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ABSTRACT
Technology has undergone a lot of radical changes in the last years which have caused the implementation of new paradigms in different sectors. It is almost impossible for education not to be affected from this change in technology. It has shifted from the traditional applications to the technology use in the classrooms. In this case, teachers’ role in the application of technology into education has become an essential part of the research in the field. Also, in higher education, teachers become the key factors to the effective use of technology in the teaching and learning processes. Thus, teachers’ technology acceptance level remains an important issue. The term, technology acceptance refers to the adoption and use of technologies in the way they were designed for. The purpose of this study is to examine the technology acceptance level of teachers at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages to test the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) that determines the variables influencing individuals’ technology acceptance. Firstly, a Likert scale type of scale was administered to measure UTAUT and the attitudes of teachers towards technology. The participants are the 44 lecturers who have started using technology recently at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages. The findings reveal that the overall technology acceptance level of participants is average.
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1. Introduction
It is impossible to deny that new technologies have started to have a big impact in our lives in every area. Computers have started to take up special place in our private and social lives. One of the most important affected areas is education. It has become impossible for education to be able to stay away from technology integration. Technology has become a part of education through e-Learning platforms and Web 2.0 services. The use of information and communication technology in the classroom is very important for providing students opportunities to learn to operate in an information age. Computers began to be placed in schools in the early 1980s, and several researchers suggest that information and communication technologies (ICT) will be an important part of education for the next generation, too (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Grimus, 2000; Yelland, 2001). Dawes (2001) is of the view that new technologies have the potential to support education across the curriculum and provide opportunities for effective communication between teachers and students in ways that have not been possible before. ICT in education has the potential to be influential in bringing about changes in teaching process. It plays a very important role in learning and teaching process. It has a great impact on students’ achievement. Many researchers and theorists assert that the use of computers can
help students to become knowledgeable, reduce the amount of direct instruction given to them, and
give teachers an opportunity to help those students with particular needs (Iding, Crosby, & Speitel,
2002; Shamatha, Peressini, & Meymaris, 2004; Romeo, 2006). According to Grabe and Grabe (2007),
technologies can play a role in student skills, motivation, and knowledge. Also, Bingimlas (2009)
claims that ICT can be used to present information to students and help them complete learning tasks.
Though a lot of institutions have taken important steps towards the integration of technology into
language classrooms, not so many of them have focused on the perceptions of teachers towards the
use of technology in the classrooms. This study will contribute to the area in such a way that
acceptance level of teachers will be identified first so that the barriers could be diminished for a full
implementation of technology in language classrooms.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Role of Teachers in The Integration of ICT

In an educational set up, teachers play a leading role in putting the computers into practice and carry
it into the classroom environments. The adaption and integration of technology into the classroom
largely depends on the teachers who are implementing this technology in the classrooms. Thus, the
role of the teachers is very crucial in using any technology during their teaching. According to Carter
et al., (2013), teacher attitudes and beliefs toward the use of technology in their classroom play a major
role in the extent to which they will integrate computers into their classrooms and provide
opportunities to their students to engage with technology for educational purposes. Successful
implementation depends largely on teachers’ beliefs about classroom computing because they are the
key holders to the integration of ICT and student engagement.

Computer anxiety and teachers’ attitudes and beliefs towards the computer use in classroom are two
main factors that affect the success of the integration of the ICT into the classrooms (Carter et al.,
2013). According to Leso & Peck (1992), computer anxiety is conceptualized as anxiety or fear when
using, or considering using, computer technologies. Hence, computer anxiety may increase when the
computer use increases in the classrooms. Previous research has found that computer skills and
technology acceptance are inversely related to computer anxiety (Ekizoglu & Ozcinar, 2010). Other
important factor is teacher attitudes and beliefs. Inan &Lowther (2010) found that teacher beliefs were
the single most important factor when predicting computer integration. Carter et al.,(2013) state that
more recent research by Celik &Yesilyurt (2012) supported these results. With a sample of 471 preservice
teachers, they found that teachers’ attitudes toward technology, perceived computer self
efficacy, and computer anxiety were significant predictors of attitudes toward using computer
supported curricula in their classrooms.

Integration of ICT into teaching and learning process is a very complex issue and a lot of problems
can be encountered during this process. Teachers’ attitudes towards technology use in classrooms is
almost one of the biggest issues in implementing technology in classrooms. Balanskat, Blamire &
Kefala (2006) argue that although educators appear to acknowledge the value of ICT in schools,
difficulties continue to be encountered during the processes of adopting these technologies.
According to Bingimlas (2009), these difficulties stem from different barriers. The one which is related
to teachers is teachers’ lack of confidence in using ICT. This may stem from the technological
pedagogical lack of teachers, which can be caused, by lack of training. Another important barrier for the unsuccessful integration of ICT into the classrooms is the teachers’ acceptance of technology. In the local context, Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages, technological pedagogical training was given to the teachers and it was studied. Thus, teachers’ acceptance, as another important issue in the integration of ICT, was studied in this paper.

2.2. Unified Theory Of Acceptance And Use Of Technology (UTAUT)

After technology became very important part of our lives, it has affected education inevitably. Technology integration into the classrooms has almost become one of the most rated topics to discuss after the introduction of the technology to the classrooms. Many theories and models have been developed to explain and predict if teachers will use information system technologies fruitfully. According to the information stated by Teo &Noyes (2011), early work included the development of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and its successor, the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991) and its extension and the Decomposed TPB (Taylor & Todd, 1995). Other relevant theories and models include Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986), the Model of Personal Computer Utilisation (Thompson, Higgins, & Howell, 1991) and the Motivational Model (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier & Ryan, 1991).

Lastly, in 2003, Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis created the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology. Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis (2003) integrated elements from eight Information Technology Acceptance Models to create their model. Gender, age, experience, and voluntariness of use were added to the model and were hypothesized to moderate the effect of four constructs (performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions) on intention to use and usage behavior. Behavioral intention is seen as a critical predictor of technology use (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003). Self-efficacy and anxiety were determined by Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis (2003) to be indirect determinants, and therefore unnecessary in the model.

In this model, the UTAUT contains four core determinants of information technology use and up to four moderators of key relationships (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Model of UTAUT (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003)
As seen in Figure 1, there are four components of UTAUT: performance expectancy (PE), effort expectancy (EE), social influence (SI), and facilitating conditions (FC).

**Performance Expectancy:** PE refers to the extent to which an individual believes that using an information system will help him or her to attain benefits in job performance (Teo & Noyes, 2011). According to PE users will find technology useful because it enables them to accomplish learning activities more quickly and effectively. It can be considered the synthesis of variables, such as PEU, found in the TAM (Davis, 1989), extrinsic motivation, found in the Motivation Model (Davis, 1989) job fit, found in the PC Use Model (Triandis, 1977), relative advantage, found in the Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 1995), and result expectancies, found in Social Cognitive Theory (Compeau & Higgins, 1995; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003).

**Effort Expectancy:** EE is defined as the degree of ease associated with the use of technology (Teo & Noyes, 2011). Based on the UTAUT, use of technology among educational users will depend on whether or not the technology is easy to use, and the influence of EE on behavioral intention will be moderated by gender and age such that the effect will be stronger for women, particularly for older women (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003). It can be considered as the synthesis of variables such as PEU, found in the TAM (Davis et al., 1989), complexity, found in the PC Use Model (Triandis, 1977), and ease of use, found in the Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 1995; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003).

**Social Influence:** Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis (2003) defined SI as the degree to which a person perceives how important it is that “other people” believe he or she should use a technology. It can be considered as the synthesis of variables such as subjective norms, found in the TAM (Davis et al., 1989), Planned Behavior Theory (Ajzen, 1971), and PC Use Models (Triandis, 1977), and image, found in the Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 1995; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003).

**Facilitating Conditions:** FCs are defined as the extent to which users believe that the necessary infrastructures to support the use of technology in an organization exist. These may include resource and technology factors concerning compatibility issues that have an impact on usage (Teo & Noyes, 2011). FC also includes the necessary training for the technology users. FC is the organizational and the technical support for the users. It can be considered as the synthesis of variables such as perceived behavioral control, found in Reasoned Behavior Theory (Ajzen, 1971), facilitating conditions, found in the PC Use Model (Triandis, 1977), and job fit, found in the Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 1995; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003).

### 2.3. Technology Acceptance In Foreign Classrooms

As the technology penetrates in every field of our lives and education, it has almost become indispensable for foreign language classrooms. The use of modern technology in teaching languages has been dramatically increasing worldwide over the past decade (Chen, Belkada, & Okamoto, 2004; O’Dowd, 2003; Pennington, 1999; Toyoda & Harrison, 2002). The creation of World Wide Web provides the language teachers with the numerous possibilities to make use of instructional materials in language teaching and learning contexts to teach both the language and the culture. (Belz, 2003, O’Dowd, 2003; Thorne, 2003). According to Chaklikova & Karabayeva (2015), if we do not integrate technology into our foreign language classrooms, we take the risk of our students’ interest, and also
we could not achieve training them to be fully equipped to be successful in such a competitive world. However, it is not easy for the teachers to be able to understand and integrate modern technologies into the classrooms because many of the older technologies required only ‘push the button’ skills to operate (Bates & Epper, 2001). Therefore, teachers may feel a lot of pressure about mastering the use of computer technologies in the first place and then later may find it difficult to keep up with the technological changes (Davies, 2003). There may be a lot of obstacles that the teachers encounter during the technology integration into language classrooms. Bates & Epper (2001) state three barriers, which keep college leaders from establishing an environment that allows teachers to take advantage of technology resources, including the needs for appropriate 1) planning and budgeting for instructional technology, 2) organizational structures and communication, and 3) faculty rewards and incentives. In this study, the teachers’ acceptance at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages, as a language teaching and learning environment, were studied and discussed. The effects of the barriers were found out and discussed and tried to be perceived on the teachers’ acceptance level.

3. Theoretical Perspective

Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis (2003) have synthesized eight user acceptance and motivation models to propose the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). The eight theories are the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the Motivational Model (MM), the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), a combined theory of Planned Behaviour/Technology Acceptance Model (C-TPB-TAM), the Model of PC Utilization (MPCU), Innovation Diffusion Theory (IDT), and Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) (Akbar, 2013). Based on a review of the extant literature, Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis developed UTAUT as a comprehensive synthesis of prior technology acceptance research. UTAUT suggests four core constructs which are the determinants of technology acceptance and use. These four core constructs of UTAUT are Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, and Facilitating Conditions. Performance expectancy is defined as the degree to which using a technology will provide benefits to consumers in performing certain activities; effort expectancy is the degree of ease associated with consumers’ use of technology; social influence is the extent to which consumers perceive that important others (e.g., family and friends) believe they should use a particular technology; and facilitating conditions refer to consumers’ perceptions of the resources and support available to perform a behavior (Brown and Venkatesh 2005; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003)

4. Method

This study aims at analyzing the attitudes and beliefs of university teachers, who are teaching language, towards the use of technology. This study uses survey design, which includes quantitative method research in order to understand the technology acceptance level of teachers at School of Foreign Languages at Anadolu University, Turkey. At this stage, technology acceptance refers to the adoption and use of technologies in the way they were designed for. For this study, to measure the technology acceptance level of teachers, Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) was used by making some adoptions to make it more suitable to the context of the sample population used in the study. The data was analyzed via SPSS statistical package using the frequency distribution and percentage, the mean scores and reliability. No further comparisons were analysed just to show the real picture in the institution.
Research Questions:

The study aims to answer the following research questions:

1- What are the teachers' perceptions towards performance expectancy in technology use for teaching?
2- What are the teachers' perceptions towards effort expectancy in technology use for teaching?
3- What are the teachers' perceptions towards using technology for teaching?
4- What are the teachers' perceptions towards social influence in technology use for teaching?
5- What are the teachers' perceptions towards facilitating conditions in technology use for teaching?
6- What are the teachers' perceptions towards self-efficacy in technology use for teaching?
7- What are the teachers' perceptions towards anxiety in technology use for teaching?
8- What are the teachers' overall technology acceptance level in EFL classes?

4.1. Participants

For this study, the population was all the lecturers at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages. The UTAUT scale was given to all the population regardless of some factors, such as age, gender, experience and technological pedagogical content knowledge. Out of almost 120 lecturers, 44 of the lecturers submitted the scale back, which was considered as a sufficient number to analyze the data and draw conclusions.

4.2. Instrument

The survey was based on the original UTAUT model (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003). The original UTAUT survey was tested and found to have an $R^2$ of 70%, indicating that the model explains 70% of the variance in user intentions to use information technology (Birch & Irvine, 2009). The survey was created as an online survey and sent to the lecturers via email. All the variables of the model were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scale is made up of 7 parts: Performance expectancy, effort expectancy, attitude towards using technology, social influence, facilitating conditions, self-efficacy, and anxiety. Each part was analyzed in its own.

5. Results

Although the UTAUT model's survey was already validated by its authors, this study reexamined the instrument to ensure its reliability in the specific context of this study. Therefore, the internal consistency reliability (ICR) was calculated using Cronbach’s Alpha for each construct. When the instrument was considered including a single factor, the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient value was found 0.940.
Table 1.
Cronbach’s Alpha values of the scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards Using Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Efficacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 1, for each construct in the scale Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was estimated and the results revealed that each factor has a value over 0.90.

5.1 UTAUT Test Results

All the factors of the UTAUT model and each item in these factors were analysed separately. Mean values and the frequencies were computed and discussed. Also, teachers’ technology acceptance level in general was argued in the light of mean values and frequencies as well.

Performance Expectancy Factor

Overall mean scores reached in this factor indicate that participants mostly have positive attitude towards their performance expectancy.

Table 2.
Mean scores for items in Performance Expectancy factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 demonstrates that most of the lecturers who took the questionnaire think that they find ICT useful for the course (PA1) as they strongly agreed with the mean score of 4.20. Also, they believe that they accomplish the tasks more quickly via ICT (PA2). The mean score of this item (3.80) indicate that participants mostly agreed on the time management issue although their score was lower. In addition, lecturers strongly agreed that using ICT increases their productivity with the mean score of 4.02.

Effort Expectancy Factor

The responses given for the items in this factor reveal that participants mean scores are above 3.00, which means their attitude is positive.
According to Table 3, most of the lecturers (% 60) think that they strongly agreed to the item that “their interaction with ICT is clear and understandable” as their mean score is 4.0 (EE1). For the second item in this factor (EE2-It is easy for me to become skillful at using ICT), the mean score of the lecturers was 3.73 which is quite lower than the previous item although it still showed a positive attitude. Also, the mean score of the third item in this factor (EE3- I find ICT easy to use) was 3.80, which means the participants found ICT as easy as it may be thought. Item 4 in this factor (Learning to operate the system is easy for me) indicated a mean score of 3.75. It may be inferred that the participants are mostly capable of learning how to operate ICT system.

### Attitudes towards Using Technology Factor

The mean scores of the items vary between the agree and strongly agree range, which show that participants have mostly positive attitudes towards using technology in their teaching.

### Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT2</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 demonstrates that with mean score of 4.16 (%53.49 agree and %30.23 strongly agree), most of the lecturers think that using ICT in lessons is a good idea (AUT1). They also believe that ICT makes their work more interesting (AUT2) almost with the same rate (4.05) to the previous one. When it comes to speaking of working with ICT is fun (AUT3), the rate of agree lowers to %44.19 and the rate of neutral rises to almost %21 although the mean score (4.02) reflects a positive attitude. With the last item (AUT4- I like working with ICT) the rate of the lecturers who chose neutral went up to almost %24 and who chose agree is still %44.19 and strongly agree rate is %25.58 which is lower than the previous items. The mean score of this item (3.91) indicates that most of the participants agreed that they enjoy working with ICT.

### Social Influence Factor

Participants’ attitudes about the social influence for using technology is above the neutral threshold according to the mean scores reached.
Table 5.
Mean scores for items in Social Influence factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that lecturers mostly agree with the item that “people who are important to me think that I should use ICT (SI1)”. However, the number of the lecturers, who chose neutral is %39.53, which is almost close to agree score. With the second item (SI2), “people who influence my behaviour think that I should use ICT”, the rate of neutral is higher than agree with %42.86, although the mean score of the item reflects a similar result. For the last item about the support of university (SI3), the rate of agree rises to %61.90 with the mean score of 4.27, which means the participants strongly agreed that their institution encourages them to use ICT in their teaching.

Facilitating Conditions Factor

Overall mean scores reached in this factor reveal that participants have positive attitude towards the facilitating conditions in their institution.

Table 6.
Mean scores for items in Facilitating Conditions factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC2</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 6, the lecturers agreed that they have the resources necessary to use ICT (FC1). For this item, the rate of the neutral is almost same with strongly agree. Also, the second item (FC2) under this factor shows that most of the lecturers have the knowledge necessary to use ICT. The rate of the neutral is %27.91 for this item. %44.19 of the lecturers chose agree for the last item “FC3- A specific person (or group) is available for assistance with system difficulties” with the mean score of 3.77, which indicates that participants have somebody to help them while using ICT.

Self-Efficacy Factor

The mean scores reached show that participants mostly feel positive about the statements in this factor. Their scores were lower than the other factors, which means that teachers may have some doubts about their self-efficacy in using technology in the classroom.
Table 7.
Mean scores for items in Self Efficacy factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7, we can see the lecturers mostly believe that they could complete a job or a task using ICT even if there was no one around to tell them what to do although seven people either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (SE1). They mostly agreed that they need to call someone for help if they got stuck with the mean score of 3.80 (SE2). They also agreed with the item (SE3) that they need a lot of time to complete the task with the mean score of 3.80, which contradicts with the results found for the second item in performance expectancy factor (Using ICT enables me to accomplish tasks more quickly). Also, they believe that they could complete the task if they had just the built-in help facility or assistance (SE4) by choosing agree with the mean score of 3.73.

Anxiety Factor

The mean scores of the items in this factor show a neutral tendency. However, the items were stated negatively and their disagreement on a negative statement is considered as a positive attitude.

Table 8.
Mean scores for items in Anxiety factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8, lecturers felt neutral with 2.20 mean score with the item that they hesitate to use ICT for fear of making mistakes they cannot correct (A1). %27.91 of the participants feel neutral about this item. In addition, the mean score of item 2 (2.05) reveals that the lecturers do not feel anxious about using ICT with a percentage of %32.56 strongly disagree and disagree with %27.91. Also, they think that they do not find ICT intimidating with the mean score of 2.18.

Overall Technology Acceptance

As the scale consisted of 24 items and the total score for a participant to get is 120 the highest. Therefore, the sum of scores participants received were organised in 3 categories as low (scores between 0-39 were coded as 1), average (scores between 40-79 were coded as 2), and high (scores between 80-120 were coded as 3). Table 9 shows the descriptive statistics for the overall level of technology acceptance.
Table 9.
Overall level of technology acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>87.7273</td>
<td>13.16861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 indicates that the scores given ranged between 58 and 108, and the mean score for the overall technology acceptance is 87.72, which assumes a high level of technology acceptance as coded 3. This result may imply that the participants in this study feel positive about the technology use in their teaching.

6. Discussion

This study aims at examining the technology acceptance level of lecturers at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages. Overall, the results revealed that participants in this study had above-average level of technology acceptance. For almost all the parts of the scale, the possible range of scores are between agree and strongly agree and sometimes neutral. It is possible that the high level of technology acceptance may be attributed to the emphasis on the frequent use of technology in the classes.

According to the study conducted by Bingimlas (2009), the lack of accessibility to resources as a barrier is closely related to several other key issues which can themselves be considered barriers to teachers’ use of ICT. Bingimlas (2009) also states that teachers cannot use technological materials because of a lack of technological pedagogical training in how to use these ICT resources. Teachers always need technical assistance. However, in this study conducted at Anadolu University, most of the teachers believe that they have the necessary resources and knowledge to use ICT and technical support is available when needed. Although the number of the lecturers who disagree with these points, the neutral point cannot be underestimated which is above %20 and even %27 for the technical support item. Though the lecturers feel safe about using ICT, they have some doubts about the technical support provided when necessary. Also, in self-efficacy factor of the scale, the results reveal most lecturers’ belief in completing a task if there is no one around, but disagree score is almost higher than any other item in the scale. This could show the need they feel for the assistance and their lack of experience and training.

In the performance expectancy part of the questionnaire, although the lecturers find ICT useful for the course, it seems that some of them have some little doubts about using ICT to make the tasks accomplish more quickly and ICT’s increasing their productivity. This could stem from not having enough knowledge about the system and not being able to use it in a desired quick way. It may require some time to specialize in using ICT since the lecturers have been using it for only a few years. Also, effort expectancy factor of the scale reveals the same results that although most of the lecturers feel secure while using ICT, some of them have still doubts about becoming skillful at using and learning to operate it. This may also stem from the lack of experience and practice in using ICT.
According to the results, social influence plays an important role for the lecturers to adopt ICT into their teaching, but the high rates of the neutral point cannot be underestimated. This shows that lecturers do not take this something social, but professional. They do not adopt it just because some people they value say so, but they want to integrate it into their classes for their professional development and for the sake of students’ benefits. In this part, the higher point is about the university support. The support of university is emphasized by a high rate of agree and strongly agree in the scale by the lecturers. The support comes from the administration and the Technology Unit formed by the lecturers at the same institution. Almost in all lessons, technology is incorporated into the syllabus and there are also lab lessons in which the students study online and get support from their teachers. This has resulted in the high level of technology acceptance reported by the lecturers in this study. Similar to this study, the support of the institution resulted in a high level of technology acceptance level among pre-service students in Thailand according to the study conducted by Teo et al.(2014).

In terms of anxiety, the results show that most lecturers are not afraid of making mistakes or they are not anxious while using ICT. They also do not find it intimidating. This could stem from the fact that they are all open to changes and technological developments in the educational field. Also, this could show their experience, may be, not in the area of ICT but in teaching generally and this experience makes them feel secure about applying new changes to the classes. Lastly, this result could also reveal that administration provides the lecturers with a secure feeling that they can make mistakes while implementing new things into the lessons.

7. Limitations of The Study

Despite the care given to all the steps of the study, it has still some limitations. Firstly, the intended population was much bigger than the actual one. Although the scale was e-mailed to almost 120 lecturers, only 44 of them returned. It is actually a small population compared to the whole population. Also, this study did not analyze any correlation between the age and experience of the lecturers and their acceptance level of technology. We believe that this study could come up with some valuable findings with such a correlation analysis. Lastly, some semi-structured interviews could be conducted to get deeper information about the technology acceptance level of lecturers at Anadolu University. In this way, the reasons behind their choices could be understood more clearly and more detailed and some deeper results could be obtained through these interviews.

8. Further Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, some future directions can be taken into consideration. Firstly, some semi-structured interviews could be conducted to get more valid, deeper and more meaningful results about the technology acceptance level of lecturers at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages. Also, technological pedagogical content knowledge of the lecturers could be identified because technological pedagogical content knowledge of the lecturers could form a base for their technology acceptance level. Also, it could explain the reasons behind their answers to the UTAUT scale. Furthermore, this study could be conducted to other universities and make comparisons between the results. In addition, the researchers could analyze the reasons of the differences, if any,
and the institutions could make further plans by taking the reasons of these differences into consideration.
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## Appendix

The Unified Theory Of Acceptance and Use Of Technology (Utaut) Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance expectancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- I find Information Communication Technology (ICT) useful for the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Using ICT enables me to accomplish tasks more quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Using ICT increases my productivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort expectancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- My interaction with ICT is clear and understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- It is easy for me to become skillful at using ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- I find ICT easy to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Learning to operate the system is easy for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward using technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Using ICT is a good idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- ICT makes work more interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Working with ICT is fun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- I like working with ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- People who are important to me think that I should use ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- People who influence my behavior think that I should use ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- In general, the university has supported the use of ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitating conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- I have the resources necessary to use ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITEMS</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- I have the knowledge necessary to use ICT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17- A specific person (or group) is available for assistance with system difficulties.

**Self-efficacy: I could complete a job or a task using ICT…**

18- If there was no one around to tell me what to do.

19- If I could call someone for help if I got stuck.

20- If I had a lot of time to complete the job for which the software was provided.

21- If I had just the built-in help facility or assistance.

**Anxiety**

22- I hesitate to use ICT for fear of making mistakes I cannot correct.

23- I feel apprehensive (anxious) about using ICT.

24- Using ICT is somewhat intimidating to me.

*(Adapted from Venkatesh et al., 2003).*