library but the online one with a limitless amount of space and no restrictions in content as such.

Web 1.0 offers poorer interface and less opportunities and variations than Web 2.0 does; the search is based on key-words, there is no live interaction between people: one leaves a message, some notes, or a text on a website and only after others may read it, and, as Jonathan Strickland (2008: 2) suggests, in most cases, the content remains the same, it cannot be changed or edited by the visitors. An example of this technology, as it is presented by Jeffrey Henning (2009: para. 5) in her article, would be Amazon and Encyclopaedia Britannica Online, or just any personal static web page with some content and, maximum, a guest sign-in form to fill in on it.

To sum up, users of Web 1.0 act primarily only as consumers: they can read, but cannot contribute anything; it is one way in that implies no interaction and no co-operation. This kind of technology looks passive and user-unfriendly, because the information and the interface never or rarely change. (Ibid.: para. 5-6)

The difference between the previous version of the Web and the next one is significant; first of all, it is greater collaboration among people who use the Internet and World Wide Web:

Unlike Web 1.0, where information moved in one direction, Web 2.0 is a two-way street where anyone can be an author and contributor. Web 2.0 has forced the world to take a hard look at what we believe about longstanding ideas regarding journalism, scholarship, free speech, and, soon, education. /.../ It brought us YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter, websites that allow anyone to put his or her life online. It brought us Wikipedia and fierce discussions of /.../ community authorship. (Fish 2009: para. 2)

Dan Zambonini, who works with web apps (applications) and also is a weblogger, agrees with Ross Mayfield (2005: para. 5), an Internet entrepreneur, who said that “Web 2.0 is made of people!”: “Web 1.0 was about connecting computers and making technology more efficient for computers. Web 2.0 is about connecting people, and making technology efficient for people” (Zambonini 2005: para. 6).

The term ‘Web 2.0’ is principally associated with the name Tim O’Reilly and it is also believed, according to Lori Cooke (2011: para. 5) and as Jane Klobas (2006: xiii) mentions in her book, that this term was coined by him, his colleagues and John Battelle in their speech at the first Web 2 conference in 2004; one of the reasons why it is that the term became official and began its rise in popularity only after the conference. But originally the term Web 2.0 dates to the year of 1999 and comes from Darcy DiNucci (1999: para. 3-4) who writes “the first glimmerings of Web 2.0 are beginning to appear, and we are just starting to see how that embryo might develop. Ironically, the defining trait of Web 2.0 will be that it won’t have any visible characteristics at all”.

There is a substantial number of characteristics which describe the Web 2 technology and its possibilities. WebAppRater (2013), the community initiative focusing exclusively on web application developers and users, according to their article “7 key features of web 2.0” written in 2010, distinguishes the following seven primary characteristics: folksonomy, rich user experience, user as a contributor, long tail, user participation, basic trust and dispersion.

As the article suggests, folksonomy, also known as social tagging, is the first key feature and means, in other words, free classification of information – people arrange the information as they wish, not only by categories; an example of it is the photo sharing site Flickr. The second principal characteristic is a dynamic and rich user experience presented by Web 2.0 – non-static and interactive web pages and services such as Google Maps. The third major feature is that today people’s role in the Net is not passive anymore, now users are contributors to the content of the Web – they are free to comment and review and are allowed to change the entered information; for example, Imdb.com and Facebook. The next characteristic is the so called long tail when some information or a product is not given or sold directly to a user or a consumer but offered by other sources or as a service for payment; an example is Google Apps. The fifth feature is crowdsourcing meaning that users participate in sharing the content as on YouTube by means of videos. One more key characteristic is basic trust and, I would add here, collaboration – when the information can be gathered together, edited, reused and shared; Wikipedia seems to be the most typical

and appropriate example of it. And the final feature, according to WebAppRater, is dispersion, or, to simplify, multiple ways of sharing the content through the Internet; this means that a person can whether watch a film online or download it onto his or her computer and, what is more, choose how – directly by the whole file or, for example, with the BitTorrent program. (Ibid.: 2010)

Nowadays it can be spoken with certainty that Web 2.0 and its tools have gradually changed things and perspectives on the Internet and online environment, especially the way people interact and communicate and the freedom itself. Today everyone who has access to the Net is mainly a participant of the web by means of messaging, using applications, blogging, social networking, podcasting, video streaming, voting online, file sharing and so on. It is even can be said that this technology is used everywhere including online space and everyday life: wikis, libraries 2.0 like [openlibrary.org](http://openlibrary.org), shopping – eBay, chatting – ICQ, phoning – Skype, doing business, making appointments, travelling, and studying.

### **Web 2.0 in Education**

To conclude, there is no doubt that the Web 2 technologies can be and are used in the educational process, but the question is to what degree and for which purpose: is it just single homework which requires a personal computer and access to the Internet, presentations of every lesson made in Microsoft PowerPoint, or a whole course based on online learning. A teacher, a student, or a learner can even not realise that they are using Web 2.0 tools since such things as e-mails, Google Docs (documents), lectures online, listening to audio files and watching videos on PC (personal computer) are common today in the educational institutions of the developed countries of the world. However, all that is only a minor part of the vast range of available applications and programs based on the engine of the technology of the second generation.

In practice, Web 2 provides a substantial number of services that allow teachers to modify the educational process, students – to achieve the goals in different ways, and learners in general – to choose and study independently; while in theory – these tools totally and completely change or, what is more, replace the traditional model of education when children go to school, write in their workbooks, visit libraries and learn materials alone at home; Web 2.0 is a global level, aimed primarily at co-operation and assumes openness. “These tools are changing how people, including our students, interact with the world. The changing nature of information and the new ways our students understand and



make sense of the world signal that we need new strategies and new tools for teaching and learning” (Schrum, Solomon 2007: 1).

Just to think of it, any subject, including languages, can be taught and learned using Web 2 technologies. Language teaching and learning can especially benefit from numerous possibilities of presenting, organising and, what is the most important, sharing information which are offered by Web 2.0 tools. But are language teachers/lecturers aware of these possibilities? Do students know these tools that would make their in-class and independent learning more efficient? The purpose of this Bachelor’s thesis is to find out to which extent both lecturers and students are aware of the opportunities of using Web 2.0 tools as well as of the necessity of using them in English language teaching and learning. The paper will also demonstrate the benefits of using Web 2 in the educational process, how it influences language acquisition. The thesis is aimed at finding out whether these tools are a novelty or a must and it also provides a number of examples both of the tools and ways how they can be and are used. The first hypothesis is the lecturers of Narva College of the University of Tartu are more aware than the students of Web 2.0 tools and their application in language teaching/learning. The second hypothesis is only 75 percent of the students of the college use the tools in learning English.

## **CHAPTER I. WEB 2.0 TOOLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING**

### **1.1 Computer, the Internet, and Web 2.0 Tools in the Educational Process**

“No language instructor, professor, applied linguist, graduate student, or department chair would deny the importance of using new technologies to enhance the learning environment – and the subject area of foreign languages is no exception” (Blake 2008: xiii). David Deubelbeiss (2010: para. 5), in his article “Web 2.0 and English Language Learning”, is also certain that “the internet offers the best way to learn language”. “Unlike traditional Web 1.0 technologies, social software such as social networks, wikis, blogs and micro-blogging (Twitter, etc.) /.../ have opened up new opportunities of interaction and collaboration between teachers and learners as well as amongst learners” (Carmesin et al 2009: 1).

In order to use the Web 2 technology in the classroom, there should be at least one computer. But it can be more than just one piece of modern equipment, for example, if every third student has got a PC, a laptop, an iPad, or a mobile phone or the whole learning place is equipped with a number of devices such as a printer, a scanner, a projector, a microphone, a SMART Board, and a webcam; different combinations are appropriate plus access to the Internet is required. However, it is proper to mention here that no one and nothing can take the teachers’ place in the class like that; their role remains to be the key one. It means that students do not have to sit behind their PCs all the time; “an ideal classroom would have additional space away from the computers for group discussion, for mingling or work on other tasks” (Gray, Teeler 2001: 55).

“Computers [and Web 2.0 tools] are becoming more and more common in language teaching” (Barrett, Sharma 2007: 13); and it is because of the simplicity of their use, accessibility, feedback, no special training is required, the Internet can replace books, it is free or cheap, the web is comfortable to use, “it offers independence and freedom” (Naik, Shivalingaiah 2008: 505), and “using technology can be motivating” (Barrett, Sharma 2007: 10). “One key feature of using technology in learning is that it allows language practice and study away from the confines of the classroom” (Ibid.: 11). For example, Web 2 provides “so many opportunities to people with disabilities that are unavailable through any other medium” (Naik, Shivalingaiah 2008: 505). “Young people in the developed parts of the globe are very aware of the new tools at their disposal and many of them spend

hours online using these tools. Because these new technologies and new capabilities engage and motivate students” (Schrum, Solomon 2007: 9).

According to the Gwen Solomon and Lynne Schrum (Ibid.) and to Nasy Inthisone Pfanner (2012: 58), a teacher of English in Austria, today any training of how to use Web 2.0 tools is not needed. Schrum and Solomon (2007: 25) write that “while using the Web has changed the world and the workplace of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, nowhere has it had a greater effect than on the lives of young people”. Pfanner (2012: 58) mentions in her article about ‘digital natives’; the term, “coined by Marc Prensky [in 2001], refers to people who grew up with technology and includes most of those who are currently students in developed countries“. “They play video games, communicate using text messaging and instant messaging, conduct Internet searches, download music and share files, and use the Web for homework. These technologies have always been available to them” (Schrum, Solomon 2007: 25). All this means that “today’s young people have grown up with technology, use it as a matter of course, and never knew a world without it” (Ibid.: 3). In addition, N. I. Pfanner (2012: 58) asserts that “we are living in a digital world and our students are digital natives: they need learning materials that correspond to their lifestyles. With high-tech homework they can have fun playing on the computer and learning at the same time”. She also suggests:

The electronic homework enhances what we learn in class; it also provides correction and feedback. Consequently, the students find out if their answers are correct immediately; they don’t have to wait to get the answers from the teacher. This rapid response accelerates learning and saves time. As a result, more classroom time can be spent on reading and conversation. (Ibid.)

That is why Dede Teeler and Peta Gray (2001: 81), in their book “How to Use the Internet in ELT”, claim that the Internet can be used as a coursebook that means “as a source of material, an instrument for real communication, a supply of internationalism and even a tool for edutainment [= education + entertainment]”. They say that “you can use the Internet as a basis for activities to accompany your coursebook. You can also go one stage further and use the Internet as the basis for your course; or even as your ‘coursebook’” (Ibid.). There are two main reasons for that since “published coursebooks and textbooks cannot cater for the specific needs of particular groups of students”, the Net is full of up-to-date information and provides “opportunities for real communication with native and non-native speakers” (Ibid.: 82). Gavin Dudeney (2007: 152), a teacher and IT manager in Spain, has the same opinion on that account and writes in his own book “The Internet and the Language Classroom” that “it is possible to /.../ use the Internet as the primary source of material for any given course”.

One more advantage of Web 2.0 is that it can be accessed on a number of devices and at any time, as according to Gary B. Shelly and Mark Frydenberg (2011: 13), “you can browse Web content from almost anywhere on almost any electronic device that has a screen: an Internet-connected television set, a netbook, a laptop or desktop PC, a personal digital assistant (PDA), a gaming console, or a cell phone”. Also the fact is “when information is stored in the Web, it is available where you are as long as you have an Internet-connected device with which to access it” (Ibid.). In that way, “the Web can be used as a virtual resource bank and library” (Barrett, Sharma 2007: 45). “The internet allows for users to learn language when they want, where they want” (Ibid.: 13) since Web 2.0 tools and the technology are “available 24/7” – “the computer does not get tired” (Ibid.: 14).

The amount of information and tasks available on the web is limitless and, moreover, learners can freely choose and, as it is mentioned above, gain immediate feedback; “they can make their own choices as to how to work through materials” (Ibid.: 10). That is why, according to Pete Sharma and Barney Barrett (Ibid.), “many learners simply like using the computer” and “multimedia exercises” since “they can proceed at their own pace”. Also here the authors of the book add that “web-based exercises are more interactive than paper-based exercises” and provide “instant feedback”, which is “appreciated by learners” and is “usually perceived as helpful” (Ibid.). With Web 2.0 tools, students, for example, “can make choices as to how many times they redo an exercise” (Ibid.: 11).

David Deubelbeiss (2010: para. 8), an educational leader in the field of Web 2.0 learning, emphasises another aspect of why the Net is “specifically good for language learning” – “the internet is cheap. Billions of dollars are currently spent learning English as a second language. Books, teachers, facilities, travel – they all cost. The internet offers the potential of completely avoiding these cost”.

Despite the fact teacher is “the crucial element” (Fortescue, Jones 1991: 104), “technology does some things better than the teacher – lightning-fast searches of an electronic dictionary is one example” (Barrett, Sharma 2007: 13). Web 2.0 tools “can offer endless exposure to the target language. The technology offers learners the possibility to control the exposure they receive” (Ibid.). An example of that is “learners can pause an audio clip at will, play it as many times as they like, or redo an exercise until they feel satisfied with their result” (Ibid.). In “Web 2.0 Tools for Teachers”, Nik Peachey, a writer

and teacher trainer specialising in web based technologies for language learning and development, demonstrates that Web 2 enables:

Socialisation - Through socialisation our students can use the language and skills they are learning to build networks and develop relationships with real people. Collaboration - They can work together with others to construct and share real knowledge. Creativity - They can create genuine products, in a wide range and combination of media to high standards, that will have a real audience. Authenticity - The tasks and activities they do and the people they communicate with to do them are real and motivating. Sharing - They can share what they create and learn from each other. (Peachey 2009: 3)

Talking about testing and the ways students can be checked, “Web 2.0 turns testing into a game, a challenge, an interactive experience that teaches as much as it tests” (DiscoveryEducation 2010: para. 1). That is because “some tools let you add pictures and sound and even embed video and animation to test questions. Many offer multiple types of questions – from true or false and fill-in-the-blank to multiple choice, multiple question, short answer and even essay” (Ibid.: para. 3). Web 2 tools affect the whole process significantly: “in the old days teachers would “give” a test and students would “take” a test. With this new approach the lines are more blurred” (Ibid.: para. 8). This means that “it’s more about learning for the sake of learning, not just for the sake of the grade. Getting the right answer is fun and rewarding; making mistakes is part of the learning process – less punitive, more forgiving, more encouraging” (Ibid.: para. 9). Testing now can be seen as an exchange of information, as feedback; with Web 2.0 technology, questions and tests are “less intimidating, more fun” (Ibid. para. 10). In the article, it is also illustrated that “students are more motivated to learn” if such methods and approaches are used (Ibid.).

Nowadays students and learners do not have to attend traditional classes and go somewhere in order to learn – they can do it at home without going out with the help of Web 2.0 tools. For example, lectures can be recorded with a video camera and watched later or even online. Nicky Hockly (2012: 61) writes in her article about such thing as ‘webinars’ (web + seminar = webinar). Webinars are “online seminars, presentations or workshops, usually open to the general public, and often free. They take place in real time and last around an hour. Recorded webinars can be accessed” anytime (Ibid.). These “frequently focus on one specific topic, although they can form part of a series over time” (Ibid.). According to Hockly (Ibid.), webinars can place in different ‘platforms’: in a text-based platform, an audio-only platform, or a video-conferencing one; she says that “with the spread of reliable broadband internet access, video-conferencing platforms tend to be the tool of choice for webinars, as it is usually more engaging to have video, audio and visual support (such as slides)”, which implies that “you both see and hear the presenter – and possibly the other participants as well”. The first variant means that “the participants

and the presenter interact via text”, as an example, N. Hockly (Ibid.) suggests that “the British Council Learn English Facebook page holds weekly webinars (or ‘chats’) about grammar for students of English”. The second type of platform is audio-only, “where you hear but don’t see the presenter and participants, although you can view the presenter’s slides”; here, the author also gives a website – the web page of “Education Week” – [edweek.org/ew/marketplace/webinars/webinars.html](http://edweek.org/ew/marketplace/webinars/webinars.html) (Ibid.).

It can be concluded with the words of Christopher Jones and Sue Fortescue (1991: 104) from their book “Using Computers in the Language Classroom”: “because the computer is capable of playing so many different roles in and out of class, we believe it to be the most exciting and potentially useful aid so far available to language teachers [and learners]”. It is totally justified since Web 2.0 tools can be used in a substantial number of ways and their application in education and English learning has such advantages and benefits as:

- simplicity of use – no special training is required, their similarity;
- accessibility – on a number of devices, anytime, anywhere;
- feedback – immediate response, suggestions;
- actual – up-to-date information and software;
- alternative – can be used for home assignments and as a textbook;
- free or cheap – no fee to post onto the web and share files;
- comfortable – saves time, takes into consideration people’s differences;
- independence and freedom – choose and study at home;
- motivating – attractive, easy, fun, present-day;
- interactive – supports socialisation, collaboration, creativity;
- faster/better than teacher (in some cases) – available 24/7, searching, dictionaries.

## **1.2. Use of Web 2.0 Tools from the Perspective of Development of Different Language Skills**

To begin with, students learn in a variety of ways. They have different learning styles that are based on how they understand and process information. For example, there are visual learners, auditory learners, and tactile/kinaesthetic learners. Technology makes it possible to target the right approaches for each student in order to provide individualized and differentiated instruction. (Schrum, Solomon 2007: 37)

“When we learn a language, there are four skills that we need for complete communication” and they are reading, writing, listening, and speaking (EnglishClub 2013: para. 1-2); with no exception, each of them can be developed and mastered on the web.

Today “a learner can, for example, watch a clip from a new foreign language movie, comment on it in the target language in a blog and thereby start a discussion about the movie in a social network with his peers or even beyond the classroom context with native speakers” since “the Web is the platform throughout” (Cherubin, Maggi 2012: 4). Everybody who has an Internet connection has “access to a vast and constantly growing range of content in form of text, audio and video files on the Web provided by users with different motivations and of different age groups, social, local and linguistic backgrounds” (Ibid.). Maurizia Cherubin and Fabrizio Maggi (Ibid.) find them “beneficial” for language learning and teaching; these tools “in terms of interactive communication, collaboration and user participation open up new potentials for enhancing each of the four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking)”.

In the authors’ article, they claim that “learners are very used to traditional learning activities such as reading article but still certainly not familiar with new learning activities like assessing or reworking articles of peers” (Ibid.). In addition, F. Maggi and M. Cherubin (Ibid.: 1) suggest that “employment of Web 2.0 tools in foreign language learning CLIL situation, besides increasing foreign language exposure and use, enhances the levels of student satisfaction, motivation, confidence and disposition which are crucial for communicative life-long foreign language learning”, and prove it by conducting a project in one school in Italy, where elder students taught in English younger ones using Web 2.0 tools and technological features such as Google Docs, YouTube, Skype for videoconferencing, Wikipedia, blogs, Dropbox, MS (Microsoft) PowerPoint, and SMART Boards (Ibid.: 11-16).

To sum up, Web 2 is a powerful tool in English language learning since it offers and gives a substantial number of possibilities and opportunities to learn the language and develop its skills. In education, according to Cherubin and Maggi (Ibid.: 4-5), Web 2.0 tools are found to be useful and comfortable to use, because “they allow you to create and edit text, presentations, graphics, photographs, mental and conceptual maps, slideshows, sound effects, video, videoseminars, hypertext and websites”, and, what is more, enable the free exchange of information, the circulation of ideas, interaction” between learners. For example, englishclub.com – a free website for language learners and teachers, which is aimed at helping learn English online and where lesson plans, educating videos and tasks can be found; with the help of those all the language skills including grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation can be studied and acquired.

### 1.2.1. Reading

“Since the Internet was basically a text medium until [the year of 2004] /.../, reading is still one of the easiest skills to practise on the Net” (Gray, Teeler 2001: 70). The Internet is one massive library with a limitless number of books, articles, magazines, journals, and other papers; all sorts of texts and genres are available there anytime. There is a number of advantages of using the web and Web 2 tools to develop reading skills in English.

First of all, a learner can always access the online library with no doubt or thoughts that the books he or she needs are taken by other readers like in traditional libraries; there are also people with disabilities or just those who have no time or opportunity to visit one. In addition, some pieces of literature, for example, amateur stories, reviews, or unpublished articles, exist only in the electronic format, because there are authors as bloggers who write and publish their works strictly onto the web.

Secondly, “because the text has interactive links, allowing students to read the way the mind often thinks, in a non-linear path. These links can also involve interplay with other readers, the author or the publisher. They can also lead to support materials that are not available off the Internet” (Ibid.).

Thirdly, information on the web is constantly updated, for example, news is “always current, and students have a wider range /.../ to choose from” (Ibid.: 71). It means that “the information gap is real, since most news services and papers open with a page of headlines divided by topic, each with a link to a summary of the article of the whole article. Further links lead to multimedia support material and background information”, which allows “to expand the activity in the direction of student interest” (Ibid.).

Finally, with Web 2.0 tools, texts can be edited and “printed out or easily saved and read offline” (Ibid.: 70). It gives learners even more freedom of choice; the fact is that when a person reads a piece of literature – he or she pays attention to the language, its grammar, vocabulary and these cannot be denied. Moreover, reading elevates mind: readers get to know history, facts, or discover something completely new. To recapitulate with the words of Dede Teeler and Peta Gray (Ibid.: 73), “there are all sorts of texts, many of which [with the help of Web 2] let the reader participate in some way”.

All in all, the web is beneficial for development of reading skills:

- access to authentic and up-to-date materials, which allows to see what happened or is happening from different points of view;



- a good source of texts for extensive reading, the activity that can be suggested proceeding from the benefit is making an independent research on a specific topic or keeping a reader's diary;
- searching for information online takes less time, the activities can vary from a pair work on finding answers to a group work on solving long-term webquests.

### 1.2.2. Writing

Web 2.0 is the read-write web; now anyone who has a wish to post a comment, to publish an article, or just write something senseless can do it and do it in one second directly online with no fee. Every day people of different nationalities and origin all around the world who have Internet access send messages using the Web 2 technology, for example, ICQ and Skype, compose e-mails, write reports and in their blogs, communicate in chats and social networks such as Facebook, create digital documents, for example, using Microsoft Office or Google Docs, give feedback by means of typing, students do their homework such as essays, researches, answering questions, and other written tasks using computers.

The authors of the paper "Using Web 2.0 tools in CLIL" say that the Internet "makes the written word, which is considered, in school, a tool for composing texts then subjected to the judgment of the teacher, become a means of interpersonal communication, discussion of ideas and experiences and, ultimately, a social tool" (Cherubin & Maggi 2012: 5).

The features and advantages of using Web 2 tools in writing are: spelling and grammar autocheck, autocorrection – if one makes a mistake in a word, customisation – any text can be formatted and edited – its style, size, font, colour, and the way it looks in general can be changed, a learner has time to think and decide what he or she would like to talk about before saying it, written works can be read by others and a student can get feedback in a short amount of time – just right after publishing online.

Activities in the class or for self-learning can vary from the simplest ones such as answering questions, giving an opinion, composing e-mails, chatting with friends in English or with native speakers, writing essays to the more complicated ones such as creating a Facebook or Twitter page, or even own website, posting on blogs for some period of time, and collaboration in conducting a research or in creating a wiki.

### 1.2.3. Developing of Grammar Skill and Expanding Vocabulary

This paragraph serves as an addition to the previous ones and completes them since, as a rule, vocabulary and grammar are parts of reading and writing – a person should understand what he or she reads and write properly so that others could understand it. The advantages of using Web 2.0 tools in learning and checking English grammar and vocabulary are: if a student makes a mistake or fails a test, he or she does not need to rewrite the whole thing and waste another paper sheet – it is possible just to ‘backspace’ (delete) the mistake or, for example, to have the second try or one more ‘life’; on the web, a learner can always ask for help other users (mates, native speakers of the language, teachers, experts) and get immediate response or feedback, there is a number of dictionaries on the Internet, for example, Google translate or Cambridge Dictionaries Online ([dictionary.cambridge.org](http://dictionary.cambridge.org)), and it takes less time than looking up in a printed edition.

Some examples of activities in the class or for self-learning: doing digital exercises, crosswords, word searches, and other tasks made with Puzzlemaker ([discoveryeducation.com/free-puzzlemaker](http://discoveryeducation.com/free-puzzlemaker)), studying and making dictionaries, work in groups or pairs on translating phrases and deciding what suits the best, the website [fraise.it](http://fraise.it) shows how to use a particular word in a sentence.

### 1.2.4. Listening

It is logical that a person should listen to the target language as much and often as he or she can in order to develop listening skills and learn the language itself; the Internet undoubtedly allows it since the Net has no borders. Nowadays learners can listen to the radio and music, listen and watch interviews with their idols and famous people, watch films, clips, videos – “the multimedia content available on the Web is stunning” (Gray & Teeler 2001: 77) – and everything is available in English.

Video and audio files can be played back immediately online or saved on the hard drive and be watched and listened later, what is more, it is also possible to pause, stop, and replay these files as many times as a learner wants to. [youtube.com](http://youtube.com) would be an example of a video sharing site on the Web 2 platform, where is a significant number of all sorts of videos, and [grooveshark.com](http://grooveshark.com) – where users can share and listen to the music online. Lyrics for songs can be found, for example, with the search engine of Google.

In the classroom or at home, students can use not only these websites, but also BBC videos ([bbc.co.uk](http://bbc.co.uk)), which are news reports in British English, TED Talks ([ted.com](http://ted.com)),

[nobuna.com](http://nobuna.com) – educating video clips, those are meant for development of grammar and practice of listening skills.

#### 1.2.5. Development of Speaking Skills

In order to develop oral skills, one needs to listen to what and how others speak the language properly and try to repeat, to talk; with Web 2.0 tools, the level of speaking can also be improved. It can be done either in the classroom or independently online.

Activities in the classroom: discussions of actual topics, monologues and dialogues, debates, role-playing games, description of pictures from the Internet, learners can just answer questions, read aloud, talk to each other, express their thoughts and opinions in English. D. Teeler and P. Gray (2001: 74) write that “in fact, it would be almost impossible to keep students from talking as they negotiate their next step around the Internet, whether they are browsing the Web, deciding what to say in a Chat or replying to e-mail”. As their homework, for example, they can interview someone on the web using Skype.

At home: students can simply use Skype to chat with other learners, take part in webinars, podcast, which means, in short, recording audio, or even stream – talking to the listeners and showing them something through a webcam or what on the computer screen is. The advantage of using technology is that a person can record and after listen to him or herself, what is more, edit the recording adding, for example, sound effects. English Central ([englishcentral.com](http://englishcentral.com)) provides users with interactive videos, the purpose of which is to help learn the language – to develop listening and oral skills plus expand vocabulary.

For example, [forvo.com](http://forvo.com) – is a multilingual user generated pronunciation dictionary; pronunciation of words can be checked, recorded, or asked others to record.

#### 1.2.6. Other Skills

During the process of learning English and communicating on the web, people not only master their reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills, but also exchange information, gain knowledge, get to know something new, learn to use programs and tools. With Web 2, learners also improve searching skills since the Internet is the online encyclopaedia about everything and, depending on a topic, it takes time and effort to find the needed and trustworthy information, develop creativity and relational skills when they work in groups and do something together, for example, make a research or create a blog, a wiki, a website, and develop their thinking skills such as comparison and contrast, induction and deduction, analysis, evaluation, justification, and other competencies when

they decide what application to choose and how to reach the target – to complete the task. For example, Dvolver Moviemaker ([dfilm.com/live/mm.html](http://dfilm.com/live/mm.html)) – a Web 2.0 tool to create animated cartoons.

### **1.3. Web 2.0 Tools in Learning – a Novelty or a Must?**

The facts, opinions, literature used in this thesis show that, with time, Web 2.0 tools in English language learning and education in general become more popular, meaning that they are used more frequently; the tendency moves forward from ‘a novelty’ to the ‘must’ direction, especially in the developed regions like the United States of America and Europe. Today it can be said, and as for digital natives, that such technology must be used in educational and learning processes or at least people are on the edge of considering it as a must. To see that, some resources of different years can be compared and analysed.

In 1991, Christopher Jones and Sue Fortescue wrote:

In the past twenty years or so, language teachers have been called upon to adopt a whole range of technical devices: teachers who themselves mastered a foreign language with the aid of nothing more technical than a book, blackboard and chalk are now expected to be able to use slide projectors, cassette recorders, overhead projectors, language laboratories, video recorders – and now computers. (Fortescue & Jones 1991: 98)

From this extract, it can be definitely seen that, in the past, all these tools were a novelty and people were not sure; then the authors add that “there is inevitably scepticism about whether all these aids are really needed, whether some are expensive gimmicks, to be discarded after a few years when novelty value has worn off” (Ibid.). Fortescue and Jones (Ibid.: 99) also mention in their edition that there were “many of teachers” who were not against using computers and the Internet in education.

In later publications, a growing number of those who are for using Web tools in teaching and learning can be traced; to look directly at more recent years – after the conference held in 2004 by Tim O’Reilly and his companions, the book entitled “Web 2.0: New Tools, New Schools” is published by Gwen Solomon and Lynne Schrum in 2007, where they claim that “the world has changed; our students have changed, and traditional schools are no longer up to the task of educating young people for the future” (Schrum, Solomon 2007: 1). The authors say “we know that students are different today from students 20 years ago, mostly because of technology” (Ibid.: 2) and that some schools have changed and “more are adopting new practises” (Ibid.: 3). But at the same time, Solomon and Schrum emphasise “after all, in spite of all the hype, technology has not yet changed schools very much” in general (Ibid.: 1); “these are still early days in bringing together

education and Web 2.0, yet there are models – both of learning and technology use – that point us in the right direction” (Ibid.: 4).

The next year, Robert J. Blake (2008: xi) already writes in “Brave New Digital Classroom: Technology and Foreign Language Learning” that “in the twenty-first century, technology is a part of nearly every aspect of life, and this is true of the field of second language learning and teaching”. In 2012, Nasy Inthisone Pfanner (2012: 58) discusses in the article “Digital homework for digital natives” about those who, so to say, cannot live and study well without technology “about 20 years ago, /.../ in the United States, technology in the classrooms was limited. There were not enough computers for everyone, so we all had to wait our turn. Moreover, few people had computers at home”, but now the situation in the developed countries of the world is totally opposite, according to her.

In the year of 2009, Gabriela Grosseck presents her paper “To use or not to use web 2.0 in higher education?” at the World Conference on Educational Sciences and provides the table “Models of integrating Web 2.0 technologies in HE”, where she gives a list of tools and suggests a number of their educational applications. Grosseck (2008: 479) talks about blogging, wikis, slides sharing, video sharing, and other Web 2.0 tools such as virtual conferences and seminars, for example, “instant messaging [offered by ICQ, Skype, or chats] increase the sense of community and accessibility which is required for collaborative learning”. According to the author of the work, blogging develops writing skills and knowledge, quickly gives feedback, “comments in blogs can encourage students to help each other”; wikis can be used “for student projects” and other group words, “as a presentation tool (as e-portfolios)” and a place to collect knowledge; file sharing inspire creativity and provide authentic materials (Ibid.).

All in all, today Web 2.0 can be considered as a must in (English) language learning since the technology reached the point when it is common and applied in every aspect of human life, which naturally includes the educational process.

#### **1.4. Web 2.0 Tools in English Learning**

Today any information including Web 2 applications and programs can be found online with the help of search engines (Google, bing.com, yahoo.com). For example, the websites [cooltoolsforschools.wikispaces.com/Home](http://cooltoolsforschools.wikispaces.com/Home) and [go2web20.net](http://go2web20.net) provide a substantial number of Web 2.0 tools and links to them.

#### 1.4.1. E-mail

E-mail or email, which means electronic mail, “is, for many reasons, the most used tool on the Internet: it’s easy to use, it’s cheap, fast and usually reliable” (Dudenev 2007: 10). One more reason for that is a person needs a valid e-mail address in order to use other online Web 2.0 tools. An email can be sent directly from a browser, for example, Internet Explorer, Mozilla Firefox, or Google Chrome, or using a program such as Outlook Express – is included into Windows and Microsoft Office package and one of the most popular programs, according to Gavin Dudenev (Ibid.). “In order to send a message successfully, you need to know the address of the person you are sending to” (Ibid.: 13), otherwise the e-mail will be sent nowhere or other addressee will get the message.

Dudenev (Ibid.) writes that “email messages are simply text documents, which can be sent over the Net. They are usually small and written in a ‘shorthand’ form, ignoring the normal conventions of written language“. That is why

it is not uncommon, for example, to see plenty of abbreviations typical of email communication: ‘u’ for ‘you’, ‘r’ for ‘are’, and the longer ones such as IMHO (in my humble opinion), FYI (for your information) and BTW (by the way). These are designed to make email quicker to write (Ibid.)

as well as “‘smilies’ or ‘emoticons’ such as :-) to express a smiling face, or :-( to express sadness” (Ibid.).

In the book, it is said that “email can be used for many purposes, from writing to friends and relatives, to having information sent to you on a regular basis”, what is more, “to send and receive other things such as picture files, documents, sound files, etc.” (Ibid.: 15-16). This, certainly, can be implemented in the educational process; Yolanda Scott-Tennant Basallote proves it in her article “E-mail in class? You can do it, too!” published in the periodical “English Teaching professional” in 1997. She comments on the question why use email from two points of view – the students’ and teacher’s, which in turn can be combined into one full answer.

At the first sight, “e-mail is quick, immediate and, if desired, relatively anonymous” (Basallote 1997: 10). This tool allows people “to communicate in a different, meaningful, and popular way” and “provides students with the tools for independent learning” (Ibid.). In the article, it is suggested that if email is used as an educational activity or in the class, “lessons are less teacher-centred and become more individualised and learner-centred” (Ibid.). To look closer, “e-mail creates new pedagogical dynamics, providing opportunities for more open-ended linguistic situations” – by that, the author means “a shift from form to content” (Ibid.). Communicating online also “reduces aspects of static social context such as gender, race, handicaps and status, and reduces physical communication cues (frowning,

hesitating, intonation, etc.)” (Ibid.). It enables “more equal participation by those who are often excluded or discriminated against: shy students, students with unusual learning styles, students who are apprehensive about writing” (Ibid.), and others. According to Basallote (Ibid.), “e-mail motivates because it provides real purposes and audiences in relation to the development of skills”; the tool “helps improve students’ intercultural awareness and to progress away from the survival skills often taught in class to the negotiating skills normally needed in genuine, sustained communication”. As an outcome, “writing quality usually improves, becomes more versatile and expressive, and reading more public and collaborative” (Ibid.). For self-educating, a learner can communicate with, for example, native speakers or other learners of English by means of messages. To conclude, e-mail “is an ideal solution for groups with very different ages or interests” (Ibid.).

This illustrates that even one of the simplest Web 2.0 tools significantly changes the educational process in a positive direction and helps learn the foreign language.

#### 1.4.2. WebQuests

Despite the Internet and its terminology are evolving, all the definitions are quite similar to each other; “put in its simplest form, a WebQuest is a project which uses the internet as its main source of information” (Brabbs 2002: 39). Another definition is – “webquests are research activities that require learners to collect information about a subject using the Web” (Barrett, Sharma 2007: 24). Other two sources – the article “Using WebQuests” of Carina Grisolia and the book of Gavin Dudeney (2007: 122) – refer to Bernie Dodge of San Diego State University, the originator of the activity (1995); “according to him, a webquest is ‘an inquiry-oriented activity in which some or all of the information that learners interact with comes from resources on the Internet’”. The whole thing suggests that “students are given a task or series of tasks to do, which requires them to collect information from different internet websites and process and organise this information in order to create a final product” (Grisolia 2008: 55).

According to G. Dudeney (2007: 122), Dodge “identifies two types of webquests: short-term webquests” and “longer-term webquests”. The aim of the first type is “knowledge acquisition and integration”; the aim of the second one is “extending and refining knowledge”, which means that “after completing a longer-term webquest, a learner will have analysed a body of knowledge deeply, transformed it in some way, and

demonstrated an understanding of the material by creating something that others can respond to, online or offline” (Ibid.).

As a rule, webquests are well-structured and consist of four regular blocks, or sections: Introduction, Task, Process, and Evaluation, or if the first two parts are united into one, then appears Conclusion as the final stage of a quest. Introduction “is designed to capture the students’ interest” (Brabbs 2002: 40), provides participants with background information on the topic. Task “describes the end product of the activity” (Ibid.), “explains clearly and precisely what the learners will have to do as they work their way through the webquest” (Dudeny 2007: 123). “The third stage of a webquest guides the learners through certain activities and research tasks, using a set of pre-defined resources [or links]” (Ibid.: 124). Evaluation “explains to students how their work will be evaluated” (Brabbs 2002: 40), “this stage can involve learners in self-evaluation, comparing and contrasting what they have produced with other learners and giving feedback on what they feel they have learnt, achieved, etc.” (Dudeny 2007: 124).

All three (Grisolia, Dudeny, and Brabbs) find a number of reasons for using webquests in English language learning; as an example, Carina Grisolia (2008: 55), a teacher and teacher trainer in Argentina, claims that “WebQuests are good for stimulating the students’ motivation and they enjoy them because they are fun to do. They provide a high level of interaction and foster learner autonomy. They also boost reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition development”.

Gavin Dudeny (2007: 122) emphasises such aspects as: “no specialist technical knowledge is needed either to produce or use” this or other Web 2.0 tools; webquests help develop both conversational and language skills; “they encourage critical (or higher level) thinking skills, including: comparing, classifying, inducing, deducing, analysing errors, constructing support, abstraction, analysing perspectives, etc.” (Ibid.: 123). C. Grisolia (2008: 55) adds that “WebQuests are extremely motivational as students are always keen to use the internet”; “they are challenging and they require students to be autonomous and to take an active role in the learning process”; these quests are “practical activities, which provide students with situations in which real-life skills can be exploited”; they also “enable students to engage with authentic material and meaningful content in the target language”.

To summarise, “the WebQuest model has already been used by many teachers and there are lots of examples already available on the web” (Brabbs 2002: 41), one of which is



[theconsultants-e.com/resources/webquests/repository.aspx](http://theconsultants-e.com/resources/webquests/repository.aspx), where additional information and materials can be found.

#### 1.4.3. Weblogs or Blogs

“A blog (short for weblog) is a frequently updated website that often resembles an online journal” (Stanley 2005: para. 3); blogs “originally served the function of online diaries kept by individual Internet users” (Dudeny 2007: 125). Terry Anderson (2008: 154) writes in the book “The Theory and Practice of Online Learning” that “blogs are becoming very popular. They are generally personal journals or newsletters that are more or less frequently updated by the owner. Most blogs are available to the general public”. Graham Stanley (2005: para. 3), an English language teacher with a special interest in learning technologies, accentuates in his article “Blogging for ELT” that “it's so easy to create and update a blog – it requires only basic access to the Internet, and a minimum of technical know-how. Because of this, it is one of the easiest ways to publish student writing on the WWW. It's almost as easy as sending an email”.

“People who post to their blogs are often referred to as bloggers. Many bloggers configure their blogs to allow readers to comment on posts” (Frydenberg, Shelly 2011: 27); it means visitors can add and share ideas, too, and weblogs become “spaces for discussing all topics, including news, technology, movie and product reviews, and travel recommendations” (Ibid.: 26). In education and language learning, “they have become tools for collaboration, information exchange and reflection” (Dudeny 2007: 125).

Graham Stanley (2005: para. 5) in his article refers to Aaron Campbell, who “outlined three types of blogs for use with language classes” in 2003 – Tutor, Class, and Learner blogs. “The Tutor Blog is run by the teacher of a class” (Ibid.: para. 6), the teacher chooses what to write about, for example, provides useful links for the learners of English or describes his or her own experience. “The Class Blog is a shared space, with teacher and students being able to write to the main area. It is best used as a collaborative discussion space, an extra-curricular extension of the classroom” (Ibid.: para. 7). “The Learner Blog is the third type of blog and it requires more time and effort from the teacher to both set up and moderate, but is probably the most rewarding. It involves giving each student an individual blog. The benefit of this is that this becomes the student's own personal online space” (Ibid.: para. 8).

Graham Stanley (Ibid.: para. 10) names a number of reasons why use blogs in the educational process and learning English; according to him, “one of the best reasons is to

provide a real audience for student writing”, because “usually, the teacher is the only person who reads student writing, and the focus of this reading is usually on form, not content”. The author of the article also says that weblogs develop reading skills (Ibid.: para. 12), improve language knowledge in general (Ibid.: para. 14), and “increase the sense of community in a class” (Ibid.: para. 15).

Here are some ideas for activities from G. Stanley (Ibid.: para. 30): “mystery guest” – when an unknown person is invited to a blog and the participants of the blog have to guess the person’s identity; a project work or international exchange of information (Ibid.: para. 31-32); and a photoblog using Flickr ([flickr.com](http://flickr.com)) (Ibid.: para. 33). Both Gavin Dudeney and Graham Stanley suggest Blogger ([blogger.com](http://blogger.com)) – in their opinion, it is the “the best known, and easiest to use” (Dudeney 2007: 126) and “one of the most reliable” websites to start and read weblogs (Stanley 2005: para. 21).

#### 1.4.4. Wikis

“Blogs and wikis are two Web 2.0 tools that allow users to publish content online” (Frydenberg, Shelly 2011: 21). “By contrast, a wiki is more akin to a collaborative website tool, allowing multiple users to add pages to a website without any specialist knowledge” (Dudeney 2007: 127). Gary B. Shelly and Mark Frydenberg, and Gavin Dudeney (Ibid.) in their editions explain what the word ‘wiki’ means: the last one writes that “‘wiki’ is Hawaiian for ‘fast’, or an acronym for ‘what I know is ...’ depending on which sources you consult”; the first two authors agree with that saying that it is “named after the Hawaiian word for quick” (Frydenberg, Shelly 2011: 21).

“A wiki is a web site or, more accurately, a collection of web sites where users can insert and edit content collectively” (Anderson 2008: 156). “Readers of a wiki may change the content of any of the pages that the wiki contains” (Frydenberg, Shelly 2011: 21). Jane Klobas (2006: 2) suggests in her book “Wikis: Tools for Information Work and Collaboration” that “like blogs, authors enter content using a web browser – but there are two significant differences. Wikis are thought of as tools for multiple authors rather than a single author” and “the communication model supported by wiki software is not one-to-many as with blogs, but many-to-many”.

Terry Anderson (2008: 156) claims “many wikis are open to the public, although some are closed and require users to log in. Wikipedia is the best-known wiki”. G. Dudeney (2007: 127) has the same opinion on that account confirming that the most famous wiki is Wikipedia ([wikipedia.org](http://wikipedia.org)), “an online encyclopaedia which has been

developed over recent years, and is now said to rival its more august print competitors such as the Encyclopaedia Britannica”. J. Klobas (2006: 3) also agrees with both pointing that “the most well-known public wiki, Wikipedia, provides an excellent example of how wikis work”.

“The basic features of most wikis” are “collaborative authorship, simple editing, quick updating, ability to add pages simply and quickly, ability to track changes and view recent changes” plus “language support”, “media and file support” (Ibid.: 153-154), and “integration with other social software tools” (Ibid.: 156), or Web 2.0 tools.

Klobas (Ibid.: 122) says “while wikis can be interesting and useful personal management tools and sources of information, it is the collaborative, creative nature of the wiki that holds the real power for education”. In education, “wikis can be used effectively by instructors for posting course information or lecture notes and inviting participation from students” (Anderson 2008: 156); it is “an ideal place for collaborative writing projects involving classes, or multinational student groups” (Dudeny 2007: 128). “Wiki software enables educators to provide learning opportunities with increased interactivity, authenticity and social purpose” (Klobas 2006: 122); “wikis also have the potential to motivate students” (Ibid.: 124).

Examples of educational and learning activities using wikis suggested by T. Anderson (2008: 156) in his book are: “students or groups of students can /.../ create their own wiki” on the topics being studied; “wikis can also be used as e-portfolios or students’ work, for evaluation by the instructor”; and “brainstorming activities can be especially powerful using a wiki, and FAQ pages are also possible”. Dudeny (2007: 128) recommends “to get started with a free wiki, try Wikispaces at wikispaces.com”.

This demonstrates, so to say, the full power of Web 2.0 tools and their possibilities, how one tool can be used in a number of ways, unite people, erase borders, help create something new collaboratively and learn the language.

#### 1.4.5. Podcasting or Voice Recording

Pete Sharma and Barney Barrett (2007: 20) explain “the name podcast is a combination of Apple's well-known audio player, the iPod, and the word broadcast from TV and radio. A podcast is a computer audio file”, or, in other words, it is a voice recording. Lindsay Warwick (2012: 59), a teacher and teacher trainer in the UK (United Kingdom), assures in her article that “voice recording is not a new concept in ELT; it has been used for language practice for decades. What makes it relevant today is the increased

use of voice recording to communicate in our everyday lives, from leaving a voice message to a loved one to recording a webinar for colleagues”.

In “Blended Learning: Using Technology in and beyond the Language Classroom”, it is mentioned that voice recordings or “podcasts come in a number of formats, including: presentations”, which are “pre-scripted and well organized”; monologues – when “a single person usually extemporising”; interviews – “a presenter asking guests questions”; and dialogues – “two or more people engaged in a conversation, usually about a predetermined topic” (Barrett, Sharma 2007: 20). All these can be recorded, for example, with ‘Sound Recorder’, a piece of software in Microsoft Windows, or with other Web 2.0 tools.

Nowadays “there are recording devices on computers and smartphones, with the option to email recordings. Free programs such as Audacity can be downloaded and used with a headset and microphone” (Warwick 2012: 59). In addition, “online recording tools, such as Vocaroo and Mailvu, allow voice or video messages respectively to be emailed privately. Audioboo uploads messages to the web and will sync them to a blog or social network” (Ibid.). Lindsay Warwick (Ibid.) also writes in the article about streaming online or screencasting: it “allows you to record your voice and whatever is on your computer screen at the same time. Jing is a popular downloadable program; the website Screencast-o-matic offers the same free facilities online, and the Voxopop website allows you to create private talk groups where students can talk asynchronously”.

According to Warwick (Ibid.), “with voice recording, English language learners: can communicate in English with people all over the world; are encouraged to take more care about what they say and how they say it”; and “have nowhere to hide and can’t let others speak for them”. Peter Travis (2007: 54), the co-founder of Flo-Joe, a website for Cambridge Exam preparation ([flo-joe.co.uk](http://flo-joe.co.uk)), suggests that “student-created podcasts can be used to increase motivation, help develop a sense of audience and offer the opportunity for self-expression.” He says “learners can podcast on general themes such as musical tastes, the experience of living in another country or advice on studying English”. (Ibid.)

In the article, L. Warwick (2012: 59) also suggests a number of activities for language development using voice recording: to “give the students the first line of a story and ask them first to record it and then to record a continuation”; “guess the words” – when “the students work in pairs and have a conversation for two minutes”, then others listen to the recording and try to guess the purpose of the talk or the meaning or the spoken words; “describe and draw” – the learners “listen to each other’s recordings and draw what

they hear”; recording an anecdote, then, in the class, choosing “the funniest, most embarrassing, etc”.

#### 1.4.6. Video

Today Web 2.0 tools allow people to screencast and to watch live videos in any language, for example, justin.tv or twitch.tv, to attend webinars in English, to communicate with anyone who has a PC and Internet access using a webcam, for example, Skype, to learn the language watching films, TED Talks, or other interactive video clips – for free and at any time.

Nicky Hockly (2012: 60) claims “the TED Talks ([www.ted.com](http://www.ted.com)) are no ordinary videos. TED stands for Technology Entertainment Design. These videos are short presentations of 3, 6, 9, 12 or 18 minutes each, made by very good speakers on a huge range of interesting topics”. By “very good speakers”, she means “politicians (Gordon Brown, Bill Clinton, Al Gore ...), /.../ technology gurus (Bill Gates, Google founders Larry Page and Sergey Brin ...) and /.../ scientists, educators, designers and other talented individuals” (Ibid.). These videos are a “good resource” for the language learners “because the speakers and topics are engaging” and “a way to develop and practise their listening skills in English” (Ibid.). According to Hockly (Ibid.), the TED Talks can be watched “inside the classroom” and “alone outside class”, with and without subtitles, and transcripts of the videos can be read.

YouTube covers a larger area and all sorts of videos are available there; it is “a video sharing website where users can upload, view and share video clips” (Balcikanli 2009: 92). Cem Balcikanli (Ibid.) writes in her work “Long Live, YouTube: L2 Stories about YouTube in Language Learning” that “most of the content on YouTube has been uploaded by individuals” – “unregistered users can watch the videos, while registered are permitted to upload an unlimited number of videos. Accounts of registered users are called ‘channels’”. In her opinion, “YouTube is one of the greatest things Web 2.0 is offering us”, because “geographical, social, cultural boundaries have been knocked out. Thanks to YouTube, people can easily upload videos and let anyone in the world know something about themselves” (Ibid.).

In the paper, it is emphasised that “YouTube is an unlimited resource for language acquisition/learning” since “one can listen to all kinds of spoken language (formal, neutral, informal) and genres (songs, parodies, debates, political speeches, talk shows, lectures) and learn a lot of vocabulary in context, which, without doubt, will help memorize more

easily” (Ibid.). C. Balcikanli (Ibid.: 92-94) proves that “YouTube is a great online learning tool” by making this research and interviewing the students of the University of Florida – they also find it useful: English can be learned “in and out-of-the classroom”; the videos can be repeated; “help learners explore the target culture” and “develop their autonomy levels as it encourages them to watch videos and clips continuously” (Ibid.: 94).

Talking about videoconferencing in educational and learning purposes, Terry Anderson (2008: 177) refers to S. Roberts, who described the pedagogic characteristics of videoconference sessions in 1998. “They add a sense of direct involvement and physical presence among geographically dispersed learners”; provide quality, live, and “interactive learning opportunities to distant sites, including delivery of global expertise to remote learners”; in addition, these sessions “eliminate or reduce travel time”, “may improve motivation”, and make “collaborative learning more attractive and feasible” (Ibid.).

### **1.5. Conclusions on the Theoretical Material**

Web 2.0 tools are the next step in the educational process and (English) language learning since they have a substantial number of advantages and benefits comparing with the traditional model of education without computers, or where the web is rarely used or used only as a supplementary tool. The World Wide Web itself has information, which is constantly updated, on almost anything; the second version makes it more attractive, easier to use and manage, because it combines different types of data (e.g., video, pictures, text). Web 2.0 allows users to contribute, to create, to collaborate, meaning that today students can write directly on the web and communicate online, can share files and access educating materials at no cost. Any language, especially English, can be freely learned in the online environment by means of interaction between other learners and users; in addition, there are all sorts of texts and tasks, from which students can choose, reread and redo them, and as a result, any language skill can also be acquired and developed. Nowadays, according to the authors mentioned in this thesis, Web 2.0 tools are a must in the schools and universities of the developed countries of the world, especially because of digital natives. These tools include social networks, weblogs, wikis, photo, video and file sharing, and other interactive applications that motivate learners. With this technology, “people are changing the way that the real world works – business practices as well as social activities. Why not use them to change schools?” (Schrum, Solomon 2007: 2).

## **CHAPTER II. USE OF WEB 2.0 TOOLS IN NARVA COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TARTU**

### **2.1. Survey**

For the practical part, in order to achieve valid data, or results and get average numbers, a form of questionnaire was chosen amongst other research methods and techniques. Because this type of survey is quick, meaning that it takes only around five-ten minutes to answer the questions, and reliable, meaning that the questionnaire is anonymous – no names are given, as well as massive, meaning that a number of people, in this case the students and members of the academic staff of Narva College of the University of Tartu, are answering the same questions at the same time.

The main aims were to support the theoretical part and to confirm or refute the hypotheses of the paper: firstly, that the lecturers of Narva College of the University of Tartu are more aware than the students of Web 2.0 tools and their application in language teaching/learning; and secondly, that only 75 percent of the students of the College use the tools in learning English. The intentions were also to find out and compare which Web 2.0 tools both the students who learn English and the members of the academic staff of Narva College of the University of Tartu use and which tools they find the most useful in language learning and teaching, the opinion of two groups on the necessity of using these tools as well as whether it is a novelty or a must in the educational process. Additionally, as the feedback, the participants were asked to give their own comments on the present work – the questionnaire, presentation, information found and presented to them, and the way this information was presented – in general, and to suggest the Web 2.0 tools they use or other tools they consider useful.

The questionnaire is divided into two parts: the first part (see Appendix 1) was delivered to the audience before the presentation on the topic of the thesis, and the second part (see Appendix 2) was handed to the respondents after the presentation. The purpose of such decision is, first of all, to check fairly the level of awareness of the both groups and whether they use Web 2.0 tools in language learning/teaching or not, and then, to get feedback and find out what the students and the language lecturers of Narva College of the University of Tartu think on the topic “Use of Web 2.0 Tools in English Language Learning: A Novelty or a Must?”.

The questionnaire is in a printed-out form and consists of two sheets of A4 format paper, naturally, the first and the second parts. In total, there are ten questions or points,

which are numbered from '1' to '10', to answer: four questions (1-4) are in the first part of the questionnaire and six (5-10) – in the second one. The students and the members of the academic staff have the same sheets and the same points to go.

The questions number 1 and 2 are aimed at studying the awareness of Web 2.0 tools and their use for language learning/teaching of both groups, which ask whether they know what these tools are and that the tools can be/are used in education – the participants simply needed to answer 'yes' or 'no'. The third and the fourth questions ask the students and lecturers whether they use Web 2 tools in language learning/teaching as well as what tools exactly they use. In the last question, which is number 4, on the first sheet of paper, there is a number of variants to choose from and more than one option is possible – a list of tools classified by their type is given: 'communication tools', 'educating tools', 'collaboration tools', 'office tools', 'file sharing', 'tools for self-expression', 'video tools', 'voice recording', 'entertaining tools', and additionally, for each variant, the examples of the tools are written in the brackets. There are also two possible options more – 'other' if a participant uses some other tools which are not mentioned in the list and 'none of them' if one does not use any Web 2.0 tools in foreign language learning.

After the students and members of the academic staff had been informed and had seen the presentation, they were given the second part of the questionnaire and had questions to answer. The question number 5 asks the participants' opinion on the necessity of using the tools in education and language learning/teaching – need to use or do not ('yes' or 'no'); the next one – their opinion on whether Web 2.0 is a novelty or a must. The seventh question is aimed at finding out the most useful tools for teachers and learners from the same list of tools as in the fourth point. In the question number 8, both groups are asked to suggest tools; the purpose of it was that the students and lecturers could add and give their own examples of the Web 2 tools, which are not mentioned by me, they use or find useful. The last two questions are aimed at getting feedback: firstly, to answer positively or negatively whether the information found and presented was helpful, and secondly, there is free space to write comments if the participants wish.

## **2.2. Presentation**

The second step of the practical part of the thesis is the presentation (see Appendix 3) made by me in Microsoft PowerPoint on the same topic as the thesis and questionnaire are. The intentions were to support the questionnaire and to inform the audience about Web 2.0 tools and the possibilities of their use in (English) language learning and in



education in general. The presentation was delivered between the first and the second parts of the questionnaire; both took place in an English classroom of Narva College of the University of Tartu on 22 of April, 2013 at 12 o'clock and lasted for 30 minutes. The whole performance, my speech, and communication were only in English.

The presentation is based on the theoretical part of the thesis and provides a general overview on the topic of the paper – 36 slides in total. The audience was briefly told about the difference between the terms the 'Internet' and 'WWW', what exactly Web 2.0 and its tools and features are, the history of the web, about Web 1.0 and its characteristics, the advantages and benefits of using Web 2 tools in education and language learning/teaching, about 'digital natives' and the language skills – reading, writing, listening, speaking, and other skills, how they can be developed with the help of Web 2.0, my opinion on whether it is a novelty or a must, and finally, the tools such as webquests, podcasting, and blogging were introduced to the public and a number of websites and examples of the technology such as justin.tv, TED Talks, Vocaroo, Mailvu, Voxopop, CoolToolsforSchools, Dvolver Moviemaker, forvo.com, englishcentral.com, nobuna.com, grooveshark.com, fraze.it, Puzzlemaker were shown. In my opinion, those are the most useful and probably interesting Web 2.0 tools for the students who learn English and the language lecturers of Narva College of the University of Tartu.

In total, there were 25 participants in the audience, excluding me. This number includes twenty students who learn the foreign language and five members of the academic staff of the College who teach languages, mostly English; the same people answered the questions.

### **2.3. Feedback and Results**

It can be said straight away that the results and feedback received from the two groups are not the same; this demonstrates the difference between the students and language lecturers in the way they think and learn or teach English, and proves a number of facts as, for example, the hypotheses of the paper.

On the questions number 1 and 2, which are aimed at studying the level of awareness of Web 2.0 tools and their use for language teaching/learning, the first group – the students of Narva College of the University of Tartu – answered more negatively than the second group – the members of the academic staff of the College. Only 25 percent of the learners knew at the moment before the presentation what 'Web 2' means and were aware of its tools and that they can be and are used in education while every language

teacher was aware and knew about it. This proves the first hypothesis of the paper that the lectures of Narva College of the University of Tartu are more aware than the students of Web 2.0 tools and their application in language teaching/learning. One of the reasons why is that nowadays it is a usual thing and people do not even realise they are using this technology, especially digital natives, that can also be said about the students of the College; and the next fact – the third question supports it.

Web 2.0 tools in language learning are used by 3 out of 4 learners, five students do not use the tools in English learning at all; and this again proves the second hypothesis of the paper that only 75 percent of the students of Narva College of the University of Tartu use Web 2 in learning the language while every member of the academic staff uses the technology. It can be explained by a number of reasons: first of all, the lecturers should know different methods and techniques how to teach and they also need to keep up with the changes in the educational process; secondly, the students are not aware of all the possibilities and opportunities of using the web to learn English and use it for their own needs or they are just not interested and prefer the traditional ways of learning, for example, studying textbooks, writing with a pen, and reading foreign literature.

The fourth question (see Table 1) illustrates which Web 2.0 tools exactly are used by both groups and in what proportion: communication tools (e.g., social networks, online chats, Skype, e-mailing, etc.) are used by every language teacher of the college and by 50 percent of the students; educating tools (e.g., dictionaries, vocabularies, Puzzlemaker, different tasks online, etc.) – used by 4 out of 5 lecturers and 55 % of the learners; collaboration tools (e.g., wikis, WebQuests and so on) – every fourth student uses them and only one English teacher of Narva College; office tools (e.g., Microsoft Office, Google Docs, etc.) are used by the same numbers from both groups – 3 out of 5; file sharing (e.g., DropBox, Flickr and others) – used again only by one member of the academic staff and by 15 percent of the learners; around the same number – 40 % for the members and 35 % for their students – uses tools for self-expression (e.g., Twitter, blogs, posting online, podcasting, streaming); video tools such as YouTube, online films, educational videos, videoconferencing are used by every language lecturer and by 3 out of 5 learners; voice recording (e.g., phoning online, recording yourself, interviewing on the web, etc.) and entertaining tools, for example, Moviemaker, or making clips, flash games, drawing – used by 15 % of the students while none of the English lecturers of Narva College of the University of Tartu apply them in language teaching.

<b>applied Web 2.0 tools</b>	<b>I group (20 students)</b>	<b>II group (5 lang. lecturers)</b>
<b>video</b>	60 %	100 %
<b>communication</b>	50 %	100 %
<b>educating</b>	55 %	80 %
<b>office</b>	60 %	60 %
<b>for self-expression</b>	35 %	40 %
<b>collaboration</b>	25 %	20 %
<b>file sharing</b>	15 %	20 %
<b>none</b>	25 %	0 %
<b>voice recording</b>	15 %	0 %
<b>entertaining</b>	15 %	0 %

*Table 1. (The most frequently) Used Web 2.0 tools in Narva College of the University of Tartu for English language learning.*

Such tendency is fair since it shows that the members of the academic staff focus more on educating, teaching and developing their students' language skills; as it can be seen the most frequently used Web 2.0 tools are communication and video ones – 100%, then educating – 80 % and office tools – 60 %, and only after, there are other tools such as for self-expression, some of the Web 2 tools are not even used, for example, entertaining. For the students, the situation is different since they use all kinds of the tools and there are average numbers for each one – around 30-50 percent meaning that the language learners combine English learning with some sort of fun, game, and more interactivity between the users of the web.

Talking about the second part of the questionnaire – more like feedback, the results of two groups are also different; it demonstrates one more time the difference between two, so to say, generations and their opinions.

With the question number 5, the language teachers – 100 % and students – 9 out of 10 both agree that there is a need to use Web 2.0 tools in the educational process, and the publications mentioned in the thesis and I think it is logical, because today the Internet is used in every aspect of human life as, for example, business, shopping, communication, etc., why should not we apply those tools in education and (English) language learning?

In the sixth point, opinions were divided on whether Web 2 is a novelty or a must in the educational process. Most of the students think it is a must – 75 percent while only two

lecturers think so, which is equal to 40 %, and one more assumes that now it is a supplementary tool and only on the edge of becoming a must; other think it is still a novelty in education and English language learning. Here, the answer depends more likely on the participants' subjective understanding or their personal opinion on how well Web 2 tools were/are implemented and how often they were/are applied in school, at the College.

The question number 7 (see Table 2) is aimed at finding out the most useful tools and they are, according to the learners of English and members of the academic staff of Narva College of the University of Tartu, communication (60 % – the students and 80 % – the lecturers), video (3 out of 4 – the first group and 3 out of 5 – the second one), and educating tools (half of the students and 80 percent of the language teachers). Additionally, the learners find office tools useful – 65 percent while only 2 out of 5 language lecturers do; the majority – 4 out of 5 of the members finds collaboration tools useful while these tools are not so popular amongst the students who learn English – 35 %. Tools for self-expression are in the middle which is 60 percent for the lecturers and 40 – the language learners; the significant difference in percentage is seen in voice recording – again 3 out of 5 and only 15 % of the students. The least useful Web 2.0 tools in the list are entertaining (1 out of 5 – the language teachers and 1 out of 4 – the learners) and file sharing tools (10 percent – the first group and 20 percent – the second one). Finally, there was one person from the first group who finds none of the tools useful.

<b>useful Web 2.0 tools</b>	<b>I group (20 students)</b>	<b>II group (5 lang. lecturers)</b>
<b>communication</b>	60 %	80 %
<b>video</b>	75 %	60 %
<b>educating</b>	50 %	80 %
<b>collaboration</b>	35 %	80 %
<b>office</b>	65 %	40 %
<b>for self-expression</b>	40 %	60 %
<b>voice recording</b>	15 %	60 %
<b>entertaining</b>	25 %	20 %
<b>file sharing</b>	10 %	20 %
<b>none</b>	5 %	0 %

*Table 2. The most useful Web 2.0 tools in Narva College of the University of Tartu for English language learning.*

The numbers above show that the participants' intentions are to learn/teach English and their approach is more practical than entertaining or theoretical since such Web 2.0 tools as communication and educating ones are popular and entertaining are not. The difference in office tools illustrates the probability although these tools are not that useful for developing the language skills the students are very responsible at doing their assignments in Microsoft Office. Another difference in collaboration and voice recording tools can be described by means of the level of awareness and their popularity in the educational process.

In the question number 8, only one member of the academic staff of the College suggested a Web 2 tool – the Moodle platform, which is free and meant for e-learning, it can be compared with a wiki and an example is moodle.ut.ee – the online environment of the University of Tartu. From the students, there were seven suggestions or comments in total: one of the learners suggested Prezi.com, which is an online presentation tool where a user can create and share his or her ideas with others; two students suggested just the whole Google platform including the search engine, e-mail, Google Maps, Google Translate and so on; another two language learners suggested in general tools for self-expression and communication tools, which they find useful and would like to see them more often in learning practice; the last person wrote that all the tools were mentioned and they could be successfully used.

Unexpectedly, the majority of the audience found the information of the theoretical part of the thesis helpful – 100 percent for the lecturers and 90 percent for the students of Narva College of the University of Tartu; two learners of English found the presentation and speech useless. Such feedback can be connected with the examples provided in the paper and presentation, which were/are useful for the participants in some way.

On the final question, only the students commented and the comments were positive: “all was very interesting and useful”, “nice speech”, “good presentation”, “good job!”, “good luck!”, and the longest one is “it was very useful information to know what we can use in our education and language learning”.

#### **2.4. Conclusions on the Practical Part**

The goals of the practical part were achieved: the students and members of the academic staff of Narva College of the University of Tartu were informed on the topic of the thesis, shown some examples from the paper, and given the questionnaire. In total, there were 25 participants. As an outcome, it is clearly seen that Web 2.0 tools are used at

the College, but the language lecturers are more aware of the tools and their possibilities in teaching/learning English than the learners. The hypotheses of this paper were also proven; only 75 % of the students use Web 2 in learning the foreign language. The most frequently used are communication, video, educating, and office tools; and the least – collaboration, file sharing, voice recording, and entertaining tools. Both groups agree with the need to use these tools in the educational process and English learning; in addition, the majority of the students think it is a must. The most useful Web 2.0 tools at the college are communication, video, and educating ones; the least useful – entertaining and file sharing tools. Only two tools – the Moodle platform and Prezi.com were suggested by the audience. The most of the participants found the theoretical materials collected by me helpful.

To be brief, the results of the practical part of the thesis can be concluded and displayed in the table number 3:

<b>Web 2.0 tools in NCTU</b>	<b>I group (20 students)</b>	<b>II group (5 lang. lecturers)</b>
<b>awareness</b>	<b>25 %</b>	<b>100 %</b>
<b>applying</b>	<b>75 %</b>	<b>100 %</b>
<b>need for use</b>	90 %	100 %
<b>a must</b>	75 %	40 % (+ 20 %)
<b>suggestions</b>	1. Prezi.com 2. Google platform	1. Moodle platform
<b>helpful info</b>	90 %	100 %

*Table 3. Use of Web 2.0 tools in English language learning in Narva College of the University of Tartu.*

## CONCLUSION

Time goes by, the world constantly changes, so does the society as well as the educational process; technological progress significantly affects the way people work, shop, communicate, and learn. Today English is one of the most spoken languages on earth and the Internet is widely used in the developed countries of the world. But can the language be learned in the online environment?

In general, the thesis describes Web 2.0 tools, their use in English language learning and studies this phenomenon in the context of Narva College of the University of Tartu. The paper provides a substantial amount of information connected to the topic and proves a number of facts; the first part is theoretical and the second one is practical.

First of all, the Internet and the World Wide Web are not the same things since the WWW is a way people access the information on the Net. Web 2.0 – the second version of the Web, which is, as a rule, associated with Tim O'Reilly and his companions dating to the years of 2004-2005, is the most popular nowadays, because, comparing with the first one, it has a significant number of benefits such as openness and freedom, interactivity and sharing, live communication and collaboration. Web 1.0 is the read-only and passive web, while Web 2.0 tools are all the features and applications of this platform, including social networks, wikis, blogs, file sharing sites, podcasting, and video streaming.

Secondly, these tools are already being used in education and English language learning but their total implementation can completely change the way students study and are taught. Examples of Web 2.0 tools are Facebook, Skype, Google platform, Microsoft Office, Flickr, Twitter, YouTube and so on; their application in the educational process is advantageous because of the simplicity of their use, accessibility (anywhere, anytime), immediate feedback and independence the tools provide, they are motivating, comfortable to use, and free (or cheap), in some cases faster and, so to say, better than teachers, for example, searching for information on the web (e.g., in dictionaries, vocabularies) and Web 2.0 is available 24/7. There are four major language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) that can be developed and mastered with the help of online tools; using computer also improves other skills, such as creativity and thinking skills (deduction, induction, comparison, contrast, analysis).

Thirdly, today Web 2.0 tools can be considered a must or at least on the edge of becoming one in schools and universities of the developed countries since technology, which is evolving, is a part of human life; students should be ready for the future and

‘digital natives’ cannot and do not imagine the world without it. The thesis also illustrates that even the simplest Web 2 tools (e-mailing, webquests) change the educational process in a positive direction.

Finally, this phenomenon was studied in Narva College of the University of Tartu by means of showing the presentation on the topic of the thesis and conducting the survey amongst the students and members of the academic staff. The aims were to find out to which extent both these groups are aware of the opportunities of using Web 2.0 tools in education in general plus the percentage of those who apply the tools in English language learning. The intentions were also to inform the learners and language lecturers of the College and to get to know their opinions on that account. As a result, the hypotheses of the paper – that the members of the academic staff of Narva College of the University of Tartu are more aware than the students of Web 2.0 tools and their use in language teaching/learning and that only 75 percent of the students of the College apply the tools in learning English – are proved. In addition, the positive feedback (95 % of the participants found the examples and information of the thesis useful and helpful) from the groups is received and the majority (57.5 %) of the respondents thinks that Web 2.0 is a must nowadays.

To summarise, the results of the research can be interpreted as follows: Web 2 tools are used for English learning/teaching by every member of the academic staff and 3 out of 4 of the students of Narva College of the University of Tartu, which is connected to their level of awareness of the tools meaning that 100 % of the language lecturers are aware while only 25 % of the learners know what Web 2.0 is. Such tendency demonstrates the difference between two generations and that these tools are a common thing for most of the students, they do not even know or realise that they use them, in other words, such learners can be considered as the digital natives; others either stick to the traditional model of education or just are not informed about the Web 2.0 technology. Talking about the language lecturers, they need to keep up with the changes in teaching and be able to apply different methods of education – that is why this group has the highest numbers.

All in all, the goals of the thesis are achieved. Web 2.0 tools are found to be powerful and useful in educational as well as in English language learning, they modify, improve the learning process making it more attractive and comfortable, the tools motivate and stimulate, offer freedom and independence, allow collaboration and choice, are simple and at the same time they educate learners. But it is just technology, which can be used in a good or bad way, the teacher is still the key figure in the classroom.



## REFERENCES

Anderson, Terry (ed). 2008. *The Theory and Practice of Online Learning*. Edmonton: AU Press.

Balcikanli, Cem. 2009. Long Live, YouTube: L2 Stories about YouTube in Language Learning. Available at [http://moodle.bracu.ac.bd/pluginfile.php/6346/mod\\_resource/content/1/Long%20Live,%20YouTube%20%20L2%20Stories%20about%20YouTube%20in%20Language%20Learning%20by%20Cem%20Balcikanli.pdf](http://moodle.bracu.ac.bd/pluginfile.php/6346/mod_resource/content/1/Long%20Live,%20YouTube%20%20L2%20Stories%20about%20YouTube%20in%20Language%20Learning%20by%20Cem%20Balcikanli.pdf), accessed May 27, 2013.

Barrett, Barney and Pete Sharma. 2007. *Blended Learning: Using Technology in and beyond the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Basallote, Yolanda Scott-Tennant. 1997. E-mail in class? You can do it, too! *English Teaching professional*, October: 5, 10-11.

Berners-Lee, Tim. 1999. The future of the Web. Available at <http://www.w3.org/1999/04/13-tbl.html>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Blake, Robert J. 2008. *Brave New Digital Classroom: Technology and Foreign Language Learning*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Brabbs, Phil. 2002. WebQuests. *English Teaching professional*, July: 24, 39-41.

Carmesin, Berit, Doris Devilly and Michelle Tooher. 2009. Wikilingua.ie: Towards using Web 2.0 Technologies in Language Learning and Teaching. Available at [http://conference.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2009/common/download/Proceedings\\_pdf/Berit\\_Carmesin,Doris\\_Devilly,Michelle\\_Tooher.pdf](http://conference.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2009/common/download/Proceedings_pdf/Berit_Carmesin,Doris_Devilly,Michelle_Tooher.pdf), accessed May 27, 2013.

Cherubin, Maurizia and Fabrizio Maggi. 2013. *Using Web 2.0 tools in CLIL*. Unpublished article. Italy.

Cooke, Lori. 2011. What is Web 2.0? Available at [http://ebstc.org/newsletter/0311/Article\\_1.htm](http://ebstc.org/newsletter/0311/Article_1.htm), accessed May 27, 2013.

Deubelbeiss, David. 2010. Web 2.0 and English Language Learning. Available at <http://ddeubel.edublogs.org/2010/09/13/web-2-0-and-english-language-learning/>, accessed May 27, 2013.

DiNucci, Darcy. 1999. Fragmented Future. *Print*, 53: 4, 32, 221-222.

Discovery Education. 2011. Testing Doesn't Have To Be a Bad Word. Available at <http://web2012.discoveryeducation.com/blog/index.cfm/2011/6/14/TESTING-doesnt-have-to-be-a-bad-word>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Dudeny, Gavin. 2007. *The Internet and the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

English Club. 2013. The 4 Language Skills. Available at <http://www.englishclub.com/learn-english/language-skills.htm>, accessed May 27, 2013

English Language. 2013. English Language Statistics. Available at <http://www.englishlanguageguide.com/facts/stats/>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Fish, Tim. 2009. School 2.0. *Independent School*, 68: 2, 80-86.

Frydenberg, Mark and Gary B. Shelly. 2011. *Web 2.0: Concepts and Applications*. Boston: Course Technology.

Getting, Brian. 2007. Basic Definitions: Web 1.0, Web. 2.0, Web 3.0. Available at <http://www.practicalecommerce.com/articles/464-Basic-Definitions-Web-1-0-Web-2-0-Web-3-0>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Grisolia, Carina. 2008. Using WebQuests. *English Teaching professional*, November: 59, 55-56.

Henning, Jeffrey. 2009. Web 1.0 vs. Web 2.0. Available at <http://blog.vovici.com/blog/bid/18085/Web-1-0-vs-Web-2-0>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Grosseck, Gabriela. 2008. To use or not to use web 2.0 in higher education? Available at <http://webpages.csus.edu/~sac43949/pdfs/to%20use%20or%20not%20to%20use.pdf>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Hockly, Nicky. 2012. Five things you always wanted to know about: TED Talks. *English Teaching professional*, May: 80, 60.

Hockly, Nicky. 2012. Five things you always wanted to know about: webinars. *English Teaching professional*, September: 82, 61.

Jones, Christopher and Sue Fortescue. 1991. *Using Computers in the Language Classroom*. London, New York: Longman.

Klobas, Jane. 2006. *Wikis: Tools for Information Work and Collaboration*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.

Mayfield, Ross. 2005. Web 2.0: Compact Definition? Available at [http://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:v9BjMTEh0rQJ:scholar.google.com/+web+2.0+definition&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0,33&as\\_vis=1](http://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:v9BjMTEh0rQJ:scholar.google.com/+web+2.0+definition&hl=en&as_sdt=0,33&as_vis=1), accessed May 27, 2013.

Naik, Umesha and D. Shivalingaiah. 2008. Comparative Study of Web 1.0, Web 2.0 and Web 3.0. Available at <http://ir.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/handle/1944/1285/54.pdf?sequence=1>, accessed May 27, 2013.

O'Reilly, Tim. 2005. Web 2.0: Compact Definition? Available at <http://radar.oreilly.com/2005/10/web-20-compact-definition.html>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Peachey, Nik. 2009. Web 2.0 Tools for Teachers. Available at <http://ru.scribd.com/doc/19576895/Web-20-Tools-for-Teachers>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Pfanner, Nasy Inthisone. 2012. Digital homework for digital natives. *English Teaching professional*, May: 80, 58.

Solomon, Gwen and Lynne Schrum. 2007. *Web 2.0: New Tools, New Schools*. USA: International Society for Technology in Education.

Stanley, Graham. 2005. Blogging for ELT. Available at <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/articles/blogging-elt>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Statistic Brain. 2012. Skype Statistics. Available at <http://www.statisticbrain.com/skype-statistics/>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Strickland, Jonathan. 2008. Is there a Web 1.0? Available at <http://computer.howstuffworks.com/web-101.htm>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Teeler, Dede and Peta Gray. 2001. *How to Use the Internet in ELT*. Harlow: Longman.

Travis, Peter. 2007. Podcasting 2. *English Teaching professional*, November: 53, 54-56.

Warwick, Lindsay. 2012. Please leave a message. *English Teaching professional*, September: 82, 59.

WebAppRater. 2010. 7 key features of web 2.0. Available at <http://webapprater.com/general/7-key-features-of-web-2-0.html>, accessed May 27, 2013.

W3Techs. 2013. Usage of content languages for websites. Available at [http://w3techs.com/technologies/overview/content\\_language/all](http://w3techs.com/technologies/overview/content_language/all), accessed May 27, 2013.

YouTube. 2013. Statistics. Available at <http://www.youtube.com/yt/press/en-GB/statistics.html>, accessed May 27, 2013.

Zambonini, Dan. 2005. Web 2.0: Compact Definition? [http://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:v9BjMTEh0rQJ:scholar.google.co/+web+2.0+definition&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0,33&as\\_vis=1](http://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:v9BjMTEh0rQJ:scholar.google.co/+web+2.0+definition&hl=en&as_sdt=0,33&as_vis=1), accessed May 27, 2013.

## KOKKUVÕTE

Käesolevas töös on autori poolt kirjeldatud Web 2.0 töövahendid ja nende kasutamine inglise keele õppimiseks ning uuritakse seda nähtust Tartu Ülikooli Narva Kolledžis, mis ongi selle töö eesmärgid.

Sissejuhatuses räägitakse lühidalt Veebi ajaloost, mis on üldse World Wide Web ja selle versioonid ehk Web 1 ja Web 2, nende erinevustest, omadustest ja tunnustest.

Esimeses osas ehk teooria osas on kirjeldatud Web 2.0 töövahendite eelised ja põhjendatud nende kasu õppeprotsessis, et Veeb 2.0 mõjutab keeleoskuste (lugemine, kirjutamine, kuulamine, rääkimine ja teised oskused) arendamist positiivselt, lisaks sellele on selgeks tehtud kas täna on see ikkagi uudsus või vältimatu asi koolides ja ülikoolides ning on välja toodud teise põlvkonna vahendite konkreetsed näidised ja kuidas võib neid rakendada.

Teine osa on praktiline, kus autori poolt on tehtud presentatsioon Web 2 töövahendite ja nende abiga inglise keele õppimise kohta, mis oli näidetud Narva Kolledži tudengitele ja keele lektoritele ning küsimustik, mis oli nendele ka jagatud ja uuris teadlikkuse taset sellistest vahenditest ja nende kasutamist selles õppeasutuses.

Lõppude lõpuks kõik eesmärgid on saavutatud ning käesoleva tööga on tõendatud, et terve Tartu Ülikooli Narva Kolledži akadeemiline koosseis on teadlik Web 2.0 töövahenditest, nende võimalustest ja kasutab neid õppeprotsessis ja inglise keele õpetamiseks ning ainult üks veerand kõigist tudengitest teavad mis on Veebi vahendid, et Web 2 võib rakendada, juba rakendatakse võõrkeele õppimiseks ja seoses sellega 75 % ülikooliõpilastest kasutavad neid oma keele oskuste arendamiseks.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1. I Part of the Questionnaire

#### Questionnaire

### Web 2.0 Tools in English Language Learning

Narva College of the University of Tartu

*April 22, 2013*

Dear **Student/Member of the Academic Staff**,

The presentation you are going to see and the questionnaire are a part of my Bachelor's thesis aiming at studying awareness of Web 2.0 tools and their use for language teaching/learning.

I would be very grateful if you could answer the following questions.

#### **I part**

**1. Do you know what Web 2.0 tools are?**

YES  NO

**2. Do you know they can be and are used in education?**

YES  NO

**3. Do you use them in learning/teaching?**

YES  NO

**4. What tools do you use in language learning/teaching?** (more than one option is possible)

- Communication tools (social networks, chats, Skype, e-mail, etc.)
- Educating tools (vocabularies, Puzzlemaker, different tasks online, etc.)
- Collaboration tools (wikis, WebQuests, etc.)
- Office tools (Microsoft Office, Google Docs, etc.)
- File sharing (DropBox, Flickr, etc.)

- Tools for self-expression (Twitter, blogs, posting online, podcasting, streaming, etc.)
  - Video tools (YouTube, online films, educational videos, videoconferencing, etc.)
  - Voice recording (phoning, recording yourself, interviewing, etc.)
  - Entertaining tools (Moviemaker – making clips, flash games, drawing, etc.)
  - Other
- 
- None of them

## Appendix 2. II Part of the Questionnaire

### Student/Member of the Academic Staff

#### II part

**5. Is there a need to use Web 2.0 tools in education?**

YES  NO

**6. What do you think it is a novelty or a must in language learning?**

NOVELTY  MUST

**7. What tools do you find the most useful? (more than one option is possible)**

- Communication tools (social networks, chats, Skype, e-mail, etc.)
- Educating tools (vocabularies, Puzzlemaker, different tasks online, etc.)
- Collaboration tools (wikis, WebQuests, etc.)
- Office tools (Microsoft Office, Google Docs, etc.)
- File sharing (DropBox, Flickr, etc.)
- Tools for self-expression (Twitter, blogs, posting online, podcasting, streaming, etc.)
- Video tools (YouTube, online films, educational videos, videoconferencing, etc.)
- Voice recording (phoning, recording yourself, interviewing, etc.)
- Entertaining tools (Moviemaker – making clips, flash games, drawing, etc.)
- Other

---

None of them

**8. What tools would you suggest?**

---



---



---

**9. Did you find this information helpful?**

YES  NO



**10. Additional comments**

---

---

---

**THANK YOU!**

### Appendix 3. Slides from the Presentation



- in the world – **380 + over 700 million**



- on the Internet – **55.1 %** of all the websites



- the network as **platform**, spanning all connected devices



- allows users to **interact** and **collaborate** with each other in a social media environment



## Web 2.0



- Flickr (a photo sharing site)
- Dropbox (a file sharing site)
- Google Docs (MS Office)
- Wikipedia (most popular wiki)
- Twitter (an information network)
- YouTube (videos, clips)
- Facebook (vkontakte)
- eBay (online shopping)
- Skype (phoning, videoconferencing)



## Web 2.0

- social networking sites
- blogs
- wikis
- video sharing sites
- hosted services (sites)
- web applications
- online tools
- streaming (screencasting)
- 'folksonomies' (social tagging)





## Among Us

- we do not realise we are using Web 2.0 tools



- such things are common today in the educational institutions



## Digital Natives

- coined by Marc Prensky, 2001



- people who grew up with **technology** and includes most of those who are currently students in developed countries



## Advantages

- simplicity
- accessibility
- feedback
- no special training
- replace books
- free or cheap
- comfortable
- independence
- freedom



## In Education

- as a coursebook
- motivating
- any time 24/7
- limitless
- choice
- immediate feedback
- \*better than teacher
- turns into a game
- webinars (online lectures)





**Non-exclusive licence to reproduce thesis and make thesis public**

I, Kirill Vassiljev

(date of birth: 21.01.1990),

1. herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to:
  - 1.1. reproduce, for the purpose of preservation and making available to the public, including for addition to the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright, and
  - 1.2. make available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright,

Use of Web 2.0 Tools in English Language Learning: A Novelty or a Must? (on the example of the academic staff and students of Narva College of the University of Tartu),

supervised by Anna Golubeva,

2. I am aware of the fact that the author retains these rights.
3. I certify that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe the intellectual property rights or rights arising from the Personal Data Protection Act.

Narva, **27.05.2013**