

## **Use of the Web Adventure Method in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language (Example of A2 Level)**

**Vedat Halitođlu<sup>i</sup>**

Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University

### **Abstract**

In this study, a three-week sample application for the use of the WebQuest method in Turkish language teaching was developed, and the effectiveness of the application was tried to be determined through a "achievement test" and students' views. The study employed the mixed methods design, in the quantitative stage of the study, experimental and control groups of 28 people each with similar Turkish language levels were formed randomly among foreign students studying Turkish at Alaaddin Keykubat University. The WebQuest method was used in the experimental group while the traditional teaching method was used in the control group. A "achievement test" was applied to the groups as a pre-test and post-test, and the results were analyzed with the SPSS 25 software. In the qualitative stage of the study, the control group's views on the teaching process were obtained through interview forms, mails, and focus groups, and the obtained data were subjected to content analysis in the Nvivo 12 software to reveal codes and themes. To increase the content validity of the theme achievement test, more than one expert was consulted. The study found that the Turkish teaching process involving the use of the WebQuest method was more effective.

**Keywords:** Language, Education, Technology

**DOI:** 10.29329/ijpe.2021.382.19

---

<sup>i</sup> **Vedat Halitođlu**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Education, Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, ORCID: 0000-0001-9557-7782

**Email:** vedat.halitoglu@alanya.edu.tr

## INTRODUCTION

### Computer Technology Assisted Language Teaching

Traditional teaching with chalk and blackboard is getting richer and different teaching opportunities arise with the introduction of technology in our lives. With the development of computer and software technology, new ways have been opened in the field of language teaching and many innovations have been offered to teachers and learners in order to ease the learning process. Computer, tablet, smart board and smart phone technology have been very effective in the language teaching process today (Djamaa, 2020; Lee, 2020; Tozcu, 2008). Those tools directly affect the quality of the language teaching process and bring innovations in language teaching for teachers and students. It is possible to say that mobile programs, videos, games, subtitle technology used for the purpose of remembering the word, providing retention and reinforcement in language teaching are increasingly effective (Behbahani & Shahbazi, 2020; Fievez et al., 2020; Sato et al., 2020). In addition, speaking skills and word pronunciation are supported by technological tools (such as podcasts) and offer serious convenience to learners (Machovikova, 2002; Mario, 2020). Reading texts can be transferred to the digital environment and designed in a more dynamic and interactive manner by making voiceovers and visualizations; student writing samples can be recorded in electronic media and easy and fast feedback can be provided to the learner about the mistakes (Ebadi & Rahimi, 2019; Huang, 2015; Pennington, 1996; Tsenk, 2015). Along with technological developments, smart board technology emerges as an effective tool in the language teaching process (Schmid, 2006; Aydinli & Elaziz, 2010; Tozcu, 2008). In this way, the learning and teaching environment is becoming more different and it also gets easier. For example, applications called second life, offer a virtual language teaching environment and brand new opportunities in terms of learning environment (Hassan 2016; Gaukrodger & Atkins, 2013; Peterson, 2010; Wang et al., 2009; Hislope, 2008). In this way, a language learning environment is constructed based on the principle of augmented reality free from the classroom or location. It is possible to talk about many similar technological tools in language teaching. Thanks to these tools, language learning and teaching is strengthened in many areas from speaking to writing, reading to listening, and lots of ground are covered. The Webquest method, which is used in language teaching and designed with computer support, comes forward with its flexible, effective and motivating aspects, and can be applied in many subjects (Abadi and others, 2018; Kobylinski C., 2018; Awada and others, 2020).

### WebQuest Method and Language Teaching

The model was first introduced by Bernie Dodge of San Diego State University in 1995. Dodge (1995) defines WebQuest as “an inquiry-oriented activity that comes from internet resources and where students interact with each other, sometimes using video conferencing and presenting some or all of the information”.

According to March (2003), the WebQuest provides a scaffolded learning structure by using the links from the internet. It is emphasized that this structure is composed of real tasks that develop the researcher side of the students, support individual development and include them in the group work process. This approach ensures a high level of learning and transition of information into more. A well-designed WebQuest inspires students to show more complex thematic relationships, facilitates real learning, and leads to reflecting individual metacognitive processes.

It is essential that the student is motivated, given the opportunity to work together; a full assessment is conducted and technology is used. In general, the method has an encouraging approach towards the student. Teacher informing the student is not the goal, rather the main purpose is to encourage the student to use the information with the teacher guiding. In WebQuest students are not on their own on the internet, the opportunity to analyze, synthesize and evaluate are provided with in-depth knowledge, the students are presented with a structured learning environment with the effective use of technology. WebQuest is an effective guiding way of helping students gain new knowledge in the learning environment and chaotic internet resources (Patterson & Pipkin, 2001). WebQuest is an

activity that encourages a higher order of thinking by building a number of information around interesting and doable tasks. It requires critical or creative thinking; provides problem-solving, reasoning, analyzing and synthesizing. These tasks should be more than questions with simple answers that appear on the screen. Ideally, they should be a similar and scaled-down version of what adults do at work or outside school walls (As cited in Starr, 2000).

This method was not originally designed to teach language, however, with the contributions of research about its use in language teaching it has been gradually employed as an effective language teaching method (Kasper, 2000; Koenraad, 2002; Luzón, 2002; Simina & Hamel 2005; Richards, 2005; Torres, 2018).

The use of WebQuest in language teaching offers significant benefits to teachers and learners. Many reasons can be given for using the method in language teaching (Dudeny & Hockly, 2007):

- It enables teachers to integrate internet and language teaching, and does not require any specific technical knowledge
- Helps to communication and information sharing by providing group activities
- It can be used as a simple linguistic tool and allows interdisciplinary work
- It supports critical thinking skills; gives the abilities to compare, classify, make inferences, analyze errors, support, summarize, analyze in depth. Learners not only have access to simple knowledge, but can also adapt what they have learned to different tasks.
- It provides motivational, authentic tasks. It increases students' willingness and shows them learning through activities is real and useful. Thus, students focus on the subject more and show more effort.

In the light of all these reasons, it is concluded that the method is important for language teaching. In order to use the method effectively, it is crucial to have a defined plan. Following steps are noted based on Dodge (2001) and other researchers' studies (Abbit & Ophus, 2008; Brito & Baia, 2007; Drew & Ausband, 2009; Kelly, 2000; Renau & Pesudo, 2016; Strickland, 2005; Trajkoska & Dimov, 2013) for these stages:



Figure. 1. WebQuest stages

These steps should be as follows:

*Introduction:* The part necessary to prepare and motivate the learners. Various information is given to introduce the course. This is also where the main purpose of all the tasks are specified. They can be explained in one or more paragraphs, figures or tables.

*Task:* Students' tasks are specified. The points to be considered while doing these are indicated. Information regarding the activities is revealed.

*Process:* The steps in this section are explained one by one. The students are supported with information. During these processes, students can access the web addresses mentioned in the resources section. Activities should be explained in detail and clearly.

*Evaluation:* This is where the criteria that students can evaluate themselves are presented. Criteria should be clear. They should be able to measure performance or a project, and include group work. Graded scoring guides (rubrics) that allow self-assessment can be used.

*Conclusion:* An overall summary is made and the results are stated. Students are reinforced for the tasks they have accomplished. Further learning is encouraged.

*Web Resources:* All kinds of supportive, constructive, and guiding internet addresses that students can use during their WebQuest tasks are predetermined and presented by the teacher in this section. When planning WebQuests, above steps most definitely should be included. The stages in question are quite important for creating effective tasks. For the WebQuest tasks to be successful, effective and qualified, it is necessary to pay attention to some factors (Dodge, 2001):

1. A good website should be either created or found
2. Resources and learners should be organized
3. Learners should be encouraged to think
4. Agents or tools should be used
5. A learning structure must be scaffolded to realize high expectations

## METHOD

The present study employed the mixed methods design, in which quantitative and qualitative methods are used together (Brannen, 2005; Creswell, 2003; Cooksey, 2020; Lin & Breslow, 1996; Morgan, 2018; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). In the quantitative stage of this mixed-methods research, the model with pre-test and post-test control group, one of the experimental designs, was used. In the qualitative stage, students' views were collected.

### Research Focus

Many teaching methods are used in language teaching. These teaching methods have been known for many years and are widely used in language teaching. However, research has revealed that it is not correct to stick to only one method in language teaching and that a mixed approach (selective) incorporating different methods is increasingly preferred (Albayati, 2020; Howard, 2001; Kumar, 2003; Kumar, 2013; Laser, 2011; Wali, 2009; Weideman, 2001). Consistent with current research on language teaching, the development and application of various language teaching methods in the field of Turkish teaching emerge as an important need. In parallel with the developments in technology, the search for alternative teaching methods has gained momentum and, as a result, new teaching methods have emerged. One of these methods, the WebQuest method, has recently been very popular among educational researchers, teachers, and students engaged in language teaching (Dodge, 2001; Ebadi &

Rahimi, 2018; Ginaya et al., 2018; Irafahmi, 2016; Liang & Fung, 2020; Ruschoff, 2009; Shutenko et al., 2019). Taking these as a starting point, the present study aims to use the WebQuest method in Turkish language teaching and to test whether the method will be effective in teaching Turkish to foreigners. To this end, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. How effective are Turkish lessons taught using the WebQuest method?
2. What do students think about the use of the WebQuest method in Turkish lessons?

### **Participants**

Participants consist of 58 students who take A2 level (Beginner level) Turkish lessons at Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University Turkish and Foreign Language Teaching Application and Research Center (ALKU TOMER). The students were evenly randomized into two groups as the experimental group and the control group (Gravetter, & Forzano, 2011; Shorten & Moorley, 2014; Yin, 2003). There were 13 girls in the experimental group and 15 girls in the control group. The countries of origin of the students in the experimental and control groups were Burkina Faso, Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, Algeria, Somalia, Tunisia, Mali, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Russia, Mongolia, and Iran. Students were in the 18-41 age range. Most of the students were in Turkey for undergraduate education (N=45). Care was taken to ensure that the demographic characteristics and readiness levels of the experimental and control groups consisting of 58 students in total were similar.

### **Data Collection Tools**

The data collection tools were as follows: “Student Information Form” (consists of eight questions about the demographic characteristics of the students), “Theme Achievement Test” (consists of forty questions about subjects such as making suffix (-lı,-sız), noun making suffix (-lık), obtative case (-e, -a), imperative case, Turkish preposition (ile) etc. to measure both groups’ prior knowledge levels before the teaching process and to determine their learning levels at the end of the teaching process), and “Student Opinion Form” (consists of four open-ended questions to collect the experimental group’s views on the language learning process with the WebQuest method). Furthermore, voice recordings obtained during focus groups and e-mails sent by students to the researcher throughout the process were also included in the data set.

### **Teaching Process**

Before the quantitative data collection stage, the students were evenly randomized into two groups (experimental and control groups), and the “Theme Achievement Test” was administered to both groups. After this stage, the teaching process continued differently in two groups.

- *The teaching process in the experimental group:* For the experimental group, a set of contents that could be adapted to online teaching and that included the subjects of “Adjective making suffix (-lı,-sız), noun making suffix (-lık), obtative case (-e, -a), imperative case, Turkish preposition (ile), simple past tense (noun sentences), comparison (gibi, kadar), future tense” determined by consulting experts was developed. The contents were enriched by the researcher with multimedia components such as animations, images, sounds, games, and quizzes and adapted to the WebQuest technique. The content package in question was presented to students in the form of online and offline tasks in a three-week period. The process consisted of six stages (introduction, tasks, evaluation, conclusion, internet resources, sharing area) and various tasks. At the end of the first week, focus groups were held with five students, and at the end of the process, interviews were re-held with five different students (Fern, 2001; Krueger & Casey, 2000). All the interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and included in the data set during the analysis stage. Throughout the process, the students exchanged e-mails with the researcher about the problems they encountered. At the end of the

process, these e-mails were also included in the data set. Also, at the end of the teaching process, a “Student Opinion Form” was sent to the students, and the process was completed once their opinions were received.

- *The teaching process in the control group:* In the same three-week period, the same contents “Adjective making suffix (-lı, -sız), noun making suffix (-lık), obative case (-e, -a), imperative case, Turkish preposition (ile), simple past tense (noun sentences), comparison (gibi, kadar), future tense” were taught to the control group with the traditional teaching method. When the teaching process was completed, the students were re-administered with the “Achievement Test,” and the results were evaluated.

### **Data analysis and coding**

The quantitative data of the study consisted of the results of the “Achievement Test” applied to the experimental and control groups before and after the teaching process. The data were analyzed in the SPSS 25 software. Before the experimental process, in order to reveal whether both groups performed similarly in the achievement test, the independent-samples t-test was performed first. Before performing the independent-samples t-test, the Shapiro-Wilk test ( $28 < 50$ ) and Skewness and Kurtosis values of each group were examined to see if the data was normally distributed. Shapiro-Wilk test results of the experimental group and the control group were found to be 0.115 and 0.350, respectively, and it was seen that this value met the assumption ( $p > 0.05$ ). Skewness and Kurtosis values of the experimental and control groups were found to be (-0.16, -1.373) and (0.094, -1.044), respectively, which were in the range of -1.5- +1.5, as stated by Tabachnick (2013). In order to check the homogeneity of the variance the Levene test was performed ( $n=28$ ), and it was determined that the variances were homogeneously distributed according to the test results ( $p=0.929$  and  $p>0.05$ ). After these procedures, independent-samples t-test analyses were performed to determine the difference between the pre-test results of the groups, and it was found that there was no significant difference between the two groups ( $p = 0.403$   $p > 0.05$ ) (Table 1). The above procedures were also applied for the results of the post-test, and it was observed that the data were normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilks=0.463;  $0.065 > 0.05$ ), and the variances were homogeneously distributed (Levene test =  $0.484 > 0.05$ ). Then, an independent-samples t-test was used for the results of the post-test. The test revealed that the post-test results of both groups differed significantly from each other ( $p=0.015$   $p < 0.05$ ). Table 1 presents the independent-samples t-test results of the post-test scores.

The analysis of qualitative data was made using the Nvivo 12 software. Focus groups held with the experimental group, e-mails, and student opinion forms comprised the qualitative data of the research. In qualitative research, data analysis is very important. Because this stage is a stage in which researchers organize their data and make inferences based on the content they analyze and report them (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). In this study, the content analysis method, which has an important place in the qualitative research approach, was used for data analysis. Content analysis allows for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of the communication (Berelson, 1952). In this context, using the software, the data were first classified and made suitable for reading, then the codes were determined after the researcher read and re-read the data. Similar codes were collected under categorical titles, and these titles were merged to obtain themes (Glesne, 2014; Hickey & Kipping, 1996; Krippendorff, 2004; Mayring, 2000; White & Marsh, 2006).

### **Reliability and validity**

Johnson (2015, p. 110) argues that “the three main components in establishing accuracy and reliability in any research project are validity, reliability, and triangulation.” More than one expert was consulted to determine the comprehensibility, suitability for the student level, and relevance of the items of the *Achievement Test* because the agreement or disagreement between expert opinions provide the researcher with a criterion for content validity. For this, we used Lawshe’s (1975) item statistics calculation method based on determining the content validity, which helps to decide whether an item should be on the scale. First of all, an expert group consisting of seven people was formed

(three people with doctoral degrees in the field and four teachers with at least five years of experience in teaching Turkish to foreigners), and the 48-item Achievement test was submitted to the experts' evaluation and approval. In order to calculate the content validity of the scale, scoring was made as "the item is appropriate" (3), "the item is appropriate but should be edited" (2), and "the item should be removed" (1) (Yesilyurt & Capraz, 2018). After receiving feedback from the experts, Content Validity Ratio (CVR) values were calculated, and the final test items were obtained. CVR is an item statistic based on content validity to decide whether an item should be on the scale or not, and it is calculated according to the following formula:

$$CVR = \frac{n_e - N/2}{N/2}$$

where "ne" indicates the number of experts who say "the item is appropriate" and "N" represents the total number of experts expressing their opinion on the item. CVR takes a value in the range of -1 (absolute rejection)- +1 (absolute acceptance). CVR values of the items are shown in Table 2. As a result, those with CVR values close to absolute rejection (8, 22, 35, 46) were removed from the scale, some items were corrected, and a final test consisting of forty items was obtained.

In the qualitative stage, various data collection tools (student interview forms, focus groups, and e-mails) were used to increase the validity of the study (Ezzy, 2002; Licoln & Guba, 1985; Mills, 2003; Patton, 1990, Strauss, 1990). For the reliability of the codes obtained as a result of the content analysis, the coding process was performed by another researcher, and Cohen's (1960) Kappa coefficient, a statistic that is used to measure inter-rater reliability, was calculated. Cohen's kappa coefficient measures the agreement between two raters who each classify "N" items into "C" mutually exclusive categories.

$$\kappa = \frac{\text{Pr}(a) - \text{Pr}(e)}{1 - \text{Pr}(e)}$$

where K is the rate of agreement, Pr (a) is the total proportion of observed agreement for the two raters, and Pr (e) is the hypothetical probability of chance agreement. Kappa value can range between (-) 1 and (+) 1. As a result of the separate evaluation made for the two categories, the agreement rate was found to be (K) = 0.7861, which represents a significant degree of agreement according to Landis and Koch (1977). The agreement rates for the codes are presented in Table 3.

### Ethics

Prior to the study, all participants were given information in many languages about the research, and approval was obtained from the participants

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1. Independent-Samples T-Test Results of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores**

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
pre_test	Experimental Group	28	20,4643	5,84670	1,10492
	Control Group	28	21,8214	6,19470	1,17069
post_test	Experimental Group	28	79,8929	7,40040	1,39854
	Control Group	28	74,5357	8,47428	1,60149

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df				Lower	Upper
pre_test	Equal variances assumed	0,008	0,929	-0,843	54	0,403	-1,35714	1,60977	-4,58454	1,87025
post_test	Equal variances assumed	0,496	0,484	2,520	54	0,015	5,35714	2,12619	1,09438	9,61990

The mean pre-test scores of the experimental and control groups were  $m=20.46$  and  $m=21.82$ , respectively. Since the independent-samples t-test yielded a significance at the  $p=0.403$  level, which is  $p > 0.05$ , it can be stated that there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of pre-test scores. Regarding post-test scores, both groups' mean post-test scores differed significantly from their mean pre-test scores, with the experimental group having a mean score of  $m=79.89$  (+59.43) and the control group having a mean score of  $m=74.53$  (+52.71). The independent-samples t-test yielded a significant difference in favor of the experimental group (+5.36) ( $p = 0.015$   $p < 0.05$ ). This result indicates that the teaching process applied to the experimental group was more effective.

**Table 2. Content Validity Ratios (CVR) of the Sample Scale Based on Expert Opinions**

number of question	appropriate	should be edited	should be removed	CVR	number of question	appropriate	should be edited	should be removed	CVR
1	6	1	0	0,71	25	6	1	0	0,71
2	7	0	0	1,00	26	6	1	0	0,71
3	5	2	0	0,42	27	7	0	0	1,00
4	6	1	0	0,71	28	7	0	0	1,00
5	6	1	0	0,71	29	7	0	0	1,00
6	6	1	0	0,71	30	6	1	0	0,71
7	6	1	0	0,71	31	5	2	0	0,42
<b>8</b>	2	2	3	<b>-0,42</b>	32	7	0	0	1,00
9	6	1	0	0,71	33	6	1	0	0,71
10	7	0	0	1,00	34	7	0	0	1,00
11	6	1	0	0,71	<b>35</b>	3	4	0	<b>-0,14</b>
12	7	0	0	1,00	36	7	0	0	1,00
13	6	1	0	0,71	37	6	1	0	0,71
14	6	0	1	0,71	38	7	0	0	1,00
15	7	0	0	1,00	39	7	0	0	1,00
16	6	1	0	0,71	40	5	1	1	0,42
17	6	1	0	0,71	41	6	1	0	0,71
18	7	0	0	1,00	42	7	0	0	1,00
19	6	1	0	0,71	43	6	1	0	0,71
20	5	2	0	0,42	44	5	2	0	0,42
21	6	1	0	0,71	45	7	0	0	1,00
<b>22</b>	2	5	0	<b>-0,42</b>	<b>46</b>	3	1	3	<b>-0,14</b>
23	5	2	0	0,42	47	6	1	0	0,71
24	6	1	0	0,71	48	7	0	0	1,00



When the CVR values indicated in the table are examined, it is seen that items 8, 22, 35, and 46 had negative values. Since these items had negative values, they were removed from the scale, which was in line with the feedback from the experts. Also, the scoring of the items was made as “the item is appropriate,” “the item is appropriate but should be edited,” and “the item should be removed.”

**Table 3. Kappa Values of Codes**

Themes and Codes			Kappa Coefficients
<b>Positive Opinions</b>			<b>0,7935</b>
motivation			0,9251
collaborative activity			0,9045
flexibility			0,8137
affordability			0,8401
reading skills			0,7651
method differences			0,8047
creativity and discovery			0,7488
attribute of learning			0,7574
effect on psychology			0,6622
measurement and evaluation			0,6814
pronunciation			0,8255
<b>Negative Opinions</b>			<b>0,7788</b>
internet requirements			0,90271
hardware requirements			0,8447
communication			0,7211
software requirements			0,7885
learning process			0,7891
informativeness			0,8271
usefulness			0,8056
impact on health			0,6456
vapidity			0,6852

Kappa value can range between (-) 1 and (+) 1. As a result of the separate evaluation made for the two categories, the agreement rates were founded (K) = 0.7935 and 0,7788 which represents a significant degree of agreement according to Landis and Koch (1977).

F\_G : Focus Group (1, 2)

M\_R : Mail Records

[S1], [S2], [S3] ... The people who were asked about their opinions (students studying Turkish and participating in webquest activities) and notable answers (number of words, sentences or paragraphs). For the students who may have difficulty in expressing themselves in Turkish, when being asked about their opinions, English was presented as an alternative language.

**Table 4. The List of Themes and Codes Formed within the Scope of the Control Group's Answers**

Themes and Categories	Number of sources	Number of codes
<b>Positive Opinions</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>198</b>
motivation	28	35
collaborative activity	20	29
flexibility	25	27
affordability	18	23
reading skills	14	20
method differences	16	16
creativity and discovery	14	14
attribute of learning	9	11
effect on psychology	9	9
measurement and evaluation	6	7
pronunciation	7	7

<i>Negative Opinions</i>	<b>25</b>	<b>153</b>
internet requirements	24	35
hardware requirements	23	27
communication	20	21
software requirements	19	19
learning process	9	15
informativeness	11	11
usefulness	8	10
impact on health	7	8
vapidity	7	7

When the answers given by the students were examined, it was understood that they mostly put emphasis on the motivation factor and they were quite satisfied with this issue. It is possible to conclude from the comments that "they were not bored," "they enjoyed the lesson," and that "they wanted the lessons to be this way." Students stated that the course was not boring and being active throughout the course is one of the prominent positive sides of webquest tasks. *"Everything is in turn; it is good for me"* [S7]. *"It was real cool"* [S19] *"my motivation was so amazing"* [S5]. They could give focus on the lesson due to the voiced, colourful and moving content *"I liked to play games again and again to get better score than the others. At the same time, I was learning!"* [S16], *"it happens in turn, it's easy to understand and there is action all the time."* [F\_G\_2\_1]. *"One task was over and I rested, but then I started another task, which is positive"* [S4]. They also stated that the courses to be taught in this way will be more effective than the other courses. *"We have games, videos, pictures. I'm so glad to these lessons type"* [S14] *"I was very pleased that the lessons online could be such pleasurable"* [F\_G\_1\_4] *"it will prevent us from getting bored in class"* [S27]. *"Using different methods and having pictures, video and voice parts better than classic lessons"* [S3].

The second issue that they are observed to be pleased to share homework pictures and make comments on these pictures and work together. *"visualized and voiced content are important parts of the process"* [S8] *"Being in a group and to be connected with the teacher and classmates is great, we improved our Turkish and solve our problems with the help of our group friends"* [M\_R\_S\_5]. *"It was very good to ask my group friends some points"* [S5]. Besides, students were most satisfied with was the communication and sharing something with each other in the sharing field in the webquest tasks. They liked the opportunity to compare the test results because it created an enjoyable competition. *"I came the third so I want to participate in another contest"* [S3]. They were pleased to share their comments on the lessons and assignments. *"The comments are very funny and nice"* [S6] *"well in order to be able to communicate with everybody"* [F\_G\_1\_4].

It was stated flexibility of lessons being outside the classroom allowed for a comfortable learning atmosphere. *"That's very comfortable action"* [S7], *"I can drink coffee on web lessons"* [S15] *"No stress, no questions, lots of time"* [S4]. It is understood that the students liked to be able to repeat the lessons and they considered its likelihood of happening as advantageous... *"it is very useful to revise; this is good for me"* [S4] *"Many revisions are advantages for us..."* [S14] *"It's very nice to study again whenever I want"* [S1].

They stressed that the courses taught by this method would not require buying bus tickets and paying tuition fees, and thus it would be possible to learn Turkish even at home. In this respect, it was often emphasized that it is economical. *"Knowledge is free"* [F\_G\_2] *"There's no obligation to go to the course, it's very comfortable"* [S4] *"I can go home because I have a course in this way"* [S16] *"no need to wait for the bus..."* [S1].

It is seen that students give important feedbacks about reading and pronunciation. It was emphasized that the exercises had positive effects on their reading in a short time. *"Now, I can read better than before"* [S10]. It was also stated that the activities had a positive effect in the reading-comprehension process. *"It positively affects my comprehension capacities and my attention during my reading"* [S12]. It was stated that the reading activity in the first part was useful *"I will say that my*

*reading was so much higher than before*” [S6] *“Especially the first part (reading video) was useful”* [S5].

When the most disturbing subjects are examined, it is seen that students draw attention to the negative aspects of doing such courses over the internet and complain about this situation. *“I couldn’t be connected to the internet at the beginning”* [S10] *“I have no internet in dormitory”* [S9] *“Not all students can participate in these kinds of lessons with us because not everyone has internet....”* [S12], *“If I haven’t got internet something I couldn’t...”* [S26] *“So I will write negative ideas first and important and necessary in lessons but not so much”* [S15] *“some friends don’t have internet”* [S13], *“Only the school’s garden has internet”* [S1].

The second aspect that students were not satisfied with was the hardware requirements for the course. *“Phone activity is very difficult”* [S10]. *“I should get a new laptop it is very slow”* [S17] *“Some classmates couldn’t do because of iPhone or laptop”* [S6] *“Everyone haven’t got smartphone”* [S24] *“computer repairing requires a lot of money.”* [S1]. *“we need to webcams, keyboard, laptop...”* [M\_R\_S\_16].

It was stated that it would be difficult to get to know each other in courses taught in this way *“We can’t know each other lesson if every lesson is taught in this way”* [F\_G\_1\_2] that friendship would become difficult *“Web quest friendship will be hard”* [S18] *“Speaking is an obligation for friendship”* [S9], that it is necessary to talk face to face for friendship *“...it’s very important to see”* [S17] were emphasized.

In addition, it was stated that computer-based courses had difficulty in use by saying that *“Flash player wasn’t downloaded”* [S22] *“My computer is very slow I need to reset and having some software...”* [S16]. *“some movies don’t open...”* [M\_R\_S11].

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It is extremely necessary and important for teachers and students to adapt to the developing technology in the twenty-first century, and to transfer the technological innovations into educational activities. It is certain that language teaching activities using web tasks will increase the quality of teaching. Because webquest tasks contain content that supports high level cognitive skills (Farenga & Ness, 2005; MacGregor & Lou, 2005). Through activities based on high-level skills such as classification, sorting, analysis, merging, making inferences, being critical, etc., persistency and functionality in language learning will increase. When the positive opinions of the students are examined within the scope of the research, it is seen that motivation is the most emphasized issue and this result is closely related to the use of technology. The students stated that as a result of the opportunities offered by technology, the teaching enriched with visual and audio content was effective in learning. It was viewed that they emphasized that they were not bored for that reason, that they enjoyed the lessons, that the lessons should be taught this way, that their interest increased due to the audio-coloured and moving contents and that these courses were more effective than the other courses. It is possible to mention numerous studies expressing such similar positive aspects of webquest. Leung & Zuhail (2013) conducted a survey of 596 students on webquest tasks in the website “ZUNAL webquest Maker”. As a result of the research, there was a consensus that web adventure tasks were fun and motivating for students, improved computer literacy and critical thinking skills, encouraged learning and met different learning needs. The “motivating” aspect, which is among the results was strongly emphasized by the students. It is understood that this result is similar to our research. It is possible to say as supported by some researches that web adventure language tasks increase students' motivation levels. (Aldalalah et al., 2015; Averkiev et al., 2015; Jung & Won, 2018; Lasaten 2017; Littlejohn, 2003; Sumtsova et al., 2016; Yenmez et al., 2017). Therefore, it can be stated that the method increases the willingness and interest of the students by the use of technology, makes learning fun, and thus develops a positive attitude towards learning.

The topic of cooperative work and interaction with the group appears to be another mostly emphasized highlight. Students were pleased to be able to communicate with each other, share and learn together in the sharing area of the webquest tasks. It was observed that the students had the opportunity to compare the results, shared the comments about the lessons and homework, and also stated that it was pleasing to share the pictures of the handicraft activity given in the form of homework. One of the strengths of the webquest method is that it promotes learning based on cooperation and allows for increasing sharing (Lacina, 2007; Lara & Leparaz, 2007; Mentxaka, 2004; Lin et al., 2016). Tasks structured by the teacher beforehand are presented to the students, independent of time and space, and the students are given the opportunity to work together in interaction. In this way, students get in contact with the group or create different working groups through tasks and find an opportunity to share.

The study also showed that students provided important feedback on reading skills and pronunciation. It was emphasized that the exercises were effective on reading in a short time. It was stated that the activities had a positive effect on the reading-comprehension process and that reading activities in the first part were beneficial. The fact that the webquest method included in the research results is effective in transferring reading skills, which is one of the areas of language learning to students, is another issue emphasized by other researchers (Alshumaimeri & Almasri, 2012; Chou, 2011; Kim et al., 2020; Tuan, 2011). Because, that the texts are supported with audio-video and pictures, that they provide correct examples of pronunciation, allow instant correction and provide reading levels in accordance with individual differences that contribute directly to the development of reading skills.

Another important point that stands out among the research results was the flexibility of the lessons taught using the WebQuest method. The ability of students to access courses as they wished, especially in terms of time and space, was an important element that increased the quality of the teaching process. As is known, the traditional classroom-based teaching process may sometimes be boring for students, which, in turn, has a negative effect on students and their learning process (Anderson & Walberg, 2003; Cheng, 2013; Fraser & Fisher, 1982). Therefore, it can be said that the ability of this method to distance students from the negative effects of the learning environment and to offer students flexibility in terms of time and space has a positive effect primarily on the motivation of the students and indirectly on the quality of the learning process.

Despite the positive results of the research, it is seen that there are some negativities. It is observed that one of the most frequently complained subjects is that the courses are conducted via the internet and are complained about this situation. Because for many student's internet access may be chargeable and in some of the dormitories there is no internet connection. In addition, some hardware and software requirements forced the students financially. Some of them are observed to complain about not being able to buy a laptop, headphones, speakers, etc. and some others complained about not being able to install some necessary programs (flashplayer). It can be said that the method involves some difficulties regarding this aspect. In this context, it is not possible to say that technology is always effective and renders traditional methods dysfunctional. Burke et al. (2003) performed a model application where the webquest method and the traditional method were used together. At the end of the study, no significant difference was found in the effectiveness of the methods in terms of learning. However, it was emphasized that the most significant difference occurred in student motivation and that teaching with webquest task stands out with this aspect. Therefore, it should be noted that using web tasks does not mean solving all problems in teaching (Leite, 2017) and that it can involve some problems. It is also thought that preparing the web tasks can be quite time consuming for the teacher but this problem can be solved by gaining experience. It might be emphasized that one of the disadvantages of the method is that it requires an uninterrupted internet connection and literacy. In other words, it is very difficult for teachers and students who are deprived of information technologies literacy to use this method.

It is thought that the WebQuest method, whose effectiveness has been revealed in the study, should be used by teachers as an alternative method in teaching Turkish to foreigners. Based on that research, it can be stated that the WebQuest method will be effective in teaching Turkish to foreigners.

### Recommendations

- Students and teachers who will teach Turkish through webquest method should be literate with computer skills and information technologies. It is an obligation to support those who lack knowledge about computer technologies.
- Students' financial situation should be taken into consideration, as well as whether everyone is able to access the internet.
- Web tasks must be used at the beginner level (A1-A2). Because the issues caused by students not understanding the teacher will be eliminated in an environment that provides a broad time frame and dictionary use.
- When preparing web tasks, the content of vocabulary should include colour and movement in order to provide tangibility and permanency.
- It is necessary to keep the communication channels open where the student can ask questions about the issues that he/she does not understand, and that provide access to the teacher.
- The teacher must plan the content before preparing the tasks.
- Internet resources should be sorted according to their subjects and government resources such as Turkish Language Institution should be suggested to the students as reliable resources.

### REFERENCES

- Abbit, J., Ophus, J. (2008). What we know about the impacts of webquests: a review of research. *AACE Journal*, 16(4), 441-456.
- Albayati, H. (2020). Approaches, methods in English language teaching: eclectic approach, *Global Scientific Journals*, 8 (3), 850-857.
- Aldalalah, O., M., A., Eyadat, Y., Ababneh, Z., W., M. (2015). Effects of webquest on the achievement and motivation of Jordanian University students of (independent & dependent) cognitive style. *World Journal on Educational Technology*. 7(2), 119-135.
- Alshumaimeri, Y., Almasri, M. M. (2012). The effects of using webquests on reading comprehension performance of Saudi EFL students. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*. 11, 295-306.
- Anderson, G. J., Walberg, H. J. (1974). *Learning environments*. In H. J. Walberg (ed.), *evaluating educational performance: a sourcebook of methods, instruments, and examples* (pp. 81-98). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Averkieva L., Chayka, Y., Glushkov, S. (2015). Web quest as a tool for increasing students' motivation and critical thinking development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 206, 137 – 140.

- Awada, G., Burston, J., Ghannage, R. (2020). Effect of student team achievement division through WebQuest on EFL students' argumentative writing skills and their instructors' perceptions, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 275-300.
- Aydinli, J. M., Elaziz, F. (2010). Turkish students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of interactive whiteboards in EFL classrooms, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(3), 235-252.
- Behbahani, A. R., Shahbazi, M. (2020). Investigating the effectiveness of a digital game-based task on the acquisition of word knowledge, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-26.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*, Free Press, Glencoe.
- Bogdan, R. C., Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education: Introduction and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brannen, J. (2005). *Mixed methods research: a discussion paper*, ESRC National Centre for Research <http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/89/1/MethodsReviewPaperNCRM-005.pdf> NCRM Methods Review Papers.
- Brito, C., Mario, B. (2007). Webquests: a tool or a transdisciplinary methodology? *Interactive Educational Multimedia*, 15, 52-64.
- Burke, M., Gurfey S., Colter S., Riehl, J. (2003). *Biowebquest: evaluating the effectiveness of a "webquest" model of inquiry learning in a biology sequence for non-science majors*. <http://www.itc.utk.edu/~burke/syllabus03> obtained from that address.
- Buyukozturk, S. (2013). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Canale, M., Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Chou, C. (2011). An inquiry into the effects of incorporating webquest in an EFL college course. *International Conference on Consumer Electronics* (s. 1-4). XianNing, China.
- Cooksey, R. W. (2020). Media review. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 14(4), 545-547.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Díez, T., Richters, M., Amanda, M. (2020). Podcasting as a tool to develop speaking skills in the foreign language classroom. *The EuroCALL Review*, 28(1), 40-56.
- Djamàa, S. (2020). Lecture in the living room, homework in the classroom: the effects of flipped instruction on graduate efl students' exam performance. *Computers in the Schools*, 37(3), 141-167.
- Dodge, B. (1995). Webquests: a technique for internet-based learning. *Distance Educator*, 1(2), 10-13.
- Dodge, B. (2001). Focus: five rules for writing a great WebQuest. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 28 (8), 6-9.
- Drew, P. Ausband, L. (2009). Developing higher-order thinking skills through webquests. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 26(1), 29-34.
- Dudeney, G., Hockly, N. (2007). *How to teach English with technology?* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

- Ebadi S., Rahimi M. (2018). An exploration into the impact of webquest-based classroom on efl learners' critical thinking and academic writing skills: a mixed-methods study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(4), 1–35.
- Ebadi, S., Rahimi, M. (2018). An exploration into the impact of WebQuest-based classroom on EFL learners' critical thinking and academic writing skills: a mixed-methods study, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5-6), 617-651.
- Ebadi, S., Rahimi, M. (2019). Mediating EFL learners' academic writing skills in online dynamic assessment using google docs, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(5-6), 527-555.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative Analysis: Practice and Innovation*. Crows Nest: Routledge.
- Farenga, S., Ness, D. (Ed). (2005). *Encyclopedia of education and human development*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Fern, E. F. (2001). *Advanced Focus Group Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Fievez, I., Montero Perez, M., Cornillie, F., Desmet, P. (2020). Vocabulary learning through viewing captioned or subtitled videos and the role of learner- and word-related factors. *Calico Journal*, 37(3), 233–253.
- Fraser, B. J., D.L.,Fisher. (1982). predictingstudents' outcomes from their perceptions of classroom psychosocial environment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19 ( 4) , 498-518.
- Gaukrodger B., Atkins C. (2013). Second Life calling: language learners communicating virtually across the world. *30th Ascilite Conference (s. 303-307)*, Sydney.
- Ginaya, G., Rejeki, I., Astuti, N. (2018). The effects of blended learning to students' speaking ability. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 4(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v4i3.661>
- Glesne, C. (2014). *Nitel arastirmaya giris* (4. Baski). A. Ersoy ve P. Yalcinoglu. (Cev. Ed.). Ankara: Ani.
- Gravetter, F. J, Forzano, L. B. (2011). Research methods for the behavioural sciences. *Cengage Learning*, 146.
- Hassan R. F., Dzakiria, H., Idrus, R. M. (2016). Using second life platform for improving English language skills: students' perception. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6, 43-47.
- Hickey, G., Kipping, C. (1996). Issues in research. A multi-stage approach to the coding of data from open-ended questions. *Nurse Researcher*, 4, 81-91.
- Hislope, K. (2008). Learning in a virtual world. *The International Journal of Learning*, 15, 51-58.
- Howard, R. M. (2001). *Collaborative Pedagogy in G. Tate, A. Rupiper& K. Schick (Eds.), A guide to composition pedagogy* (pp. 54-70). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Huang, H. (2013). E-reading and e-discussion: EFL learners' perceptions of an e-book reading program, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26 (3), 258-281.
- Irafahmi, D. T. (2016). Creating a 'real' WebQuest: Instructional design point of view. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(2), 427–438.

- Jacob Cohen (1960), A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales, *Educational and Psychological Measurement* Vol.20, No.1, pp.37-46.
- Johnson, A. P. (2015). *Eylem Arastirmasi El Kitabı*. Ani yayincilik, Ankara.
- Jung, S., Won, E. (2018). Systematic review of research trends in robotics education for young children. *Sustainability*, 10 (4), 905.
- Kachina, O. A. (2012). Using webquests in the social sciences classroom. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 5(3), 185-200.
- Kasper, L. (2000). New technologies, new literacies: focus discipline research and ESL learning communities. *Language Learning and Technology*, 4(2), 105-128.
- Kelly, R. (2000). Working with webquests. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 32 (6), 4-13.
- Kim, M. K., Gaul, C. Z., Bundrage, C. N., Madathany, R. J. (2020) Technology supported reading comprehension: a design research of the student mental model analyzer for research and teaching (SMART) technology, *Interactive Learning Environments*
- Kobylynski, C. (2014). Student feedback on the effectiveness of using a webquest for an integrative skills course in a Korean University. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 7, 63-68.
- Koenraad, A. L. M. (2002). *TalenQuest: WebQuests for modern languages* [PDF]. <http://www.koenraad.info/CALL> obtained from that address.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krueger, R. A., Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research 3rd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Pub.
- Kumar, C. P. (2013). *The eclectic method: theory and its application to the learning of english*. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3(6), 2250-3553.
- Lacina, J. (2007). Inquiry-based learning-technology: designing-exploring webquests. *Childhood Education*, 83(4), 251-252.
- Landis, J. R., Koch G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*. 33, 159-74.
- Lara, S., Repáraz C. (2007). Effectiveness of cooperative learning fostered by working with webquest. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 5(3), 731-756.
- Lasaten, R. C. (2017). Development and validation of webquests in teaching epics. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(2), 59-66.
- Lee, B. J. (2020). Smartphone tapping vs. handwriting: A comparison of writing medium. *The EuroCALL Review*, 28(1), 15-25.
- Leite, R., Vieira, P., Silva, R. M., Neves, T. (2017). The Role of webquests in science education for citizenship. *Interactive Educational Multimedia*, 15, 18-36.
- Leung, C. B., Unal, Z. (2013). Advantages and disadvantages of classroom instruction with webquests: connecting literacy and technology. *Journal of Reading Education*, 38(2), 31-38.



- Liang, W., Fung, D. (2020). Development and evaluation of a WebQuest-based teaching programme: Students' use of exploratory talk to exercise critical thinking. *International journal of educational research*, 104, 101652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101652>.
- Lin M., Preston A., Kharrufa A., Kong Z. (2016). Making L2 learners' reasoning skills visible: The potential of computer supported collaborative learning environments. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 22, 303–322.
- Littlejohn, A. (Ed.). (2003). *Reusing online resources: a sustainable approach to e-learning*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Luzón, M. J. (2002). Internet content-based activities for ESP. *English Teaching Forum* 40(3), 20-25.
- MacGregor, S., Lou, Y. (2005). Web-based learning: how task scaffolding website design support knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 37, 161-175.
- Machovikov, A., Stolyarov, K., Chernov, M., Sinclair, I., Machovikova, I. (2002). Computer-based training system for Russian word pronunciation, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1(2), 201-214.
- March, T. (2003). The learning power of webquests. *Educational Leadership*, 61(4), 42-47.
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2).
- Mentxaka, Í. (2004). Webquest: internet como recurso didáctico. *Alambique*, 40, 62-70.
- Mills, G. E. (2003). *Action Research. A Guide For The Teacher Researcher*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Morgan, D. (2018). Living with blurry boundaries: the values of distinguishing between qualitative and quantitative research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 12(3), 268–276.
- Orucu, D., Simsek, H. (2011). Educational administration: theory and practice. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, 17(2), 167-197.
- Patterson, N., Pipkin, G. (2001). Guiding readers to new understandings through electronic text. *Voices from the Middle*, 8(4), 64-66.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Pennington, M. C. (1996). Writing the natural way: on computer, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 9(2-3), 125-142.
- Peterson, M. (2010). Learner participation patterns and strategy use in second life: an exploratory case study. *European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 22(3), 273-292.
- Renau, M. L., Pesudo, M. (2016). Analysis of the implementation of a webquest for learning English in a secondary school in Spain. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 12(2), 26-49.
- Richards, C. (2005). The design of effective ICT-supported learning activities: exemplary models, changing requirements, and new possibilities. *Language Learning and Technology*, 9(1), 60-79.

- Ruschoff, B. (2009). *Output-Oriented Language Learning With Digital Media*. In M. Thomas, (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Web 2.0 and Second Language Learning*. Hershey, London & New York: IGI Global Reference.
- Sato, T., Murase, F., Burden., T. (2020). An empirical study on vocabulary recall and learner autonomy through mobile-assisted language learning in blended learning settings. *Calico Journal*, 37, 254-276.
- Schmid, E. (2006). Investigating the use of interactive whiteboard technology in the English language classroom through the lens of a critical theory of technology, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 19(1), 47-62.
- Shorten, A., Moorley, C. (2014). Selecting the sample. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 17(2), 32–33. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2014-101747>.
- Shutenko, A. I., Shutenko, E., Ryzhkova, I., Koreneva, A., Sidorova, M., Rotaryanu, L. (2019). The use of WebQuests in foreign language training of students of nonlinguistic specialties, *Revista Espacios*, 40 (19), 1-7.
- Simina V., Hamel, M. J. (2005). Computer application in second language acquisition through a social constructivist perspective: webquest in project-driven language learning. *ReCALL*, 17(2), 217-228.
- Simsek, H., Yildirim, A. (2003). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Arastirma Yontemleri*. Ankara: Seckin Yayincilik.
- Starr, L. (2000). *Meet Bernie Dodge: The Frank Lloyd Wright*. [https://www.educationworld.com/a\\_issues/chat/chat015.shtml](https://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/chat/chat015.shtml) obtained from that address.
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, C. A. : Sage.
- Strickland, J. (2005). Using webquests to teach content: comparing instructional strategies. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 5(2), 138-148.
- Sumtsova, O.V., Azhel, Y. P., Buyankina, A. S. (2016). webquest-based role play as a way of raising students' motivation to studying foreign languages. *iJET*, 11(3), 63-66.
- Şahin, S. M., Baturay, M. H. (2016). The effect of 5E-learning model supported with WebQuest media on students' achievement and satisfaction. *E-learning and Digital Media*, 13(3-4), 158-175
- Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, Pearson.
- Tashakkori, A., Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Applied Social Research Methods Series*, 46, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tozcu, A. (2008). The use of interactive whiteboards in teaching non-roman scripts, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(2), 143-166.
- Trajkoska, D. A., Dimov, B. C. (2013). Webquest as a teaching strategy. *Journal of Faculty of the Education Bitola*, 7(2), 315.
- Tseng, S., Yeh, H., Yang, S. (2015). Promoting different reading comprehension levels through online annotations, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(1), 41-57.

- Tuan, L. T. (2011). Teaching reading through webquest. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(3), 664-67.
- Unal, Z., Bodur, Y., Unal, A. (2012). Choosing or designing the perfect webquest for your learners using a reliable rubric. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 12(2), 209- 231.
- Wali, N. H. (2009). Eclecticism and language learning. *Al- Fatih Journal. Diyala University-College of Basic Education*, 5(39), 289-298.
- Wang, C., Song, H., Xia, F, Yan, Q. (2009). Integrating second life into an efl program: students' perspectives. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Weideman, A. (2001). The old and the new: reconsidering eclecticism in language teaching. *linguam*, 17(1):1-13. doi.org/10.5785/17-1-131 (PDF) *The Eclectic Method to language Teaching: Clarifications and Conceptual Extensions*. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331743322\\_The\\_Eclectic\\_Method\\_to\\_language\\_Teaching\\_Clarifications\\_and\\_Conceptual\\_Extensions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331743322_The_Eclectic_Method_to_language_Teaching_Clarifications_and_Conceptual_Extensions) [accessed Nov 16 2020].
- White, M. D., Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: a flexible methodology. *Library Trends* 55(1), 22-45.
- X. Lin, N. E. Breslow. (1996) Bias correction in generalized linear mixed models with multiple components of dispersion, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 1007-1016.
- Yenmez, A. A., Ozpinar, I., Gokce, S. (2017). Use of webquests in mathematics instruction: academic achievement, teacher and student opinions. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(9), 1554-1570.
- Yesilyurt, S, Capraz, C . (2018). Olcek gelistirme calismalarinda kullanilan kapsam gecerligi icin bir yol haritasi. *Erzincan Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 20 (1) , 251-264.
- Yildirim, A. (1999). Nitel arastirma yontemlerinin temel ozellikleri ve egitim arastirmalarindaki yeri ve onemi. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 23, 7-17.
- Yildirim, A., Simsek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Arastirma Yontemleri (6. Baski)*. Ankara: Seckin Yayıncılık.
- Yin, C. C. (1994). Classroom environment and student affective performance: an effective profile, *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 62(3), 221-239, DOI: 10.1080/00220973.1994.9943842
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research, design and methods*, Newbury Park, CA, SAGE.