

Examination of Technology Acceptance and Use Among Academics Working in the
Field of Sports Sciences*

Zafer GAYRETLİ¹, Akın ÇELİK²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.1880386>

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

¹Karadeniz Technical
University, Department of
Physical Education,
Trabzon/Türkiye

²Trabzon University,
Faculty of SportSciences,
Trabzon/Türkiye

Abstract

In the study examining the effects of academics' demographic characteristics in the field of sports science on technology acceptance and use, a correlational survey model was used within a quantitative research approach. The study population comprises academics working in sports science in Turkey, and the sample group consists of 374 academics selected via simple random sampling. During the data collection phase of the study, the “Personal Information Form” created by the researchers and the “Teachers Technology Acceptance and Use Scale (TTAUS)”—an extension of Davis's (1989) “Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)” that incorporates external variables as proposed by Ursavaş (2014)—were utilized. In the analysis, the t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used because the normality assumptions were met. According to the data obtained, no significant differences were found by gender or duty area, whereas significant differences were observed in the overall scale and some sub-dimensions, driven by variables such as age, years of service, department, in-service training, and the number of technological tools and equipment used. According to the technology use level variable, significant differences were found across all sub-dimensions of the scale. In conclusion, it has been determined that demographic variables influence the acceptance and use of technology among academics working in sports science, and that the level of technology use affects all factors. This situation illustrates that proficiency in technology use is a significant factor influencing academics' acceptance and adoption of technological tools.

Keywords: Sports Sciences, Technology Acceptance and Use, Academic.

Corresponding Author:
Zafer GAYRETLİ
zaferrgayretli@gmail.com

**Spor Bilimleri Alanında Görev Yapan Akademisyenlerin
Teknoloji Kabul ve Kullanım Durumlarının İncelenmesi**

Öz

Spor bilimleri alanında görev yapan akademisyenlerin demografik özelliklerinin teknoloji kabul ve kullanım durumları üzerindeki etkisinin incelendiği araştırmada, nicel araştırma yaklaşımlarından ilişkisel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini, Türkiye’de spor bilimleri alanında görev yapan akademisyenler oluştururken; örneklem grubunu ise basit tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilen, 374 akademisyen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın veri toplama sürecinde, araştırmacılar tarafından oluşturulan “Kişisel Bilgi Formu” ile Davis (1989) tarafından geliştirilen “Teknoloji Kabul Modeli”ne Ursavaş (2014) tarafından dış değişkenler dâhil edilerek genişletilmiş “Öğretmen Teknoloji Kabul ve Kullanım Ölçeği (Ö-TKKÖ)” kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde, normallik varsayımları karşılandığı için t-testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) testi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen verilere göre; cinsiyet ve görev bölgesine göre anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmezken, yaş, hizmet yılı, bölüm, hizmet içi eğitim, teknolojik araç ve gereç kullanım sayısı değişkenlerine göre ise ölçek geneli ve bazı alt boyutlarda anlamlı farklılıklar tespit edilmiştir. Teknoloji kullanım düzeyi değişkenine göre ise, ölçek ile tüm alt boyutlarda anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Sonuç olarak, spor bilimleri alanında görev yapan akademisyenlerin teknoloji kabul ve kullanım durumlarını demografik değişkenlerin etkilemiş olduğu, özellikle teknoloji kullanım düzeyi değişkeninin tüm faktörleri etkilediği tespit edilmiştir. Bu durum, akademisyenlerin teknolojiye yönelik kabul ve kullanım davranışlarının geliştirilmesinde teknoloji kullanım becerilerinin önemli bir rol oynadığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Spor Bilimleri, Teknoloji Kabul ve Kullanım, Akademisyen.

*This study is made from the doctoral thesis titled “Examination of the opinions of academics working in the field of sports sciences regarding the use of information technology” conducted by the first author.

Introduction

Technology has had a significant impact on human life since ancient times, and its rapid development has greatly facilitated the production, transmission, dissemination, and access to information (Koska & Göksu, 2017). As information continues to develop under the influence of technology and permeate every area of our lives, taking advantage of existing technology has become a necessity rather than a personal privilege (Kolburan-Geçer & Dağ, 2010). Technology encompasses not only scientific and technical knowledge but also the social and economic activities that facilitate the application of this knowledge to human life (Özer & Eryılmaz, 2021). The term information society denotes a social order in which information and technology play a decisive role in production processes and social relations, with information serving as the foundation of the economic structure (Yalçın & Kocaoğlu, 2025).

Technological change and the rapid increase in knowledge are driving widespread change across many areas of society (Karasakaloğlu et al., 2011). This rapid technological development requires individuals in society to be able to use information Technologies effectively (Daniela et al., 2018; Ng'ambi, 2013). As a result, technology is increasingly present in the education system, one of the most important areas of society. From the first stage of education to higher education, many institutions and organizations are increasingly using technology (Sivrikaya & Biricik, 2019), and education is becoming increasingly technology-supported, with even technology-based teaching systems emerging (Murat & Erten, 2018). Technology in education is not limited to increasing the diversity of materials; it also reshapes how students access information, the opportunities for individualizing the learning process, and collaborative processes (Pangestu & Pasaribu, 2022). As technology advances rapidly, it is also necessary to focus on how computers can be used effectively. The effective use of computers, especially in the workplace, has a direct impact not only on the performance of an institution or business but also on that of its employees (Eryılmaz, 2018). Therefore, as in every field, the integration of technology and education has become an inevitable reality (Kurtuluş, 2019), and with the reflection of technological developments in education, the quality of education has increased both quantitatively and qualitatively (Danış et al., 2023).

Recent technological advancements have significantly influenced information technologies, resulting in the diversification, increased accessibility, and widespread adoption of these tools (Taş et al., 2019). These advancements are driving substantial changes in educational processes and shaping individuals' lifestyles (Pangestu & Pasaribu, 2022). Generation Z predominantly uses digital technologies for entertainment, which poses challenges for integrating technology into educational settings (Bellet & Banet, 2023; Huang, 2023). While various factors contribute to individuals' effective use of information technologies, educational institutions play a particularly

critical role (Eryılmaz, 2018). Higher education institutions are expected to rapidly adapt to the integration of technology, a key component of the education system. Consequently, the digital transformation of higher education has accelerated alongside developments in educational technologies (Kukulsha-Hulme, 2012). Integrating new Technologies into education through digital transformation enables students to shift from passive recipients to active participants in the learning process. During this transition, essential skills such as communication, critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and digital literacy become increasingly vital (Kocaman-Karoğlu et al., 2020; Sürer, 2020). Among these developments, rapid and intensive advances in information technology have had a significant impact on higher education systems. In this context, the impact of technological developments on universities is increasing day by day (Yılmaz & Horzum, 2005). Several factors complicate this process, including the selection and implementation of educational technologies, institutional size, alignment of targeted learning outcomes with technology integration, and the development of strategies to engage teaching staff (Educause, 2019). Technology integration extends beyond the provision of hardware infrastructure and includes pedagogical activities, communication, and collaboration processes that utilize remote access capabilities (Bervell et al., 2022). Therefore, educators who will effectively and efficiently use the information technologies to be integrated into the education system must take on the task of training individuals who will use these technologies (Bayrakçı, 2005). Students demonstrate varying rates of technology adoption; some engage actively, while others remain distant or reluctant due to hardware limitations and individual, social, or psychological factors (Bozkurt, 2020; Altınpulluk, 2021; Andrews et al., 2021). However, as students interact with educational institutions throughout their formal education, they are generally expected to develop information technology skills by graduation (Aydoğmuş & Karadağ, 2020). At this point, the task of learning how to use information technologies in education primarily falls to educators (Kocaman, 2019). Because students spend so much time with technology, integrating technology into the teaching process becomes a goal for educators (Hew & Brush, 2007). In this sense, educators who will use information and communication technologies in education must also adapt to technology (Ayyıldız, 2019). The use of information technologies by educators in the educational process is an important factor not only for the transmission and interpretation of information but also for the quality of educational activities and the adaptation of the learning-teaching process (Gözel, 2022). Furthermore, the use of information technologies in education systems demonstrates that educators can diversify and help create new learning environments through technology (Mama & Hennessy, 2013). Academics have emphasized the importance of modifying course materials, keeping class durations short, and increasing communication with students to make class schedules more student-friendly, thereby

increasing student participation and making course content more engaging (Akıncan & Çakır, 2021).

Technological advancements are increasingly integrated into the multidisciplinary field of sports and continue to progress (Mısırlıgil & Bayansalduz, 2023). In today's sports, in order to achieve success and quality, sports education provides a flow of information that is conveyed both theoretically and practically during the teaching and learning process (Gümüşdağ, 2017), and the use of information technologies is important both in preparing for web-based distance education and in teaching activities during the education process (Yücel & Devecioğlu, 2012). The use of information technologies in sports education enables the teaching of theoretical knowledge and psychomotor skills, increases student motivation (Gümüşdağ, 2017), and supports body analysis programs and club management systems (Sivrikaya & Biricik, 2019). Of course, for these sports field trainings to be conducted more efficiently and effectively, educators must also adapt to this rapidly advancing technological process, be trained, and acquire information technology education.

Studies have examined the use of information technology by teachers and academics in various educational fields with different variables (Dlamini & Mbatha, 2018; Ghiatau & Mata, 2019; Hatlevik, 2017; John, 2015; Salleh & Laxman, 2014). This research addresses a gap in the sports science literature. It aims to analyze technology acceptance and use among sports science academics. The research question is: "To what extent do academics working in sports science use information technology in their teaching and learning activities?"

Materials and Methods

Research Model

In the study examining the effects of academics' demographic characteristics in the field of sports science on technology acceptance and use, a correlational design was used as the quantitative research approach. A correlational study aims to assess the existence and extent of relationships among two or more variables (Creswell, 2013).

Population and Sample Group

The study population consists of academics working in the field of sports sciences in Turkey (n=2515), based on information obtained from the YÖK Academic page on February 22, 2023 (YÖK Akademik, 2023). The research sample group consists of 374 academics working in the field of sports sciences in seven regions of Turkey (Aegean, Mediterranean, Marmara, Black Sea, Central Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia, and Southeastern Anatolia) and four different departments (Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Sports Management, Coaching Education, and Recreation).

According to Balçı (2018), a sample size of 356 is sufficient for a population of up to 5,000. In selecting the academics, the “simple random sampling”, which is frequently preferred in research and ensures that all individuals in the population have an equal chance of being selected, was used.

Data Collection Tools

The personal information form consists of questions regarding independent variables such as gender, age, years of service, duty area, department, in-service training, number of technological tools used, and level of technology use. The relevant measurement tool, the “Technology Acceptance Model (TAM),” was developed by Davis (1989) and finalized by Ursavaş (2014) with the inclusion of external variables. The “Teachers Technology Acceptance and Use Scale (TTAUS)” consists of 37 items and 11 factors: “Perceived Usefulness (PU)”, “Perceived Ease of Use (PEU)”, “Attitude Toward Use (ATU)”, “Behavioural Intention (BI)”, “Facilitating Conditions (FC)”, “Perceived Enjoyment (PE)”, “Self-Efficacy (SE)”, “Technological Complexity (TC)”, “Compatibility (C)”, “Anxiety (A)”, and “Subjective Norm (SN).” The first 4 questions of the TTAUS measure PU, 3 questions measure PEU, 4 questions measure ATU, 4 questions measure BI, 3 questions measure FC, 4 questions measure PE, 3 questions measure SE, 3 questions measure TC, 3 questions on C, 3 questions on A, and the last 3 questions on SN. The items in the 37-item data collection tool are 5-point Likert-type and consist of negative and positive questions. The 6 items consisting of negative statements have been reverse-coded. Cronbach's Alpha values for the scale and its factors are .92, .88, .91, .90, .84, .91, .82, .84, .86, .86, and .79, respectively. In this study, Cronbach's Alpha values were calculated as .89, .89, .89, .89, .91, .89, .89, .91, .89, .90, .89, and .90 for the scale as a whole.

Data Analysis

SPSS 25.0 statistical software was used to analyze the data in this study. In the study, to assess whether the data followed a normal distribution, descriptive statistics (frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, kurtosis, and skewness) were used. According to George and Mallery (2010), skewness and kurtosis values are accepted between -2 and +2, and these values were considered in the study. Descriptive statistics revealed that the data followed a normal distribution. Therefore, parametric tests were used in the study. The t-test was used for analyses with two variables, while the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for analyses with more than two variables. To determine the direction of the significant difference in the T-test results, interpretation is performed based on the arithmetic mean variable (in the direction of the larger mean), while Post Hoc tests are used to determine the direction of the significant difference in ANOVA. In selecting the Post Hoc tests to be applied to the significant ANOVA difference, the

homogeneity condition was checked; if it was present, the Scheffe test was applied; if it was not, the Games-Howell test was applied. The direction of the difference was determined by the significance value: (-) or (+). Additionally, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated to assess the scale's reliability.

Research Ethics

Ethical committee approval for the applications to be carried out within the scope of my research has been obtained by applying to the Trabzon University Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee, as documented in letter number E-81614018-000-693.

Findings

Table 1

Distribution of Teacher Technology Acceptance and Usage Scale Scores

	Number of Items	n	\bar{X}	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min.	Mak.
PU	4	374	4.47	0.57	-0.78	-0.14	2.50	5.00
PEU	3	374	4.21	0.71	-0.52	-0.51	2.00	5.00
ATU	4	374	4.27	0.64	-0.60	-0.04	2.00	5.00
BI	4	374	4.25	0.65	-0.53	-0.36	2.25	5.00
FC	3	374	3.91	0.76	-0.71	0.89	1.00	5.00
PE	4	374	4.13	0.69	-0.52	-0.18	2.00	5.00
SE	3	374	4.21	0.61	-0.20	-0.73	2.67	5.00
TC	3	374	3.45	0.87	-0.70	0.56	1.00	5.00
C	3	374	4.14	0.72	-0.47	-0.38	1.67	5.00
A	3	374	3.95	0.81	-1.04	1.65	1.00	5.00
SN	3	374	3.72	0.75	-0.40	0.40	1.00	5.00
TTAUS	37	374	4.06	0.49	-0.19	-0.35	2.56	5.00

Table 1 shows that the scores obtained from the scale used in the study fall within the range of “-2 to +2”. When examining the skewness and kurtosis values of the scores obtained from the TTAUS and its factors, the data appear to follow a normal distribution.

Table 2

t-Test Results for TTAUS Scores According to Participants' Gender Variable

Gender	Female (n=81)		Male (n=293)		t	df	p
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd			
PU	4.41	0.60	4.49	0.56	1.13	372	0.25
PEU	4.15	0.66	4.22	0.72	0.79	372	0.42
ATU	4.23	0.63	4.28	0.65	0.57	372	0.56
BI	4.21	0.62	4.27	0.66	0.70	372	0.48
FC	3.88	0.76	3.92	0.76	0.34	372	0.73
PE	4.00	0.61	4.16	0.71	1.77	372	0.07
SE	4.17	0.57	4.23	0.62	0.75	372	0.45

TC	3.57	0.74	3.42	0.90	1.32	372	0.18
C	4.12	0.71	4.15	0.73	0.34	372	0.73
A	3.87	0.72	3.97	0.84	1.01	372	0.31
SN	3.62	0.79	3.75	0.73	1.46	372	0.14
TTAUS	4.02	0.49	4.08	0.49	0.92	372	0.35

Table 2 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the scores obtained from the TTAUS ($t=0.92$; $p>0.05$) and its factors between male and female academics working in the field of sports science. In other words, the difference between the mean scores obtained by female and male academics in the field of sports science on the TTAUS and its factors is not statistically significant.

Table 3

ANOVA Results of TTAUS Scores According to Participants' Age Variable

Age	A. 24-34 (n=96)		B. 35-45 (n=158)		C. 46-56 (n=94)		D. 57-67 (n=26)		F	p	MD
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd			
PU	4.54	0.53	4.56	0.53	4.33	0.63	4.18	0.51	6.21	0.00*	A-D; B-C,D
PEU	4.35	0.63	4.28	0.70	4.02	0.74	3.89	0.74	5.81	0.00*	A-C,D; B-C
ATU	4.37	0.58	4.35	0.64	4.12	0.67	3.93	0.59	5.86	0.00*	A-D; B-D
BI	4.27	0.62	4.35	0.64	4.18	0.67	3.88	0.66	4.58	0.00*	B-D
FC	3.84	0.82	3.95	0.79	3.91	0.66	3.95	0.62	0.39	0.75	-
PE	4.28	0.59	4.17	0.72	3.95	0.70	3.92	0.72	4.57	0.00*	A-C
SE	4.34	0.54	4.32	0.60	4.02	0.60	3.79	0.58	11.15	0.00*	A-C,D B-C,D
TC	3.67	0.93	3.52	0.84	3.24	0.76	3.02	0.90	6.46	0.00*	A-C,D
C	4.26	0.68	4.21	0.70	3.97	0.72	3.94	0.85	3.64	0.13	-
A	4.19	0.83	4.01	0.71	3.73	0.83	3.50	0.92	8.49	0.00*	A-C,D; B-D
SN	3.81	0.74	3.79	0.79	3.57	0.69	3.53	0.58	2.72	0.44	-
TTAUS	4.17	0.43	4.14	0.50	3.91	0.46	3.77	0.50	9.33	0.00*	A-C,D B-C,D

* $p<0.05$ MD: Meaningful Difference

Groups: A: 24-34 years old, B: 35-45 years old, C: 46-56 years old, D: 57-67 years old

Analyses revealed that the scores obtained for the FC, C, and SN factors did not differ significantly across age groups among academics working in the field of sports sciences ($p>0.05$). TTAUS ($F_{3,370}= 9.33$; $p<0.05$) showed significant differences in scores across the other factors.

According to the results of the Scheffe test conducted to determine the differences between age groups; when the scores obtained from the TTAUS were examined, the scores of academics aged 24-34 were higher than both the scores of academics aged 46-56 and the scores of academics aged 57 -67 age group; the scores of academics in the 35-45 age group were statistically higher than the scores of academics in both the 46-56 age group and the 57-67 age group.

When TTAUS scores are examined by age group, academics in the 24-34 age range had higher scores than those in the 57-67 age range on the PU and ATU dimensions. In the PU and SE dimensions, the scores of academics aged 35-45 were statistically higher than those of academics aged 46-56 and those aged 57-67. The results show that the scores of academics aged 24-34 on the dimensions of PEU, SE, TC, and A are statistically higher than those of academics aged 46-56 and 57-67. In the dimensions of ATU, BI, and A, the scores of academics aged 35-45 were statistically higher than those of academics aged 57-67. In the PEU dimension, the scores of academics aged 35-45 are statistically higher than those of academics aged 46-56. In the PE dimension, the scores of academics aged 24-34 are statistically higher than those of academics aged 46-56.

Table 4

ANOVA Results for TTAUS Scores According to Participants' Years of Service Variable

Service Year	A. 1-10 (n=161)		B. 11-21 (n=101)		C. 22-32 (n=89)		D. 33-43 (n=23)		F	p	MD
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd			
PU	4.55	0.55	4.54	0.51	4.32	0.64	4.21	0.53	5.14	0.00*	A-C
PEU	4.34	0.65	4.19	0.72	4.05	0.74	3.89	0.75	5.01	0.00*	A-C,D
ATU	4.39	0.60	4.26	0.64	4.10	0.67	4.03	0.64	5.13	0.00*	A-C
BI	4.33	0.63	4.28	0.62	4.17	0.69	3.95	0.70	2.81	0.39	-
FC	3.87	0.86	3.92	0.73	3.99	0.58	3.81	0.69	0.59	0.62	-
PE	4.25	0.64	4.09	0.72	3.97	0.73	4.05	0.71	3.48	0.01*	A-C
SE	4.35	0.56	4.25	0.60	4.01	0.61	3.94	0.66	8.06	0.00*	A-C,D
TC	3.63	0.88	3.39	0.87	3.27	0.77	3.17	0.90	4.74	0.00*	A-C
C	4.24	0.70	4.11	0.73	4.05	0.70	3.97	0.87	2.01	0.11	-
A	4.16	0.80	3.90	0.73	3.71	0.85	3.62	0.76	7.91	0.00*	A-C,D
SN	3.86	0.77	3.65	0.81	3.61	0.60	3.59	0.65	3.02	0.30	-
TTAUS	4.18	0.48	4.05	0.45	3.93	0.48	3.84	0.54	7.04	0.00*	A-C,D

*p<0.05 MD: Meaningful Difference Groups: A: 1-10 years, B: 11-21 years, C: 22-32 years, D: 33-43 years

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference in the scores for the BI, FC, C, and SN factors across years of service for academics working in the field of sports sciences ($p>0.05$). However, a significant difference was observed in the scores obtained from the TTAUS ($F_{3,370}=7.04$; $p<0.05$) and other factors. According to the analysis of the Scheffe test conducted to determine the differences in years of service between groups; When examining the scores obtained from TTAUS, it is seen that the scores of academics with 1-10 years of service are statistically higher than both the scores of academics with 22-32 years of service and the scores of academics with 33-43 years of service.

When TTAUS scores are examined by factor, it is observed that the scores of academics with 1-10 years of service are statistically higher than those of academics with 22-32 years of service in the dimensions of PU, ATU, PE, and TC. In terms of PEU, SE, and A, the scores of

academics with 1-10 years of service are statistically higher than those of academics with both 22-32 years of service and 33-43 years of service.

Table 5

ANOVA Results for TTAUS Scores According to Participants' Area of Responsibility Variable

Area of Respons.	A. Aegean (n=39)		B. Mediterranean (n=24)		C. Marmara (n=57)		D. Black Sea (n=129)		E. Central Anatolia (n=56)		F. Eastern Anatolia (n=54)		G. Southeastern Anatolia (n=15)		F	p
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd		
PU	4.57	0.59	4.46	0.55	4.32	0.67	4.46	0.56	4.48	0.55	4.51	0.48	4.65	0.46	1.11	0.35
PEU	4.41	0.57	4.09	0.80	4.20	0.71	4.21	0.73	4.04	0.71	4.29	0.66	4.13	0.82	1.31	0.25
ATU	4.32	0.71	4.06	0.62	4.17	0.71	4.29	0.60	4.26	0.62	4.32	0.69	4.43	0.57	0.92	0.48
BI	4.33	0.67	4.06	0.77	4.28	0.66	4.25	0.61	4.18	0.64	4.31	0.65	4.28	0.81	0.66	0.68
FC	4.20	0.60	3.90	0.84	3.97	0.78	3.82	0.81	3.79	0.67	4.04	0.69	3.66	0.76	2.11	0.05
PE	4.16	0.75	3.97	0.83	4.10	0.74	4.14	0.64	4.07	0.71	4.20	0.64	4.20	0.79	0.43	0.85
SE	4.27	0.59	4.12	0.62	4.13	0.62	4.27	0.56	4.11	0.70	4.26	0.59	4.31	0.62	0.87	0.51
TC	3.54	0.85	3.08	0.90	3.42	0.81	3.57	0.84	3.42	0.82	3.29	1.04	3.64	0.69	1.71	0.11
C	4.31	0.69	3.97	0.74	3.97	0.80	4.19	0.65	4.12	0.66	4.21	0.78	4.08	1.01	1.31	0.25
A	4.02	0.81	4.06	0.73	3.90	0.87	3.98	0.84	3.95	0.75	3.83	0.86	3.86	0.57	0.41	0.87
SN	3.94	0.65	3.62	0.78	3.75	0.82	3.74	0.73	3.47	0.83	3.80	0.64	3.77	0.65	1.84	0.08
TTAUS	4.19	0.48	3.94	0.51	4.02	0.53	4.09	0.45	3.99	0.51	4.10	0.46	4.09	0.55	1.03	0.40

Groups: A: Aegean, B: Mediterranean, C: Marmara, D: Black Sea, E: Central Anatolia, F: Eastern Anatolia, G: Southeastern Anatolia

When examining the analysis results in Table 5, it was found that the scores obtained from the TTAUS ($F_{6,367}=1.03$; $p>0.05$) and its factors did not differ significantly across the region variable for academics working in the field of sports sciences. According to this finding, the difference between the means of the scores obtained from the scale and its factors, by work region, among academics working in the field of sports sciences, is not statistically significant.

Table 6

ANOVA Results for TTAUS Scores According to Participants' Department Variable

Department	A. Physical Education and Sports Teaching (n=127)		B. Sports Management (n=118)		C. Coaching Education (n=95)		D. Recreation (n=34)		F	p	MD
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd			
PU	4.50	0.54	4.49	0.52	4.46	0.62	4.35	0.67	0.64	0.59	-
PEU	4.12	0.77	4.37	0.63	4.12	0.67	4.18	0.76	3.14	0.02*	B-A
ATU	4.24	0.65	4.25	0.62	4.33	0.66	4.27	0.69	0.42	0.73	-
BI	4.20	0.70	4.25	0.59	4.33	0.63	4.22	0.73	0.71	0.54	-
FC	3.95	0.73	3.92	0.85	3.79	0.71	4.02	0.65	1.17	0.32	-
PE	4.12	0.71	4.10	0.72	4.16	0.65	4.16	0.69	0.16	0.92	-
SE	4.18	0.64	4.29	0.58	4.17	0.56	4.21	0.69	0.84	0.46	-
TC	3.43	0.89	3.51	0.89	3.54	0.63	3.09	1.18	2.45	0.06	-
C	4.08	0.73	4.22	0.71	4.19	0.69	3.98	0.77	1.55	0.20	-
A	3.88	0.90	4.05	0.74	4.04	0.61	3.60	1.08	3.44	0.01*	B-D

SN	3.75	0.76	3.72	0.80	3.70	0.66	3.68	0.77	0.13	0.94	-
TTAUS	4.04	0.52	4.11	0.48	4.08	0.44	3.98	0.53	0.73	0.53	-

*p<0.05 MD: Meaningful Difference

Groups: A: Physical Education and Sports Teaching, B: Sports Management, C: Coaching Education, D: Recreation

The analyses showed that the scores obtained from the factors PEU ($F_{3,370}=3.14$; $p<0.05$) and A ($F_{3,370}=3.44$; $p<0.05$) differed significantly, whereas the scores obtained from the TTAUS ($F_{3,370}=0.73$; $p>0.05$) and other factors did not differ significantly. According to the results of the Scheffe test, which examined differences between departments, when TTAUS scores are analyzed by factor, academics in the sports management department have statistically higher PEU scores than those in the physical education and sports teaching department. In the A factor, the scores of academics in the sports management department were statistically higher than those in the recreation department.

Table 7
t-Test Results for TTAUS Scores According to Participants' In-Service Training Variable

In-Service Training	Yes (n=114)		No (n=260)		t	df	p
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd			
PU	4.52	0.55	4.45	0.57	1.05	372	0.29
PEU	4.35	0.63	4.15	0.73	2.56	372	0.01*
ATU	4.34	0.64	4.23	0.64	1.44	372	0.15
BI	4.36	0.65	4.21	0.65	2.06	372	0.04*
FC	4.04	0.75	3.85	0.75	2.13	372	0.03*
PE	4.29	0.66	4.06	0.70	2.97	372	0.00*
SE	4.33	0.58	4.16	0.61	2.36	372	0.01*
TC	3.55	0.92	3.41	0.84	1.43	372	0.15
C	4.28	0.61	4.08	0.76	2.51	372	0.01*
A	4.03	0.83	3.91	0.81	1.32	372	0.18
SN	3.92	0.63	3.64	0.78	3.42	372	0.00*
TTAUS	4.18	0.47	4.01	0.48	3.08	372	0.00*

*p<0.05

Table 7 shows that, for academics working in the field of sports sciences, there was no significant difference in the scores for the PU, ATU, TC, and A factors. It was found that the scores obtained from the TTAUS ($t=3.08$; $p<0.05$) and other factors differed significantly in favor of those who received in-service training.

Table 8
ANOVA Results of TTAUS Scores According to the Variable of Participants' Number of Technological Tools and Equipment Use

Number of Technological Tools and Equipment Used	A. 2	B. 3	C. 4	D. 5	E. 6	F. 7
	Different Tools (n=62)	Different Tools (n=89)	Different Tools (n=95)	Different Tools (n=60)	Different Tools (n=42)	Different Tools (n=26)

	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	F	p	MD
PU	4.38	0.59	4.46	0.59	4.45	0.57	4.51	0.48	4.41	0.64	4.77	0.42	1.98	0.08	-
PEU	3.98	0.76	4.15	0.72	4.16	0.72	4.25	0.63	4.45	0.63	4.66	0.53	4.82	0.00*	F-A E-A
ATU	4.16	0.72	4.23	0.63	4.22	0.68	4.29	0.57	4.36	0.65	4.60	0.47	2.05	0.07	-
BI	4.21	0.70	4.22	0.65	4.20	0.69	4.24	0.56	4.31	0.66	4.61	0.53	1.85	0.10	-
FC	3.83	0.83	3.74	0.83	3.90	0.76	3.87	0.63	4.19	0.56	4.34	0.63	3.96	0.00*	F-B
PE	3.96	0.74	4.05	0.67	4.06	0.66	4.17	0.66	4.27	0.72	4.70	0.52	5.24	0.00*	F-A,B,C
SE	4.03	0.62	4.13	0.63	4.12	0.56	4.27	0.58	4.53	0.53	4.60	0.51	6.79	0.00*	F-A,B,C E-A,B,C
TC	3.24	0.92	3.46	0.86	3.48	0.81	3.50	0.82	3.45	0.94	3.75	0.89	1.38	0.22	-
C	4.13	0.74	4.19	0.69	4.04	0.71	4.09	0.73	4.15	0.75	4.50	0.69	1.78	0.11	-
A	3.67	0.91	3.84	0.78	4.08	0.75	3.90	0.85	3.98	0.72	4.58	0.61	5.78	0.00*	F-A,B,D
SN	3.52	0.78	3.70	0.66	3.70	0.75	3.78	0.67	3.73	0.87	4.24	0.70	3.56	0.00*	F-A
TTAUS	3.92	0.52	4.02	0.46	4.04	0.47	4.08	0.47	4.17	0.47	4.49	0.42	5.85	0.00*	F- A,B,C,D

*p<0.05 MD: Meaningful Difference

Groups: A: 2 Different Tools, B: 3 Different Tools, C: 4 Different Tools, D: 5 Different Tools, E: 6 Different Tools, F: 7 Different Tools

The analyses show that the scores for PU, ATU, BI, TC, and C do not differ significantly ($p>0.05$) across the number of technological tools and equipment used by academics working in the field of sports science. The TTAUS ($F_{5,368}=5.85$; $p<0.05$) indicates that the scores for other factors differ significantly. When examining the scores obtained from the TTAUS, it is found that the scores of academics who selected 7 different tools are statistically higher than those of academics who used 2, 3, 4, or 5 different technological tools and equipment.

When TTAUS scores are examined by factor, it is observed that the scores of academics who selected 7 different tools in the PEU and SN factors are statistically higher than those of academics who selected 2 different tools, in terms of the number of technological tools and equipment used. In the PEU factor, the scores of academics who selected 6 different tools were statistically higher than those of academics who used 2 different technological tools and equipment. In the FC factor, it was determined that the scores of academics who selected 7 different tools were statistically higher than the scores of academics who used 3 different technological tools and equipment. It is observed that the scores of academics who selected 7 different tools in the PE and SE factors are statistically higher than those of academics who used 2, 3, or 4 different technological tools and equipment. In the SE factor, the scores of academics who selected 6 different tools were statistically higher than those of academics who used 2, 3, and 4 different technological tools and equipment. In the A factor, it is observed that the scores of academics who selected 7 different tools are statistically higher than those of academics who used 2, 3, or 5 different technological tools and equipment.

Table 9
ANOVA Results for TTAUS Scores According to Participants' Technology Use Level Variable

Level of Technology Use	A. Introduction (n=12)		B. Adoption (n=41)		C. Adapting (n=110)		D. Appropriation (n=94)		E. Discovering New Applications (n=117)		F	p	MD
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd			
PU	3.77	0.52	4.42	0.57	4.36	0.63	4.51	0.52	4.62	0.47	8.41	0.00*	E-A,C D-A; C-A; B-A
PEU	3.02	0.61	3.97	0.73	3.97	0.71	4.40	0.57	4.48	0.58	22.49	0.00*	E-A,B,C D-A,B,C C-A; B-A
ATU	3.68	0.71	4.16	0.60	4.16	0.66	4.32	0.57	4.42	0.65	5.36	0.00*	E-A; D-A
BI	3.37	0.51	4.06	0.70	4.10	0.69	4.37	0.53	4.46	0.58	12.99	0.00*	E-A,B,C D-A,C C-A; B-A
FC	3.66	1.00	3.82	0.67	3.79	0.77	3.91	0.80	4.08	0.69	2.73	0.20	E-A,B,C D-A,B,C
PE	3.54	0.43	3.87	0.74	3.95	0.66	4.26	0.62	4.34	0.69	9.75	0.00*	E-A,B,C D-A,B,C
SE	3.58	0.58	4.03	0.63	3.97	0.57	4.34	0.54	4.47	0.54	17.34	0.00*	E-A,B,C D-A,C
TC	3.08	1.09	3.17	0.72	3.33	0.75	3.44	0.88	3.72	0.92	5.04	0.00*	E-B,C
C	3.08	0.88	3.97	0.65	4.03	0.69	4.23	0.62	4.35	0.71	11.73	0.00*	E-A,C D-A; C-A B-A
A	3.44	0.91	3.60	0.75	3.83	0.75	3.99	0.80	4.20	0.81	6.86	0.00*	E-A,B,C
SN	2.86	0.86	3.54	0.74	3.58	0.68	3.71	0.73	4.02	0.68	11.45	0.00*	E- A,B,C,D D-A
TTAUS	3.37	0.48	3.87	0.45	3.92	0.44	4.13	0.40	4.29	0.47	19.91	0.00*	E-A,B,C D-A,B,C C-A; B-A

*p<0.05 MD: Meaningful Difference
Groups: A: Introduction, B: Acceptance, C: Adapting, D: Appropriation, E: Discovering New Applications

Upon examining Table 9, a significant difference in scores for the factors of the TTAUS ($F_{4,369}=19.91$; $p<0.05$) was found across technology use levels among academics working in the field of sports sciences. To determine which groups differed in technology use levels, the Games-Howell test was applied to the PU factor, and the Scheffe test was applied to the PEU, ATU, BI, FC, PE, SE, TC, C, A, and SN factors. When TTAUS scores were examined, academics with discovering new applications-level technology use showed statistically significantly higher scores than those with introduction, adapting, and appropriation levels of technology use. The scores of academics with appropriation technology usediscovering new applications show statistically significant positive differences relative to those of academics with introduction, adoption, and adapting levels of discovering new applications. Academic scores for those with adoption technology discovering new applications show statistically significant positive differences relative to those with introduction-level discovering new applications.

When TTAUS scores are examined by discovering new applications level, academics with a discovering new applications level of technology use have higher scores than those with introduction or adapting levels on the PU and C factors. Across PU, ATU, C, and SN, it was found that scores for academics at an appropriation level of technology use were statistically higher than those for introduction. In terms of PU, PEU, BI, and C, the scores of academics with an adapting level of technology use were found to be statistically higher than those of academics with aintroduction level of technology use. It was found that the scores of academics with adoption-level technology use were statistically higher than those of academics withintroduction-level technology use across the factors of PU, PEU, BI, and C. PEU, BI, FC, PE, SE, and A factors indicate that academics with discovering new applications-level technology use have higher scores than those with introduction-, adoption-, or adapting-level technology use. It was found that the scores of academics with appropriation levels of technology use on the factors of PEU, FC, and PE were statistically higher than those of academics with introduction, adoption, and adapting levels of technology use. In terms of BI and SE, the scores of academics with appropriation technology use were statistically higher than those of academics with introduction or adapting levels of technology use. In terms of attitude toward technology use, scores among academics with discovering new applications were statistically higher than those among academics at the introduction level. In the TC factor, the scores of academics with discovering new applications-level technology use are statistically higher than those of academics with adoption- and adapting-level technology use. In the SN factor, scores for academics with discovering new applications-level technology use were statistically higher than those for academics at introduction, adoption, adapting, and appropriation levels.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study, which aimed to examine the technology acceptance and use among academics in sports science, included 374 academics: 81 (21.7%) women and 293 (78.3%) men. Considering that the score range for all factors is 1-5 and the average is 3, it was determined that the scores obtained from the scale and all factors are above the average. Looking at the average scores on the scale and its factors, it was found that academics in the field of sports sciences preferred the Perceived Usefulness (PU) factor most and the Technological Complexity (TC) factor least.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to the gender variable, it was determined that the scores obtained by academics in the field of sports science on the scale and the scores obtained from the factors were not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). In other words, gender does not affect participants' levels of technology acceptance and use. In this day and age, technology use has become widespread and

necessary in all areas, especially education. As in many other areas, it is no secret that there are inequalities between women and men in the IT sector. With the increase in the number of female academics working in today's sports education system and the growing awareness of IT opportunities, it can be said that the difference in IT use levels between female and male academics has disappeared. A review of the literature reveals that Karasakaloğlu et al. (2011) found that Turkish teachers' attitudes toward technology and their level of IT use did not differ according to gender. Gözel (2022) found that classroom teachers' self-efficacy in using information and communication technologies in education differed significantly by gender. The studies by Çağtaş (2019), Koca (2006), Önal and Çakır (2015), and Özçelik (2006) also support these findings. These findings are like the research results. However, these results differ from the research results.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to the age variable; the average difference between the scores obtained from the FC, C, and SN factors were found to be statistically insignificant ($p > 0.05$), while the difference between the mean scores obtained from the scale and the mean scores obtained from the other factors was found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). This result is thought to stem from the fact that younger academics in the field of sports science are more likely to use information technologies, adapt more readily to modern technologies, and gain greater ease and proficiency in learning. We can state that the significant difference in the perceived usefulness factor stems from the fact that young and middle-aged academics believe that the use of information technology in education contributes to the efficient delivery and active processing of their courses. It can be said that the significant difference in the perceived ease of use factor stems from the fact that young and middle-aged academics do not experience difficulties with information technology and feel prepared. The significant difference in the attitude factor towards use can be attributed to the fact that young and middle-aged academics, who are in tune with the technological age, are aware of which information technology systems are appropriate and usable in their classes. The significant difference in the behavioural intention factor can be attributed to the middle-aged academic group being ready to use information technology and inclined to incorporate it into their courses. Similarly, the reason for the significant difference in the perceived enjoyment factor can be attributed to the fact that it can be thought that for the younger generation of academics, using information technology in their courses is no longer a necessity but a requirement, and they reflect the pleasure they derive from this process onto their students. It can be concluded that the significant difference in self-efficacy is due to young and middle-aged academics perceiving their information technology use self-efficacy as at desired levels and considering themselves competent in this technology system. The reason for the significant difference in the anxiety factor can be said to stem from the fact that they minimize their concerns about information technology use and are

able to cope when exposed to technology. Çağtaş (2019) found that school administrators' self-efficacy in using information technologies differed significantly by age. Yılmaz (2016) found a significant difference in teachers' attitudes toward technology in education according to age. Karatay and Torun (2016) found significant differences in teachers' attitudes toward computer-assisted education across age groups. Bilgin (2012) aimed to determine the IT use competencies of technical branch teachers in education and found that IT use competencies were low among older teachers. Ayyıldız (2019) found that teachers' ages significantly affected their information technology use competencies. In his study, Gözel (2022) concluded that classroom teachers' self-efficacy in using information and communication technologies in education differed significantly by age.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to their years of service, it was found that the difference between the averages of the scores they received from the BI, FC, C, and SN factors were found to be statistically insignificant ($p>0.05$), while the difference between the scores obtained from the scale and the average scores obtained from other factors was found to be statistically significant ($p<0.05$). It is undeniable that young academics, keeping pace with technological development over recent years, spend a massive portion of their time with technology, adapt to new technological elements, and have an elevated level of interest in, proficiency with, and interaction with technology. The reasons for the decrease in technology acceptance and use levels among academics working in the field of sports science, despite their increasing years of service, include technological differences at the beginning of their careers, insufficient experience in integrating technological developments into their courses, low perceived self-efficacy in technology use, and, as a result, avoidance of its use. It can be suggested that priority should be given to employees with greater years of service in in-service training to increase their levels of technology acceptance and use. The difference in perceived usability may be attributed to the fact that academics with fewer years of service are younger, more adaptable to emerging technologies, and use them effectively in their teaching. The significant difference in the perceived ease of use factor can be attributed to their experience with technology, which enables them to make no extra effort and complete the process efficiently. As for the significant difference in attitude towards the use factor, they have a general opinion about the information technology materials they will use in their courses and are therefore prepared. The significant difference in perceived enjoyment indicates that academics with fewer years of service enjoy interacting with technology and actively use it in their classes. Regarding the significant difference in the self-efficacy factor, it can be said that academics with fewer years of service, whom we refer to as the younger generation, have higher information technology self-efficacy, and use it effectively across all parts of their courses. Regarding the significant difference in the

technological complexity factor, it can be stated that, in addition to being deeply involved in technology, academics with fewer years of service need to be prepared to develop technology and keep themselves up to date. Regarding the significant difference in anxiety levels, it can be said that, given their fewer years of service, sometimes knowing technology very well is not sufficient, and they become anxious about transferring this knowledge in their lessons. A review of the literature reveals that Solak (2012) found no difference in perceived usefulness, subjective norms, and intention to use based on the professional experience variable regarding primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of smart board use and its effect on their intention to use smart boards. However, Solak did find a significant difference in perceived ease of use. Gözel (2022) found a significant difference in classroom teachers' self-efficacy in using information and communication technologies in education based on their years of professional experience. In their study, Bilge Taşkın (2018) found a significant difference in teachers' acceptance of and intention to use ICT based on their years of professional experience. Artul (2003) found that school administrators' competence in IT differed significantly by seniority. However, these results do not align with those of this study.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to the task area variable, it was found that the difference between the average scores obtained by academics working in the field of sports science on the scale and the average scores obtained from the factors was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). In the past, the inability to integrate technological opportunities into education across every region of our country, the limited information technology courses offered at universities in terms of content and duration, and the inadequacy of technological materials and infrastructure have highlighted our shortcomings in using technology. Today, however, these shortcomings have been eliminated, and academics in the field of education can use information technologies on an equal footing, thereby eliminating these differences. Considering the research results from this perspective, it can be said that the education provided by academics working in the field of sports sciences in different regions is learned and utilized at an equal level by students, that the technological necessity in education is emphasized, and that the perceptions and attitudes of the teaching staff towards technology have developed. Reviewing the literature, Demircan (2021) found that the region experienced had no effect on the relationship between preschool teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge and their use of information and communication technology. This finding is also consistent with the research results. In addition, Çam (2017) found in his study that attitudes and factors considered important for teachers' technological pedagogical professional success showed significant differences across locations where they worked. This finding in the literature does not support the research results. Based on these results, it can be said that, in general, the locations where

academics working in the field of sports sciences are employed do not affect their acceptance and use of technology.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to department variables, it was found that the difference between the average scores of academics working in the field of sports science on the PEU and A factors was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), while the difference between the average scores obtained from the scale and the average scores obtained from other factors was found to be not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). According to these results, the reasons for the significant difference in the PEU and A factors are, respectively: when looking at the course content of the sports management department, academics who completed their undergraduate and graduate education in the sports management department took courses that are close to technology and prone to technology use (Economics, business administration, accounting, management information systems, statistics, financial management, etc.). Considering this perspective, it would not be wrong to say that academics have advanced in this area, are prepared to use technology, and do not feel anxious when faced with it. Therefore, even today, when computer-assisted education systems are widespread, it can be said that academics in the sports management department will not encounter difficulties using technology, especially information technology, in education and knowledge transfer. The significant difference in the perceived ease of use factor stems from the fact that the sports management department's curriculum is conducive to technology-based education. The significant difference in anxiety stems from the sports management department's emphasis on theory-based courses, which leaves academics to rely on technology in their course delivery. Therefore, it can be said that they are more affected and anxious compared to the application areas we call recreational areas. A review of the literature reveals that Ayyıldız (2019) found that teachers' information technology use competencies differed significantly across subjects. In his study, Özçelik (2006) found a significant difference in computer self-efficacy levels between classroom and subject teachers in primary schools, depending on the subject. Bilge Taşkın (2018), in a study examining teachers' intentions to accept and use information and communication technologies, found a significant difference in these intentions across subjects.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports sciences according to the in-service training variable; it was found that the scores obtained from the PU, ATU, TC, and A factors did not show a significant difference ($p > 0.05$), it was found that the scores obtained from the scale and the scores obtained from other factors differed significantly in favor of those who received in-service training ($p < 0.05$). The ongoing global technology and information revolution has impacted every stage of working life and has significantly strengthened its position, particularly in education. This situation has also affected

educators involved in education and teaching activities. With the process of using information technologies in education and training, developments such as distance learning, e-learning, computer-assisted learning, and mobile learning have emerged. Educators have been negatively affected by these developments and have been inadequate in their use of technology. With the in-service training model, training courses are now being offered at all higher education institutions to develop academics' skills in technology use and teaching. With these beginnings, efforts have been made to maximize the use of technology, proficiency, perception, and attitude among many academics. According to these results, academics who have received in-service training use information technologies more efficiently in their educational processes, as well as in other areas. This may be attributed to the provision of in-service training programs at universities or other institutions. A review of the literature reveals that Avcu and Göktaş (2011) found a significant difference in the total average scores for teachers' acceptance and intention to use ICT, depending on whether they had received computer training. The difference favored teachers who received computer training, and it was significant in favor of those who received training on intention, perceived ease of use, self-efficacy, and facilitating conditions. In his study, Yılmaz (2020) found a significant difference in the relationship between classroom teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge and professional competence depending on whether they participated in in-service training.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to the variable of the number of technological tools and equipment used, the difference between the average scores obtained from the scale and the A and SN factors was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), while the average scores obtained from the PEU, FC, PE, SE, A, and SN factors were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). However, the difference in the mean scores for the PU, ATU, BI, TC, and C factors was found to be statistically insignificant ($p > 0.05$). With the integration of technology into education, instructors who will use this technology must also find their place in this field. Because today's era is often called the information age, relying solely on classrooms for education is no longer considered sufficient. At this point, innovations in classroom use and organization are being implemented. These innovations are facilitated by technological tools, making the education and teaching process sustainable. To achieve this sustainability, academics must possess the skills to use technological tools. The more technological tools are used, the easier it will be for academics to adapt to technology, especially information technology in education. This will improve the use of information technology in the teaching and learning process, their perceptions of using tools, and their technological self-efficacy. It is also thought that they will be able to overcome the problems they encounter when using information technologies and understand the necessity of using the system with the opinions of different people. When the

literature is examined, Tanık Önal (2017) stated in their study that science teacher candidates use information-sharing tools, television, telephone, computer, tablet, life-facilitating tools, and help tools to meet their needs. When looking at the purposes of teacher candidates' use of ICT, it was determined that this included communication, homework, following current events, acquiring information, using social media, and entertainment. Baki et al. (2009) stated that the technological tools that teachers know best and use most frequently are computers and the internet. Koçak Usluel et al. (2007) stated that teachers' purposes for using ICT were to utilize the internet, e-mail, and MS Word applications; to use word processors, the internet, and MS Excel applications for administrative tasks; and to use educational software CDs, the internet, and MS Word applications for teaching tasks.

When examining the technology acceptance and use status of academics working in the field of sports science according to the technology use level variable, it was found that the difference between the average scores obtained from the scale and the factors obtained by academics working in the field of sports science was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The technological learning mobility resulting from the integration of education and technology has also significantly affected educators and differentiated learning processes. Educators have attempted to determine their level of technology use in line with these differentiated learning processes and have charted a course for themselves.

Recommendations

Regarding the research results;

- Expanding in-service training for academics working in the field of sports science at universities on topics related to introducing and using technology,
- Increasing the budget for sports science to enrich educational materials,
- Provision of facility equipment,
- The continuous renewal of technological sports equipment and its integration with new developments,
- Improving the infrastructure capabilities of universities so that academics working in the field of sports science can utilize information technologies in their courses,
- Updating and accrediting sports science course programs and content in line with technological developments,
- The use of information technology in the field of sports science should be expanded and made available to as many students and academics as possible,

- It is recommended that technology-based training be included in national and international conferences, seminars, symposiums, and workshops.

Abbreviations

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Teachers Technology Acceptance and Use Scale (TTAUS), Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEU), Attitude Toward Use (ATU), Behavioural Intention (BI), Facilitating Conditions (FC), Perceived Enjoyment (PE), Self-Efficacy (SE), Technological Complexity (TC), Compatibility (C), Anxiety (A), and Subjective Norm (SN), Information Technology (IT)

Ethics Committee Permission Information

Ethics review board: Trabzon University Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee

Date of ethical approval document: August 05, 2021

Issue number of the ethical approval document: E-81614018-000-693.

Authors' contributions

The entire study was conducted by the first author under the supervision of the second author.

Conflicts of interest

The authors has no conflict of interest declaration regarding the research.

References

- Akıncan, E., & Çakır, R. (2021). Uzaktan eğitim sürecinde görev alan öğretim elemanlarının performanslarını arttırmaya yönelik görüş ve öneriler. *International Journal of Field Education*, 7(2), 134-165. <https://doi.org/10.32570/ijofe.1012742>
- Altınpulluk, H. (2021). Türkiye'deki öğretim üyelerinin COVID-19 küresel salgın sürecindeki uzaktan eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 41(1), 53-89. <https://izlik.org/JA92NH23PU>
- Andrews, J. E., Ward, H., & Yoon, J. (2021). UTAUT as a model for understanding intention to adopt AI and related Technologies among librarians. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(6), 102437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102437>
- Artul, O. (2003). *İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin bilgi teknolojileri konusundaki yeterlik düzeyleri (İstanbul ili Avrupa yakası örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Avcu, D. Ü., & Gökdaş, İ. (2012). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğretmenlerinin bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerine ilişkin kabul ve kullanım niyetleri. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 42-59.
- Aydoğmuş, M., & Karadağ, Y. (2020). Öğretmen adaylarının bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri (BİT) yeterlikleri: Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi örneği. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(3), 686-705. <https://doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.715457>
- Ayyıldız, G. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin bilgi teknolojileri özyeterlilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.

- Baki, A., Aydın Yalçınkaya, H., Özpınar, İ., & Çalık Uzun, S. (2009). İlköğretim matematik öğretmenleri ve öğretmen adaylarının öğretim teknolojilerine bakışlarının karşılaştırılması. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 1(1), 65-83. <https://izlik.org/JA45UW96HB>
- Balcı, A. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma, yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler* (13. bs.). Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.
- Bayrakçı, M. (2005). Avrupa birliği ve Türkiye eğitim politikalarında bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri ve mevcut uygulamalar. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 33(167), 1.
- Bellet, T., & Banet, A. (2023). UTAUT4-AV: An extension of the UTAUT model to study intention to use automated shuttles and the societal acceptance of different types of automated vehicles. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 99, 239-261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2023.10.007>
- Bervell, B., Kumar, J. A., Arkorful, V., Agyapong, E. M., & Osman, S. (2022). Remodelling the role of facilitating conditions for Google Classroom acceptance: A revision of UTAUT2. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(1), 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7178>
- Bilge Taşkın, H. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerine ilişkin kabul ve Kullanım niyetlerinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre analizi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Bilgin, H. (2012). *Teknik öğretmenlerin eğitimde bilgi teknolojileri kullanım yeterliliklerinin belirlenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Bozkurt, A. (2020). Koronavirüs (COVID-19) pandemi süreci ve pandemi sonrası dünyada eğitime yönelik değerlendirmeler: Yeni normal ve yeni eğitim paradigması. *Açıköğretim Uygulamaları ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(3), 112-142. <https://izlik.org/JA99ML86GW>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Araştırma deseni: Nicel, nitel ve karma yöntem yaklaşımları* (S. B. Demir, Çev.). Ankara: Eğiten Kitap.
- Çağtaş, Ö. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin bilgi teknolojileri kullanım öz yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çam, E. (2017). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin teknolojik pedagojik alan bilgisi (TPAD) düzeylerinin yaşam boyu öğrenme, özyeterlilik düzeyleri ve hizmet içi eğitim gereksinimleri açısından incelenmesi: Muş/Bulanık örneği* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Amasya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Amasya.
- Danış, F., Özkal, H., Öncü, M. A., Geçitli, F., Gergin, S., Adıyaman, S., Solmaz, M., & Durak, M. (2023). Eğitim teknolojileri ile etkileşimli tahtaların öğrenme ortamlarına etkileri. *International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research (JSHSR)*, 10(97), 1599-1611. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8209997>
- Daniela, L., Visvizi, A., Gutiérrez-Braojos, C., & Lytras, M. D. (2018). Sustainable higher education and technology-enhanced learning (TEL). *Sustainability*, 10(11), 3883. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10113883>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319-340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Demircan, N. (2021). *Okul öncesi öğretmenlerin teknolojik pedagojik içerik bilgisi ile bilgi iletişim teknolojisi kullanımı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Dlamini, R., & Mbatha, K. (2018). The discourse on ICT teacher Professional development needs: The case of a South African teachers' union. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 14(2), 17-37.
- Educause (2019). Horizon report: 2019 higher education edition. EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative and The New Media Consortium website: <https://library.educause.edu/-/media/files/library/2019/4/2019horizonreport.pdf> was obtained from the address on March 11, 2026.
- Eryılmaz, S. (2018). Öğrencilerin bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri yeterliliklerinin belirlenmesi: Gazi Üniversitesi, turizm fakültesi örneği. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17(65), 37-49. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.310987>
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update* (10th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Ghiatau, R. M., & Mata, L. (2019). Factors influencing higher education teachers' attitudes towards unethical use of information technology: A review. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(1), 287-300. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/111>

- Göktaş, Z. (2011). Beden eğitimi ve spor öğrencilerinin bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerine yönelik özgüven algılamaları. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(1), 50-57. <https://izlik.org/JA29TW96BF>
- Gözel, R. (2022). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin eğitimde bilgi teknolojileri kullanımı öz yeterlikleri ile teknolojik pedagojik içerik bilgileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- Gümüşdağ, H. (2017). Bilişim'in spor içinde kullanılmasının incelenmesi. *Diyalektolog-Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 16, 261-274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22464/diyalektolog.164>
- Hatlevik, O. E. (2017). Examining the Relationship between teachers' self-efficacy, their digital competence, strategies to evaluate information, and use of ICT at school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 61(5), 555-567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2016.1172501>
- Hew, K. F., & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 55(3), 223-252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-006-9022-5>
- Huang, Y. C. (2023). Integrated concepts of the UTAUT and TPB in virtual reality behavioral intention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 70, 103127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103127>
- John, S. P. (2015). The integration of information technology in higher education: A study of faculty's attitude towards IT adoption in the teaching process. *Contaduría y Administración*, 60(S1), 230-252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cya.2015.08.004>
- Karasakaloğlu, N., Saracaloğlu, A. S., & Uça, S. (2011). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin teknoloji tutumları ile bilgi teknolojilerini kullanma düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2), 26-36. <https://izlik.org/JA76LN89UJ>
- Karatay, R., & Torun, E. (2016). Bilgisayar destekli eğitime ilişkin öğretmen tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(28), 388-402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.16992/ASOS.1176>
- Koca, M. (2006). *Bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri kabul ve kullanım birleştirilmiş modelinin değişkenlerine göre öğretmenlerin bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerini kullanımlarının incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Kocaman Karoğlu, A., Bal Çetinkaya, K., & Çimşir, E. (2020). Toplum 5.0 sürecinde Türkiye'de eğitimde dijital dönüşüm. *Üniversite Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(3), 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.32329/uad.815428>
- Kocaman, M. (2019). *İlkokul yöneticilerinin bilgi teknolojilerini kullanımına ilişkin öz-yeterlik algıları* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Koçak Usluel, Y., Kuşkaya Mumcu, F., & Demiraslan, Y. (2007). Öğrenme-öğretme sürecinde bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri: Öğretmenlerin entegrasyon süreci ve engelleriyle ilgili görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(32), 164-178.
- Kolburan Geçer, A., & Dağ, F. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin bilgisayar okur-yazarlık düzeylerinin belirlenmesi: Kocaeli Üniversitesi örneği. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 20-44. <https://izlik.org/JA72DR87DN>
- Koska, A., & Göksu, N. (2017). Hastanelerde bilişim teknolojileri kullanımı ile hasta güvenliği kültürü arasındaki ilişki. *Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(4), 181-188. <https://izlik.org/JA25RT55YW>
- Kukulska-Hulme, A. (2012). How should the higher education workforce adapt to advancements in technology for teaching and learning?. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(4), 247-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.12.002>
- Kurtuluş, E. (2019). *Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenme stilleri ve teknoloji kullanım niyetlerinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Mama, M., & Hennessy, S. (2013). Developing a typology of teacher beliefs and practices concerning classroom use of ICT. *Computers & Education*, 68, 380-387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.05.022>
- Mısırlıgil, H., & Bayansalduz, M. (2023). Teknolojinin spor performans alanına etkisi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(2), 30-36. <https://izlik.org/JA87PP34NB>
- Murat, A., & Erten, H. (2018). Fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerini kullanmaları ve bu teknolojileri öğrenme-öğretme sürecine entegrasyonları hakkındaki görüşleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 28(1), 61-71. <https://doi.org/10.18069/firatsbed.388068>

- Ng'ambi, D. (2013). Effective and ineffective uses of emerging technologies: Towards a transformative pedagogical model. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(4), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjjet.12053>
- Önal, N., & Çakır, H. (2015). Eğitim fakültesi öğretim elemanlarının teknolojik pedagojik içerik bilgilerine ilişkin özgüven algıları. *HAYEF Journal of Education*, 12(2), 117-131.
- Özçelik, H. (2006). *İlköğretimde çalışan öğretmenlerin bilgisayar özyeterlilikleri: Balıkesir ili örneği* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Özer, A., & Eryılmaz, S. (2021). Bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri yeterlilikleri ile teknoloji bağımlılığı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(1), 16-25. <https://doi.org/10.51725/etad.854068>
- Pangestu, M. G., & Pasaribu, J. P. K. (2022). Behavior intention penggunaan digital payment QRIS berdasarkan model unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT) (Studi pada UMKM sektor industri makanan and minuman di Kota Jambi). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan (JUMANAGE)*, 1(1), 29-37. <https://doi.org/10.33998/jumanage.2022.1.1.23>
- Salleh, S. M., & Laxman, K. (2014). Investigating the factors influencing teachers' use of ICT in teaching in Bruneian secondary schools. *Education and Information Technologies*, 19(4), 747-762. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-013-9251-2>
- Sivrikaya, M. H., & Biricik, Y. S. (2019). Dijital çağda bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerinin kullanımı: Spor bilimleri fakültesi öğrencileri üzerine bir uygulama. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 21(3), 148-156. <https://izlik.org/JA74WR52YG>
- Solak, M. (2012). *Öğretmenlerin akıllı tahta kullanımına karşı tutumlarının teknoloji kabul modeline göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Sürer, A. G. (2020). Eğitimde dijitalleşme çağı. *Kapadokya Eğitim Dergisi*, 1(1), 28-34. <https://izlik.org/JA89AZ73NA>
- Tanık Önal, N. (2017). Bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri kullanımı: Fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri. *International Journal of Active Learning (IJAL)*, 2(1), 1-21. <https://izlik.org/JA98PK98HT>
- Taş, M., Ünal, A., & Zengin, B. (2019). Sosyal medyanın turistlerin satın alma kararları üzerindeki etkisi: Erzincan Kemaliye örneği. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 7(3), 2226-2250. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2019.469>
- Ursavaş, Ö. F. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin bilişim teknolojilerini kullanmaya yönelik davranışlarının modellenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Yalçın, S., & Kocaoğlu, M. (2025). Çalışma hayatının dijital dönüşüm sürecindeki yeri: Yükseköğretim kurumları üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir analiz. *Journal of Management Theory and Practices Research*, 6(2), 284-310. <https://doi.org/10.71284/jmtp.202563>
- Yılmaz, K., & Horzum, M. B. (2005). Küreselleşme, bilgi teknolojileri ve üniversite. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(10), 103-121.
- Yılmaz, M. (2016). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin eğitimde teknoloji kullanımına ilişkin bilgisayar yeterliliklerinin ve teknoloji tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Mersin Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Mersin.
- Yılmaz, M. U. (2020). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin teknolojik pedagojik alan bilgisi ile mesleki profesyonelliği arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- YÖK Akademik (2023). Spor Bilimleri Temel Alanı <https://akademik.yok.gov.tr/AkademikArama/view/searchResultviewListAuthor.jsp> adresinden 22 Şubat 2023 tarihinde edinilmiştir.
- Yücel, A. S., & Devocioğlu, S. (2012). Spor eğitiminde bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerinin kullanımı. *Sport Sciences*, 7(2), 1-17. <https://izlik.org/JA69KC47FK>



This paper by Mediterranean Journal of Sport Science is licensed under [CC BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)