



## The Use of Web 2.0 Tools among English Language Instructors of Higher Learning Institutions in Sabah, Malaysia

**Anna Lynn Abu Bakar**, Romzi Ationg & Mohd. Sohaimi Esa, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, E-Mail: [annalynn@ums.edu.my](mailto:annalynn@ums.edu.my)

**Abstract-** In this rapidly changing and evolving of digital world, it is undeniable that technology plays a vital role in the teaching and learning process. In fact, the social scientists suggest that there is a benefit of using Information and Communications Technology (ICT) in the teaching and learning. This includes the prospect of making the learning and teaching process more engaging and connected to real life. They even argued that the English language instructors, particularly the English language instructors at the Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) are required to integrate technologies or to be more specific the ICT in teaching and learning process for such reason. Nevertheless, getting English language instructors to use ICT in teaching and learning activities will not be possible unless they understand and see the necessity of it in such activity. Thus, understanding English language instructors' attitude, motivation and perception towards the importance of ICT and specifically the Web 2.0 tools in teaching and learning process become inevitable. Hence, this paper analyses the attitude, motivation and perception of English language instructors at the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia towards the importance of using ICT and specifically the Web 2.0 tools in their teaching and learning activities. The study which this paper is based has employed the mixed method approach, approach that allows for the combination of both qualitative and quantitative components of data collection.

**Keywords:** Teaching and Learning; Web 2.0 Tools, English language instructors' Attitude, Higher Learning Institutions

### I. INTRODUCTION

As English is the second language in Malaysia and the language of ICT, it is important that English language instructors to be able to integrate both English and ICT in their teaching practice. The reason is that Information and Communication Technology (ICT) plays an important role in our daily and professional lives. The influence of ICT is evidently seen in the education field where English language instructors and students are encouraged to integrate the use of ICT in their teaching practice.

In this rapidly changing and evolving of digital world, it is undeniable that ICT has made a great impact in the way the teaching and learning takes place in the classroom. Acknowledging the importance of keeping up to date with the ICT trend, a lot of training has been conducted by Higher Learning Institutions (HLI) among their institutions for academicians to integrate the use of ICT in the teaching practice in order to create effective learning in the classroom. However, despite professional development or in-house training regarding new educational tools and methods that are provided to English language instructors' in HLI, it had resulted to too little effect on English language instructors' classroom practice (Zhao & Frank, 2003).

This brings about the question why this scenario is happening in the HLIs. This scenario is supported by an idea put forward by Belawati (2001) that one of the constraints of the use of ICT is the classroom is 'the lack of English language instructors' ability to integrate ICT related skills' into the teaching and learning process. Prensky described this type of English language instructors as Digital Immigrants who 'would turn to the internet as a second option rather than first'. He said, "Digital Immigrant English language instructors assume that learners are the same as they have always been, and that the same method that worked for the English language instructors when they were students will work for their students now" (Prensky, 2001)

Unfortunately, this assumption is no longer valid in today's digital era. Therefore, it is important that English language instructors are equipped with the knowledge and skills as well as a mind shift not only to be at par with the students who are Digital Natives, but also to be able to make full use of ICT at the aim of enhancing their teaching practice. In explaining such view, Baylor and Ritchie (2002) stated that "regardless of the amount of technology and its sophistication, technology will not be used unless faculty members have the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to infuse it into the curriculum". Such

phenomenon prevails in Malaysia and specifically in Sabah as the research carried out in Malaysian HLIs (which include public and private universities as well as polytechnics) by the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) suggests that majority of the academic staff are not compliant with the e-learning policy (Kaur, Mohamad Amin Embi, 2011). The study found that even though academic staff were aware of the existence of an e-Learning policy but not everyone is carrying out the e-Learning process in the teaching and learning process. Specifically, the study found that in terms of compliance with the e-Learning policy, only 30.6% of academic staff complied with the policy fully, and that the remaining 58.7% complied with some parts of the policy. Moreover, the study conducted by Kaur and Mohamad Amin Embi (2011) revealed that academic staff were not only aware of the existence of an e-Learning policy, but also carried out the e-Learning process in accordance with the guidelines set by the policy.

For this reason, the MOHE have decided to introduce a strategic plan called the National Higher Education Strategic Plan (PSPTN) in 2011. It is a documented strategic plan that translates the direction of National Higher Education for the future. It focuses on the development of quality human and intellectual capital. The result of such move has been the development of a '21 Critical Agenda Projects' or better known as 'CAPs'. Each CAPs have strategic objectives and targets to be achieve which must be carried out by either the ministry level under MOHE which includes all HLIs. One of the CAPs is e-learning. The e-learning which is an expression of ICT usage in HLIs is seen as a medium which assist and enhances the teaching and learning process. Moreover, the MOHE opined that the use of e-Learning technology in HLI is no longer an option but a necessity.

The e-learning is defined as all forms of educational technology that electronically or technologically support teaching and learning Kaur and Mohamad Amin Embi (2011) Among the key components of the e-Learning is Web 2.0 tools. It is a component of e-learning that have become one of the new ways to engage students in teaching and learning activities. It offers a new experience to both English language instructors and students. Apart from that it also provides a new dimension and perspective to the teaching and learning process compared to the traditional way of teaching before the digital era. Due to such quality, it is expected that the ideal teaching and learning conducted in classroom be integrated with the use of ICT, particularly the Web 2.0 tools.

The Malaysian government and specifically the MOHE, thus, has put an emphasis of the importance of the integration of ICT and specifically the Web 2.0 tools in the teaching and learning in the HLIs across the county. This is to equip the future and younger generation with the necessary ICT skills which will be useful for personal and career development in the future. Therefore, the agent of change lies in the hand of the teacher who is responsible to prepare the students with the necessary ICT skills which are beneficial for them in the future. However, realistically, this is not happening in most HLIs. In fact, despite the benefits of using ICT for educational purposes, Lau and Sim (2008) opined that many English language instructors are still refuses to use it in their teaching activities. The study conducted by Kopyc (2007) even showed that English language instructors do use computers to send emails, compose text using word process but integrating and applying ICT to enhance and boost their teaching are still very low. To complicate the matter further, Ghaviefekr and Rosdy (2015) found that the use of ICT is not seen as a replacement to the traditional way of teaching but merely as a supplement tool in the classroom in this country. This portrays that though the e-Learning has been used in Malaysian HLIs as early as the year 2000, significant use of ICT and specifically the Web 2.0 tools remain vague in Malaysia. Thus, Lim and Chai (2007) argue that investigation on English language instructors' attitude, motivation and perception towards the importance of ICT and specifically the Web 2.0 tools in teaching and learning process is highly needed. In a similar tone, Teo (2008) also opined that examining the English language instructors' attitudes, motivations and perceptions towards the use of ICT for instructional purposes is of immensely valuable.

Therefore, the principal objective of the study which this paper is based is to explore and highlight the reason behind the lack in usage of Web 2.0 tools among the English language instructors at the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia. Specifically, the objective of the study which this paper is based are: to investigate the English language instructors' perception towards the importance of using Web 2.0 tools in their teaching activities in the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia, and to identify what exactly the factors that have significantly affected the English language instructors' attitude, motivations and perception towards the importance of using Web 2.0 tools in their teaching activities in the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia. By exploring and highlighting these issues, this paper has contributed in the theorisation of interrelationship between ICT and teaching and learning in the HLI, especially in the context of making the teaching and learning

activities more engaging and connected to real life. Moreover, this paper also prevails the similarities and differences on English lecturers' attitudes, motivations and perceptions towards the use of Web 2.0 tools in their teaching and learning in HLI. Thus, this study helps shed some light not only to other educators but also to the administrators on the reasoning behind the phenomenon of unfavourable use of Web 2.0 tools in the teaching practice among the English language instructors in the Malaysian HLIs.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The study which this paper is based has employed a mixed method approach as it is an approach that combines both quantitative and qualitative forms. As Creswell (2012) explained, "a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases in the research process. As a method it focuses on collecting, analysing and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or series of study" (2012). This approach was adopted as a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approach provide a better understanding of the research problems than either approach alone (Creswell, (2012) Ahmad Tarmizi, et. al (2017)). This approach is also relevant to this study as the researcher(s) attempts to determine whether English language instructors' attitude, motivations and perceptions has influence on the use of Web 2.0 tools in the teaching process. Apart from that, this approach provides the researcher(s) an in-depth understanding of the research problem due to inductive and deductive thinking.

Creswell (2012) identifies four major types of mixed methods designs which are the triangulation design, the embedded design, the explanatory design, and the exploratory design. However, in 2011 Creswell and Plano (2011) have identified 6 commonly used mixed methods designs in educational research. Four of which are the basic designs in use today and the other two as complex designs that are becoming more popular. These designs include the convergent parallel design, the explanatory sequential design, the exploratory sequential design, the embedded design, the transformative design, and the multiphase design.

Therefore, due to the nature of the study, the explanatory sequential mixed methods design was used to address English language instructors' perceptions towards the importance of using Web 2.0 tools in their teaching activities. This design involved collecting qualitative data after a quantitative phase. An explanatory sequential mixed method design allows the researcher to collect the quantitative and qualitative data sequentially in two phases with one form of data collection following the other. The reason this approach is employed so that the quantitative data and results gathered could provide a general view of the research problem and a more detailed and extensive and refined data through the qualitative data collection is gathered to explain the general picture of the study.

In the first quantitative phase of the study, a set of questionnaire was distributed and collected from 30 English language instructors from a local public university in Sabah, Malaysia. It was followed up with a few individuals to probe or explain the results from the quantitative data in more depth. In the second phase, qualitative semi structured interviews were used to explore in-depth what shapes English language instructors' attitude, motivations and perceptions about the use of Web 2.0 in their teaching and learning activities. The reason for the qualitative follow up data is to have a better understanding of the quantitate results acquired.

Moreover, the data obtained for this study comes from two main sources which include primary and secondary resources. The primary data was gathered through interview and observations sessions with the respondents and questionnaire; while the secondary data was collected by assessing library materials, related books, articles as well as published and online journals from the internet. Sutton and Austin (2015), Babbie (2011), and Zainudin (2011) suggested that the use of multiple sources of instruments for qualitative research is to ensure the validity of the data collected. Therefore, such idea accounted in the study which this paper is based.

### III. FINDINGS/RESULTS

Understanding English language instructors' attitude, motivation and perception towards the importance of ICT and specifically the Web 2.0 tools in teaching and learning process becomes inevitable as incorporating technology is a must.

#### Demographic information of the respondents

30 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents involved for the pilot study. However, only 23 questionnaires were filled and returned. The demographic data of the respondents is shown in the table below.

**Table 1: Demographic information of the respondents**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Male	5	21.7
Female	18	78.3
Total	23	100.0
<b>Age in categories</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
21-30	5	21.7
31-40	7	30.4
41-50	5	21.7
51-60	6	26.1
Total	23	100.0
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Associate Professor	1	4.3
Senior Lecturer	3	13
Lecturer	15	65.2
Language Teacher	4	17.4
Total	23	100.0
<b>Number of years of teaching experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
1-5 years	5	21.7
6-10 years	4	17.4
11-15 years	6	26.1
16 and above	8	34.8
Total	23	100.0
<b>Level of education</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
College/University	3	13.0
Masters/PhD	20	87.0
Total	23	100.0

Out of 23 respondents that were involved in the pilot study, 5 (21.7 %) of them are male and 18 (78.3 %) females. Most of the respondents are aged between 31- 40 years old (30.4 %), while an equal number of them are aged between 21-30 years old (21.7 %) and 41-50 years old (21.7 %) and a small number of the respondents are aged 51 years and above (26.1%).

In terms of number of years teaching a majority of the respondents have a background of 16 years and above experience (34.8 %) while 15 of them have less than 15 years of teaching experience (65.2 %).

In the case of education, only 3 of the respondents (13.0%) are university/college graduates while a majority of the respondents (87.0) hold a masters and PhD degree.

### English language Instructors' perception of integrating Web 2.0 tools in the classroom

The findings from the questionnaire revealed the English language instructors' perception of integrating Web 2.0 tools in the classroom.

**Table 2: Instructors' perception of integration of Web 2.0 tools**

Item (N=23)	Mean	Std. Deviation
C1- I am aware of what Web 2.0 tools are	3.56	1.12
C2- I have knowledge and ability in using Web 2.0 tools.	3.30	1.11
C3-I often use blogs in teaching writing in the classroom	2.04	1.02
C4-I am competent in using blogs in teaching writing in the classroom	2.45	1.21
C5-Blog is a useful Web 2.0 tool to teach writing in the classroom	3.04	1.11
C6-I often use Youtube in teaching in the classroom	2.65	1.15
C7-I am competent in using Youtube in teaching in the classroom	3.09	1.24
C8-Youtube is a useful Web 2.0 tool in teaching in the classroom	3.22	1.31
C9-I often use Facebook in teaching in the classroom	1.87	0.87
C10-I am competent in using Facebook in teaching in the classroom	2.26	1.05
C11-Facebook is a useful Web 2.0 tool in teaching in the classroom	2.74	1.21
C12- Web 2.0 tools help learners develop communication and language skills.	3.43	1.24
C13-Web 2.0 tools allow learners to work through their ideas and promote critical reflection	3.22	1.13
C14-Web 2.0 tools allow learners to share photos, music, and video	4.17	0.65
C15-Web 2.0 tools allow learners to hold forums to discuss topics of interest	3.91	1.04
C16-Web 2.0 tools allow learners to find and share educational resources	4.04	0.88
C17- Web 2.0 tools appeal to digital natives learners	3.74	1.21
C18- Web 2.0 tools promote knowledge sharing	4.09	1.00
C19- I often use other Web 2.0 tools in teaching writing in the classroom	2.26	1.29

C20- I feel it is important to learn the new interactive Web 2.0 tools for teaching and learning	3.52	1.24
C21- I must plan to use Web 2.0 tools in my classroom	3.52	1.20
C22- Using Web 2.0 tools are compatible with the way I teach	3.35	1.11
C23-Using Web 2.0 tools fit well with the way I teach	3.35	1.19
C24-I feel comfortable using Web 2.0 tools in my teaching	3.39	1.31
C25-I could easily use Web 2.0 tools on my own	3.43	1.27
C26-I am interested in taking a course to learn about Web 2.0 tools	3.70	1.40
C27-I often integrate Web 2.0 tools in my teaching	2.90	1.32
Overall mean for section C:	3.19	0.76

As indicated in Table 3.5 almost all of the answers provided by the respondents fall into the mean 'agree' and within one standard deviation (SD) of the mean. This probably indicates that the respondents perceive that the integration of Web 2.0 tools in teaching could help enhance their quality of teaching and benefits the students.

**Table 3: Frequency of instructors' perception of integration of Web 2.0 tools**

Item (N=29)	SD (%)	D (%)	M (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
C1	8.7	4.3	26.1	43.5	17.4
C2	4.3	21.7	26.1	34.8	13.0
C3	30.4	47.8	13.0	4.3	4.3
C4	21.7	34.8	26.1	13.0	4.3
C5	13.0	8.7	47.8	21.7	8.7
C6	17.4	30.4	26.1	21.7	4.3
C7	17.4	4.3	43.5	21.7	13.0
C8	17.4	4.3	34.8	26.1	17.4
C9	39.1	39.1	17.4	4.3	0.0
C10	30.4	26.1	30.4	13.0	0.0
C11	17.4	26.1	30.4	17.4	8.7
C12	13.0	4.3	26.1	39.1	17.4
C13	13.0	4.3	39.1	34.8	8.7
C14	0.0	0.0	13.0	56.5	30.4
C15	4.3	4.3	17.4	43.5	30.4
C16	0.0	4.3	21.7	39.1	34.8
C17	8.7	4.3	21.7	34.8	30.4
C18	4.3	0.0	17.4	39.1	39.1
C19	30.4	43.5	4.3	13.0	8.7
C20	8.7	8.7	30.4	26.1	26.1
C21	13.0	0.0	26.1	43.5	17.4
C22	4.3	17.4	34.8	26.1	17.4
C23	8.7	13.0	30.4	30.4	17.4
C24	8.7	17.4	26.1	21.7	26.1
C25	4.3	26.1	17.4	26.1	26.1
C26	17.4	0.0	8.7	43.5	30.4
C27	13.0	34.8	21.7	13.0	17.4

Table 3 above indicates a more detailed figure for each item in Section C. Item C1 and C2 shows that the respondents are aware of Web 2.0 tools (A=43.5 %) and they do possess the knowledge and ability in using Web 2.0 tools (A=34.8 %). However, they do not often integrate Web 2.0 tools such as blogs,

Facebook and Youtube in their daily teaching. This is indicated in items C3 (SD& D=77.8 %), C6 (SD&D=47.8%) and C9 (SD&D=78.2%). Even though they do not use Blogs, Facebook and Youtube in their teaching, n Item C19 (SD&D 73.9%) also shows that a majority of the respondents do not use other Web 2.0 tools in their teaching as well.

For items C12-C18, most of the respondents agree that Web 2.0 tools do bring benefits to the learners in terms of improving their methods of acquiring knowledge.

Items C20-C27 indicates that most of the respondents are willing to learn about Web 2.0 tools and integrate it in their teaching practice. This probably shows that most of the respondents are open in receiving and acquiring new skills that could help them enhance their knowledge and skills in teaching.

### **Instructors' perception of obstacles to successful technology integration in the classroom.**

This section determines to seek answers on the respondents' perception of the obstacles they face in successful technology integration in the classroom. The respondents were asked to record their answer on a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Moderate (M), Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA) for each 18 items. The table below shows the computed scores of the respondents' answer by averaging the rating for each item in the section

**Table 4: Instructors' perception of the obstacles of successful technology integration**

<b>Item (N=23)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
D1- I may not have enough time to prepare and implement them in the classroom	3.22	1.20
D2- I may not have enough encouragement to use technology in the classroom	2.26	1.01
D3- There are not enough qualified staff available to help me	3.04	1.26
D4- there are not enough equipped labs available in the institutions	3.91	1.28
D5-I may not have the technical knowledge to prepare materials based on technology.	2.91	1.12
D6- I may not be able to relate Web 2.0 tools with teaching	2.39	0.99
D7- I may face difficulties in proper teaching methods when applying technology in the classroom	2.70	1.11
D8- There are problems of accessibility to use existing hardware (i.e computer, LCD projector, etc)	3.35	1.34
D9- the course content does not require me to integrate technology in my lesson	2.91	1.28
D10-There are no incentives given for integrating technology in the teaching and learning process	3.35	1.40
D11-There is too much work load that hinders me from integrating technology in the classroom	2.83	1.34
D12-There are inadequate ICT courses offered to us.	3.00	1.21



D13-Inefficiency of institutions technical infrastructure about instructional technology	3.48	1.31
D14-Deficiency in support services in material development for technology usage	3.48	0.99
D15-I have lack or little interest in technology usage while teaching	1.96	0.88
D16- I have difficulties introducing Web 2.0 tools to students in my lesson	2.57	0.95
D17- Students do not have the ICT skills required	2.39	0.94
D18-There are no or little internet access due to filters or internet firewall	3.09	1.28
Overall mean for Section D	2.93	0.63

Table 4 above shows that most of the answers provided by the respondents have the average mean of 3.00 and above for items D1, D3, D4, D8, D10, D12, D13, D14 and D18. This probably indicates equipped internet facilities play an important role in order to ensure successful internet integration in the classroom.

**Table 5: Frequency of obstacles of successful technology integration**

Item (N=29)	SD (%)	D (%)	M (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
D1	8.7	21.7	21.7	34.8	13.0
D2	17.4	56.5	13.0	8.7	4.3
D3	8.7	34.8	13.0	30.4	13.0
D4	4.3	17.4	4.3	30.4	43.5
D5	8.7	30.4	30.4	21.7	8.7
D6	17.4	43.5	21.7	17.4	0.0
D7	8.7	43.5	26.1	13.0	8.7
D8	13.0	17.4	8.7	43.5	17.4
D9	13.0	30.4	21.7	21.7	13.0
D10	13.0	13.0	30.4	13.0	30.4
D11	21.7	17.4	30.4	17.4	13.0
D12	17.4	13.0	26.1	39.1	4.3
D13	13.0	8.7	17.4	39.1	21.7
D14	0.0	21.7	21.7	43.5	13.0
D15	30.4	52.2	8.7	8.7	0.0
D16	8.7	47.8	21.7	21.7	0.0
D17	17.4	39.1	30.4	13.0	0.0
D18	17.4	8.7	34.8	26.1	13.0

Table 5 above indicates a more detailed figure for each item. Items D1 shows that the respondents agree (A=34.8%) that they do not have time to prepare and implement technology in their lessons. D2 indicates that the respondents disagree (SD & D= 73.95). For item D3 and D4 respondent agree (A=30.4 %) that there are not enough staff nor equipped computer labs available in the institutions. C19 (SD&D 73.9%) also shows that a majority of the respondents do not use other Web 2.0 tools in their teaching as well.

Items D5-D7 indicates that respondents disagree that they might have difficulties in implementing technology using Web 2.0 tools in their teaching and learning.

Item D8 revealed that majority of the respondents agree that they have problems in accessing the hardware such as LCD projector, Laptop as there are not enough to cater every English language instructors as classes were conducted simultaneously.



Items D9- D11 relate to the course content, incentives and work load where respondent highly agree with the respective statements of the items.

Items D12-14 and D18 show that majority of the respondents agree that there are not enough IT courses provided as well as facilities that support the technology environment in the institutions.

The findings for items D15-D17 revealed that the respondents disagree that they have difficulties in introducing Web 2.0 to the students or have lack of interest in the use of technology in their teaching.

### **Results of the semi structured interview**

A total of 10 respondents were interviewed in the pilot study to gain more insights of the quantitative data collected. Each interview session was conducted around 10-15 minutes for each respondent. The interview sessions were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim to provide subsequent data analysis.

Each 10 respondents' interview consisted of semi-structured questions which were prepared earlier by the researcher to investigate their perceptions towards the use of Web 2.0 tools in Higher Education Institutions. (HEIs) particularly in the school they are teaching.

**Question 1:** What are the challenges faced in teaching English in HEI today? What challenges affect you most?

Most of the respondents stated that the challenges that affected them most is the students' competency in the English language.

One of the respondents expressed that,

*'I would say that the students' levels of English right not so it's very challenging in the sense that they aaaa they becoming with a very weak basic of the language. so it's hard for us to cover syllabus sometimes because we have to cover back to the basics sometime even up to grammar' (Respondent 3 Pris: Line 8-10)*

Apart from that the style of teaching that revolves around ICT also getting familiarized with the different types of software are also the challenges faced by the respondents in teaching English in Higher Education Institutions today. Getting English language instructors to use ICT in the classroom will not be possible unless they understand and see the necessity of it in their teaching activities

This was expressed by one of the respondents as follows,

*'I think the biggest challenge is becoming familiar with the software and that there's so many softwares and there's new one coming on market all the time and i think a lot of teachers, speaking for myself anyway i most wanting what is the best software to be using. if i do use this software would it be appropriate or is there a better one available. so this uncertainty of which software to use and then there's also the fear or resistance about becoming familiar with it you know. Learning to use the software it seems a challenge and also another challenge is adopting lessons or sorry no adapting lessons to incorporate this software going from traditional teaching over to you know sort of a mix lesson plan involving some of the traditional techniques and some use of web 2.0 tools. So i think there are the main challenges.'* (Respondent 4 Mark: Line 8-16)

**Question 2:** What is ICT's role (if any) in meeting these challenges?

According to some of the respondents, ICT helps to make the lesson more interesting apart from engaging the students' interest in learning. One of the respondents states that,

*'I see that ICT is a tool for me to overcome this challenge as it helps me to get around the problems that comes up so ICT gives me that flexibility to work around'. (Respondent 9 JC: Line 20-21)*

However, one of the respondents felt that ICT can only help to a certain extend.

*'ICT does help but ummm there are certain short coming as well. in the sense that aaa some of these students are not.. well verse with the use of ICT especially those from interior areas so because of that there is limitation. however what is useful in terms of the use of ICT is what ever they cant say or put in word they can actually put in writing yeah so that's one aspect that I see' (Respondent 3 Pris: Line 12-15)*

**Question 3:** What are your views on how ICT has been used by teachers in your institution to date? Why do you say so?

A majority of the respondents responded that the teachers in their institutions have minimum use of ICT due to the lack of facilities and infrastructures provided by the institution. However, two of the respondents mentioned that in their department, most of their colleagues are heavy users of ICT and do apply it in their teaching.

One of the respondents stated that,

*'I will say maybe most of us are using ICT, those who are ICT savvy of course aaaa..mm.. but again they're some who are not using it because of the age factor, they are not IT savvy and then we have lack of facilities' (Respondent 1 Chel: Line 25-27)*

Another respondent mentioned that.

*'ICT when used appropriately would assist in raising the quality of education by making the teaching and learning process more engaging and connected to real life' ((Respondent 6 Ee: Line 22-24)*

**Question 4:** How might ICT/Web 2.0 tools improve the teaching of English in HEI?

Some of the respondents mention that the use of ICT/Web 2.0 tools helps to make the teaching and learning more interactive.

As stated by one of the respondents,

*'obviously they are appealing to students.. students who are born with computers they love computers they love imagery' (Respondent 4 Mark: Line 88-89)*

They also use the tools for sharing resources with the students.

*'mainly for sharing resources at the same time i do upload some assignments and request that they upload their assignment online as well' (Respondent 3 Pris: Line 37-38)*

**Question 5:** Do you use any Web 2.0 tools in your teaching? If yes, why do you do so? If not, why don't you?

Despite knowing the benefits of using ICT/Web 2.0 tools in teaching, most of the respondents do not use Web 2.0 tools in their teaching as it takes time in preparing materials for the lesson. Apart from that, facility factor is also one of the reasons that discourage them from using ICT/Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

*'I mean they sounded great, things like JING which is like how to capture images, sounds, ooo that sounds good but i haven't felt the need to use for instance JING but i don't really felt the need to capture images screen very often' (Respondent 4 Mark: Line 79-81)*

Only a few of the respondents do experiment using Blogs for teaching writing and Youtube to teach speaking to their students and they find that the students are more interested and excited to learn.

For example respondent 10 uses blog in her teaching,

*'i would just ask them to put in the blog and thanaaa i actually mantain of blog myself and then i ask the student to keep them updated and then they can use whatever things i put in there for them to try out for their lesson' (Respondent 10 Yun : Line 125-127)*

**Question 6:** What are your views on the future directions of ICTs (Web 2.0 tools) in HEIs?

Most of the respondents do acknowledge that the future directions of ICT/ Web 2.0 tools are very bright and important for the students. However, this can only be achieved if the infrastructure and facilities are working and equipped in the institutions. This is emphasized by Respondent 6 as she stated that,

*'It would be good if every room is adequately equipped. If some of the rooms are equipped and some of the rooms are not, it won't be fair for the students' (Respondent 7 Gan: Line 80-81)*

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the result of the study showed that English language instructors do perceived that the integration of technology in the teaching and learning is important and needed. It is undeniable that the internet has long been valued by English language instructors as a powerful research and communication tool. Due to the rapid growth of ICT that is happening globally, every country is putting effort to reform the education system by upgrading the facilities in schools as well as in higher institutions. Training for educators are also provided to ensure that they are at par with the current trends of ICT used in the teaching practice. Franklin and Harmelen (2008) view that Web 2.0 is a technology with profound potential for bringing change in the Higher Education field. They further mention that Web 2.0 has an impact on universities especially on the business of education. Moreover, ICT in a broad sense, has brought about a sea of change in the way students find, manage, and use information. Web 2.0 particularly offers affordances such as the ability to network, communicate, collaborate, co-create and aggregate knowledge offer considerable opportunities for learning and teaching.

In the context of Higher Education, it is undeniable that Higher Education Institutions are facing strong pressures to adjust their method of knowledge creation, sharing and preservation due to the technological changes of the past years. Thus, the Ministry of Higher Education in Malaysia had launched the E-learning policy on 16 April 2011. The policy emphasizes the significance of E-learning that promotes flexibility and collaboration in learning in order to produce graduates who are versatile and competitive in the global arena. In fact, many, if not all, Higher Education Institutions in Malaysia have

invested a lot of money in enhancing ICT facilities in the respective institutions. The effort taken by these Higher Institutions indicate that the role of ICT in education development is recognized.

Therefore, the principal objective of the study which this paper is based is to explore and highlight the reason behind the lack in usage of Web 2.0 tools among the English language instructors at the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia. Specifically, the objective of the study which this paper is based are: to investigate the English language instructors' attitude, motivations and perception towards the importance of using Web 2.0 tools in their teaching activities in the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia, and to identify what exactly the factors that have significantly affected the English language instructors' attitude, motivations and perception towards the importance of using Web 2.0 tools in their teaching activities in the HLIs in Sabah, Malaysia. By exploring and highlighting these issues, this paper has contributed in the theorisation of interrelationship between ICT and teaching and learning in the HLI, especially in the context of making the teaching and learning activities more engaging and connected to real life. Moreover, this paper also prevails the similarities and differences on English lecturers' attitudes, motivations and perceptions towards the use of Web 2.0 tools in their teaching and learning in HLI. Thus, this study helps shed some light not only to other educators but also to the administrators on the reasoning behind the phenomenon of unfavourable use of Web 2.0 tools in the teaching practice among the English language instructors in the Malaysian HLIs.

#### **Acknowledgement**

We would like to thank the Universiti Malaysia Sabah, particularly the Centre for Postgraduate Studies, the Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning and the Faculty of Psychology and Education, which had given us the opportunity to conduct a research that led to the writing of this paper. We acknowledge that without the opportunity, this paper would have not been produced and publishable.

#### REFERENCES

- 1.Ahmad Tarmizi Abdul Rahman, Romzi Ationg and Nurul Ain Zulhaimi. "A paradigm shifts in understanding mixed method research: A Malaysian perspective". *Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioural Science*, 9, no. 1 (2017): 46-56.
- 2.Babbie, E. (2011). *Introduction to social research*. Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- 3.Baylor, A., and Ritchie, D. (2002) "What factors facilitate teacher skill, teacher morale and perceived student learning in technology-using classrooms?" *Computers and Education*, 39 pg. 395-414.
- 4.Belawati. T. (2001). *Open and Distance Education in the Asia Pacific Region*. (eds. Jegede, E. & Shive, G.Hong Kong: Open University of Hong Kong Press.
- 5.Creswell, J. and Plano, C. V. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Method Research (2nd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 6.Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (4th Edition)*. Boston: Pearson.
- 7.Franklin, T., & Harmelen, M. (2008). *Web 2.0 for Content for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*. Manchester: Franklin Conculting and Mark van Harmelen.
- 8.Ghavifekr, S. and Rosdy, W.A.W.(2015) "Teaching and learning with technology: Effectiveness of ICT integration in schools". *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 1( 2), pg. 175-191.
- 9.Kopyc, S.(2007) "Enhancing Teaching with Technology: Are we there yet?" *Innovate Journal of Online Education*, 3(2), pg. 11-23.
- 10.Lau, B., & Sim, C. (2008). *Exploring the Extent of ICT Adoption Among Secondary School Teachers In Malaysia*. *International Journal of Computing and ICT Research*, 2 (2), 19-36.
- 11.Lim, C. and Chai, C. (2007) "Teacher's pedogogical beliefs and their planning and conduct of computer-mediated classroom lessons". *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39. (5) pg. 807-828.
- 12.Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. (2011). *National Higher Education Strategic Plan 2*. Putrajaya: Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia.
- 13.Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital Native, digital immigrants*. *On the Horizon*, 9 (5), pg. 1-14.
- 14.Sutton, J. and Austin, Z. (2015) "Qualitative Research: Data Collection, Analysis, and Management". *The Canadian journal of hospital pharmacy*, 68 (3), pg: 226-231.
- 15.Teo, T.(2008) "Beliefs about teaching and uses of technology among pre-service teachers". *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36,(2),pg. 163-175.
- 16.Zainudin Awang. (2011). *Research Methodology for Business and Social Science*. Shah Aalam: UPENA.
- 17.Zhao, Y. and Frank, K. (2003). *Factors affecting technology uses in schools: an ecological Perspective*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 4 (40), pg. 807-840.