



The Relationship between Socioeconomic Status, Technology Acceptance, and Technology Use among Iranian EFL Teachers

Helia Nodeh ^{a*}, Amin Shahini ^b

^a Master of Teaching Language, Science and Research Branch, Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

^b Department of language sciences, Gorgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Gorgan, Iran.

Received: 15 June 2021

Accepted: 05 July 2021

Published: 02 September 2021

Abstract

Technology has been at the center of researchers' attention over the last decade in ELT due to growing use of mobiles and other electronic devices among EFL learners. On other hand, socioeconomic status is a term on which a good number of studies have been done lately in education and especially in ELT. Thus, the present study sought to find out whether there is any relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' socioeconomic status and their technology acceptance and also technology use. In this study, 60 Iranian EFL teachers were selected through convenience sampling as participants. They were in an age range of 25 to 45 and from both genders. Socioeconomic status questionnaire (Aggarwal et al. 2005), technology acceptance scale (Park, 2009) and technology use scale are the three instruments used to collect data in this study. After data collection, first, the normality test, K-S test along with Shapiro Wilk test was run to see if the data would be normal. Since they were normal, the parametric statistical procedure of Pearson correlation test was run to find out whether there would be any relationship between the variables. The results showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' SES and technology use. In addition, the results also showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between SES and teacher acceptance too. As the main pedagogical implication of the present study, teacher educators need to teach teachers how to use technology in their classes.

Keywords: -

How to cite the article:

H. Nodeh, A. Shahini, *The Relationship between Socioeconomic Status, Technology Acceptance, and Technology Use among Iranian EFL Teachers*, *J. Hum. Ins.* 2021; 5(3): 50-58.

©2021 The Authors. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

1. Introduction

Relative income determines a person or family's savings and consumption depending on the family's income in relation to others. Income is usually used as a measure of social economic status as it is relatively easy to count for most persons. Income inequality is most frequently considered around the world by the Gini Coefficient, where 0 matches perfect equality and 1 shows perfect inequality. Low income emphasizes on facing abrupt requirements and do not collect wealth that might be approved upcoming generations, therefore

increasing inequality. Families with upper and unessential income can gather wealth and concentrate on encountering immediate requirements while being capable of using and appreciating luxuries and weather crises (GOK, 1983).

Socioeconomic status is an economic and sociological combined measure of an individual's work experience and of a person's or family's economic and social position connected to others, based on income, education, and occupation. After analyzing a family's social economic status, the domestic income, earners' education and

* Corresponding Author: helia.nodeh@gmail.com

occupation are studied, along with combined income, against an individual, when their own characteristics are evaluated (Marmot, 2004). Lareau (2003) perceived that socioeconomic status is usually divided to three categories, high, middle, and low to define the three parts a family or a person might fall into when assigning a family or individual into one of these categories any or all of the three variables income, education, and occupation can be measured. Furthermore, low income and little education have revealed to be prominent predictors of a sort of physical and mental health problems because of environmental conditions can be the whole reason of that person's social predicament to begin with. Simiyu (2001) claimed that the family income determines wages salaries, profit, rents and any flow of earnings expected. Likewise income may come in the shape of unemployment or workers compensation, social security, pensions, interests or dividends, royalties, trusts, alimony, or other governmental, public, or family financial assistance. Income might be observed in two terms, relative and absolute. Absolute income is the relationship wherein as income raises, also will consumption. Socioeconomic status has been a concern for investigators in education. It was approached to see whether it has any possible relationship with or effect on various aspects of learning. Consequently it was studied in the scope of ELT too (Simiyu, 2001).

Education has always been important and significant to human beings. As a result, it was one of the main areas which could attract a great amount of innovation. Recently, technology has found a key role in education. Consequently, this trend has been transferred to ELT. Accordingly, some relevant accepts appeared. Two of them are technology use and technology acceptance. As many English teachers resist against using technology in their classes, it has always been my own personal concern to find out more about this reluctance. To find the answer of my question, the related literature was reviewed. As far as the author explored the literature, a high number of studies were found to be concerned with these two terms in education and particularly in ELT. However, there were some gaps which motivated the author to focus on some. One of the aspects which were neglected was the relationship between technology and socioeconomic background of the teachers. Regarding the overriding significance of this aspect in today's scope of research in education in general and ELT in particular, investigating this relationship can be of high contribution to the existing body of the related literature.

On the other hand, due to dramatic increase in pace of technology development, it is a must to explore more the role of technology in language education.

Thus, doing a research focusing on the relationship between teachers' socioeconomic status of English teachers and their technology use and technology acceptance can cast light on the dark areas of this scope. Another problem which intrigued the author to be focused on this relationship is the overwhelming amount of using internet among teachers but not using them in their career in their classes. Thus, through this study this problem may be solved. Therefore, the present study sought find out whether there would be any relationship between socioeconomic status and technology use and technology acceptance among Iranian EFL teachers.

2. Literature Review

In this part, it is tried to portray an image of the previous studies done on the variables of the present study and also of the related theories and models. First, for each variable, empirical studies are reported and then the related theories and models are presented.

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

Professions are graded and a number of the most respected jobs are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, and communications analysts. These occupations, measured to be gathered in the high status in organization, offer more challenging work, capability and more control over working situations. Those occupations with inferior rankings included food preparation workers, counter attendants, bartenders and helpers, dishwashers, janitors, maids and housekeepers, vehicle cleaners, and parking lot attendants. The professions that were less appreciated were similarly paid meaningfully less and are more difficult, very risky, and offer less self-sufficiency. Economic assets or possess, shows a source of security presenting an extent of a family's skill to encounter emergencies, engage economic shocks, or offer the means to live easily. Wealth reveals intergenerational transitions in addition to accumulation of income and savings, income, age, marital status, family size, religion, occupation, and education are all predictors for wealth fulfillment (Marmot, 2004).

Socio-economic background or status discusses an individual's place in an assumed group, society or culture as realized by prosperity, job, education and social class. Amutabi (2003) argues the influence of socio-economic status on children's readiness for school. He declares that the separating nature of social class, ethnicity might actually decrease the diversity of inspiring experiences supposed to be requirement for making readiness to acquire amongst children. Social class, ethnicity, dictate neighborhood, housing, and admission to resources

that influence improvement or deficiency in addition to the achievement of specific value systems. American Psychological Association, (APA) define the relationship of family socio-economic status to children's readiness for school, Across all socio-economic groups; parents encounter main challenges when it derives to giving best care and education for their children. For people in poverty these challenges might be difficult. Occasionally, once elementary requirements are missing, parents should put highest importance on housing, food, clothing, and health care. Educational toys, games, and books might seem to be luxuries, and parents might not have the time, energy, or knowledge to discover innovative and less-expensive methods to increase young children's improvement. Sheldon (2003) perceives that even in families with better average income parents frequently lack the time and energy to devote entirely in their children's readiness for school, and occasionally they encounter a restricted range of choices for high-quality child care both before their children begin school and through the primary school years. Kindergarten educators in the country mention that children are progressively arriving at school incompetently prepared. Families with low socioeconomic status regularly don't have the financial, social, and educational cares that describe families with high socioeconomic status. Besides, poor families might have insufficient or restricted admission to community resources that help and maintain children's improvement and school readiness. Parents possibly will have insufficient abilities for such accomplishments such as reading to and with their children, and they might don't have adequate information about childhood immunizations and nutrition.

The elimination of physical barriers has permitted tutors better availability according to professional development and graduate education. Before the age of the internet and the advent of distance learning, involving in a learning community, such as a workplace network or a school, needed a close amount of physical proximity among community members. Currently, there are multiple instances of the use of distributed learning technology in the educational field. First, numerous graduate schools have initiated transitioning into programs that consider distance education. No longer is it an obligation that tutors have geographical proximity to a university so as to follow advanced education and certification. This tendency to online classes and educational opportunities has even become so prevailing that there are universities which is made of only online classes, letting an educator to finish a whole course of study over distance learning (Dempsey & Van Eck, 2007).

Second, the use of distance learning is not restricted to the university setting, but also seen in school site, district, and state levels of professional development for tutors, with the appearance of web-based conferences and seminars (Kirpatric, 1996). Moreover, internet based technology permits educators to shape their own learning communities that are not limited to the local school site. For instance, science instructors might use a wiki or content delivery system to network and share information with educators at other schools both inside and outside their local school district. Even more exciting, is the evidence that educators can not only obtain information and exercise from a central authority, such as district or state personnel, but that tutors might improve content and share their information among their peers. This resulted in states of reciprocal teaching and mentorship that are part of a greater informal learning community. In terms of design, online learning communities consider a multitude discussions and socialization that follow a constructivist learning principle, wherein individuals effectively acquire information when experiencing and describing knowledge over social contexts (Dempsey & Van Eck, 2007).

Nevertheless, technology may help students in the imagining of earlier unacquainted content in a way which aids learning. For instance, multimedia presentations, which use multiple formats of media, such as images, narration, and text, may be used to help pupils in concept visualization. Other formats, such as simulations and games might improve an extra level of interactivity between the student and the content, which changes the educational process from a passive to an active process. Advocates of multimedia follow a cognitive learning philosophy and see the main advantage to multimedia learning as the habit of multiple learning channels, under the supposition that any one sensory channel can merely process a restricted extent of information simultaneously (Driscoll, 2007).

One of the famous models associated to technology acceptance is the technology acceptance model (TAM), firstly recommended by Davis in 1986. TAM has confirmed to be a theoretical model in assisting to clarify and predict user performance of information technology (Legris, Ingham, & Collette, 2003). As stated by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) TAM is measured as an influential extension of theory of reasoned action (TRA). Davis (1989) suggested TAM to clarify why a user accepts or rejects information technology by adjusting TRA. TAM offers a basis with which one suggests how external variables influence belief, attitude, and intention to use. Two cognitive beliefs are suggested by TAM: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use.

TAM prolonged the original model to describe perceived usefulness and usage intentions including social influence (subjective norm, voluntariness, and image), cognitive instrumental processes (job relevance, output quality, and result demonstrability) and experience. The new model was established in both voluntary and mandatory settings. The outcomes intensely reinforced TAM2 and described 60 percent of user adoption using this updated version of TAM (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). This work assumed TAM2 as the baseline model as well as TAM. As said by Louho, Kalliojaand and Oittinen (2006), technology acceptance considering how individuals agree and assume a number of technology for use. User acceptance of technology has additionally been described as the noticeable readiness in a user group to adopt IT for the stuffs it is intended to promote. So acceptance may be observed as a task of user participation in technology use. Also acceptance can be described as the critical factor in realizing the achievement or failure of any technology and acceptance has been theorized as an outcome variable in a psychological procedure that users experience in making decisions about technology (Dillon & Morris, 1996).

2.2 Empirical Works

Several research works proved the relationship of SES with school children's cognitive ability and academic achievement (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). These studies have gone to the extent that asking what part or parts of SES truly have an effect. Social researchers frequently claim that there are particular indicators of SES that have more of an influence on children's cognitive development, which basically tells their academic and IQ performance. Similarly it has been said that the most important indicators are the parent's level of education, after their income and then their occupation; but they make a stronger influence when they are all used in a measure (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). The parent's education is significant as a factor for SES since there is an association between high parental education and higher school achievement for the child (Anderson, Case & Lam, 2001). Anderson, Case and Lam (2001) maintained that this association might be because of educated parents being better capable of helping their children with their school work, or it can be owing to educated parents being capable of putting their kids in better schools, with a high quality of education. It is supposed that parents with a higher education have a high paying job, which lets them to be capable of putting their children to better schools, with a high quality of education. Likewise it associates with the parents income, which as it was specified above is one of the SES indicators used in this kind of study. Parent's income is renowned as having an important influence on a

child's cognitive development concerning the family being able to give not just good education or effective pre-primary schools that permit for beneficial cognitive development, but nutrients which allow for full improvement as well. We can then determine that parent's level of education and income has a significant relation to how children will achieve at school and on IQ measures; which displays the effects of SES.

Herbst and Huysamen (2000) recognized that early school and game activities at home are observed to be very substantial for a child's development and academic performance. Pre-school activities and game materials for children are different, which in sequence help them to achieve better and more efficiently in school than disadvantaged children; as their cognitive and motor skills are more developed (Herbst & Huysamen, 2000).

Barnett's (1998) study indicated that persistent early childhood educational programs, before a child goes five is worthy for their cognitive development, which has been revealed to have permanent positive effects on IQ scores and school success all together. This displays that socioeconomic status can influence a child's school performance, as parents from Low SES groups frequently do not have the resources to confirm that their child gets this kind of primary childhood education for their cognitive development.

Furthermore, Shen and Eder (2009) observed pupils' interest to use the virtual world Second Life for education and examined factors related with their purposes. Outcomes recommended that perceived ease of use affects user's purpose to assume Second Life through perceived usefulness. Computer self-efficacy and computer playfulness were also noteworthy backgrounds to perceived ease of use of virtual worlds. Based on TAM, Teo (2009) examined teacher candidates in Singapore. The work established that technology acceptance of teachers increased their effective technology use in their classes. Moreover, Al-hawari and Mouakket (2010) evaluated the importance of TAM factors with regard to certain external factors on pupils' e-retention and the mediating role of e-satisfaction within e-learning context. They perceived significant relationships between these factors and also specified that more testing across different countries is required to recognize other external factor that might influence IT acceptance. Also, Waheed and Jam (2010) verified the educators' acceptance of applying a web-based learning environment based on TAM. The outcomes of the study maintain that tutors are accepting applying the new virtual based learning system for superior productivity of tutors, learners, and institution.

Selim (2003) specified that there was a necessity to examine TAM with web-based learning. He suggest the course website acceptance model (CWAM) and

verified the relationships among perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and intention to use with university students using the structural equation modeling techniques of the LISREL program. He determined that the model matches with the collected data and that the usefulness and ease of use seemed to be good determinants of the acceptance and use of a course website as an effective and efficient learning technology. Perceived usefulness could be well-defined as the degree to which a university student considers using e-learning will improve his or her learning. In the meantime perceived ease of use is described as the degree to which one accepts using e-learning will be free of cognitive effort. In this work, e-learning refers to pure, web-based, asynchronous learning over an Internet site activated by the university. It is protected by the learning management system (LMS) of the university too.

Pituch and Lee (2006) considered system and learner characteristics as external variables that were theorized to influence perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and use of an e-learning system. Once applying a structural equation modeling technique with LISREL, it was determined that system characteristics were significant determinants to perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and use of an e-learning system, and that the theoretical model based on TAM was well reinforced. Besides, Saadé, Nebebe, and Tan (2007) asserted that university students' participation and involvement were essential to effective e-learning systems and thus students' acceptance behavior must be evaluated. They recommended that TAM was a solid theoretical model where its validity can cover the multimedia and e-learning context.

Venkatesh and Davis (2000) concentrated on understanding the backgrounds of the perceived ease of use. It was settled that computer self-efficacy acts as a determinant of perceived ease of use both before and after hands-on use and that the objective usability was seen to be a determinant of ease of use only after direct experience with a system. Meanwhile, it was realized by Grandon, Alshare, and Kwan (2005) that e-learning self-efficacy has indirect effect on students' intentions over perceived ease of use. Moreover, Mungania and Reio (2005) observed a significant relationship between dispositional barriers and e-learning self-efficacy. They said that educational practitioners have to take into account the learners' dispositions and discover ways by which e-learning self-efficacy can be enriched. In this research, e-learning self-efficacy is mostly characterized as the personal confidence in gathering information and cooperating with a teacher inside the e-learning system and the essential abilities for using the system.

Regarding what has been discussed above, the present study sought to find out whether there is any relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' socioeconomic status and their technology acceptance and also technology use. Accordingly, the aim of the present study is two-fold; finding the relationship between SES and technology use and also between SES and technology acceptance among Iranian EFL teachers. Thus, the research questions are as follows:

1. Is there any significant relationship between socioeconomic status and technology use among Iranian EFL teachers?
2. Is there any significant relationship between socioeconomic status and technology acceptance among Iranian EFL teachers?

3. Method

This part contains different parts of methodology of the present research. Firstly the participants are discussed which is followed by the instruments and procedure of the study which states the different steps of the doing this research gradually. Finally, data analysis is presented to express the statistical procedures used to analyze the collected data.

3.1 Participants

In this study, 60 Iranian EFL teachers, 30 males and 30 females, were selected through convenience sampling as participants. They were in an age range of 25 to 45 and from both genders. They were from different levels of socioeconomic status and with different job experiences and academic degrees. They were selected from both private sectors and public schools. Their academic degrees ranged from B.A to Ph.D in English-related majors (BA: 32; MA: 26; PhD: 2) and have taught English for 5 to 25 years.

3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 Socioeconomic Status Questionnaire (Aggarwal et al. 2005)

Aggarwal et al. (2005) developed a questionnaire to measure learners' socioeconomic status. The English form of questionnaire consists of 22 items which are all multiple choice items. In this questionnaire, attempts were made to cover all aspects of socioeconomic issues including education, economy, job and properties. The learners were scored out of 100.

It was pilot tested on a 50% of sample in a various socio-economic levels of the community before finishing its contents, format and scoring by Aggarwal et al. (2005). In the English form, the scale included 22 items. Appropriate weightage was assumed to each item and scoring for each item was according to a scale ranging from 3 to 9. Question 16 i.e. relating the existence of cattle or pets in the family was scaled on a 4 point scale and question 12

related to living in the type of a house was scaled on a 5 point scale. The maximum aggregate score was 100. In agreement with the final score, the socio-economic states of the family is divided into six socio-economic categories, namely Upper high (combined score of more than 76), High (61-75), Upper Middle (46-60), Lower Middle (31- 45), Poor (16-30) and Very Poor (combined score less than 15). In this study, the instrument was used to assess the socio-economic status of all strata of the society. This questionnaire was translated by the researcher. Since some items of the questionnaire were not compatible with the Iranian context, after consultation with three experts in the field of applied linguistics, some items were deleted and some items were revised. Then the Persian version was piloted among 20 teachers. The data collected from the pilot study were analyzed in SPSS through Cronbach Alpha. The coefficient was .75 which is over .7 and is considered as an acceptable figure. Thus, the translated version of this questionnaire benefits from good amount of reliability (Appendix A).

3.2.2 Technology Acceptance Scale (Park, 2009)

The instrument was developed by Park (2009) based on the objectives of the study and previous literature review. The completed instrument consisted of three parts.

The questions in Part one were not only made based on Davis's prior studies with modifications to fit the specific context of the e-learning but also mainly adapted from other studies. Part one consisted of four sub-sections, as follows: perceived ease of use (PE), perceived usefulness (PU), attitude (AT), and behavioral intention (BI). The questions in Part two were developed by the researcher to measure e-learning self-efficacy (SE). It was measured by two indicators: confidence in finding information in the e-learning system and degree of necessary skills for using an e-learning system. The questions in Part three were divided into two sections: subjective norms (SN) and system accessibility (SA). Subjective norms as social influence factors were measured. All constructs were measured on seven-point Likert-type scales, from 1 =strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. It is remarkable to mention that this questionnaire experienced some slight changes to fit the participants of the present research.

3.2.3 Technology Use Scale

To measure teachers' technology use, they were asked how often they use different forms of

technology such as computer, tablet, mobile, ipod, and laptop in their classroom based on a five-point Likert scale (never:0, rarely:1, sometimes:2, usually:3, and always:4). Then the aggregate number was their amount of using technology. They were rated out of 20.

3.3 Procedure

First, the participants were selected through convenience sampling. Then, they were given the questionnaires which were going to be filled out by them. The next step was collecting the questionnaires and checking to see whether they were answered fully. It took them around 10 minutes to complete the SES questionnaire, 10 minutes to answer the TA questionnaire and just 1 minute to answer TU questionnaire. If any of the questionnaires had some missing information, they were given back to them to complete them. For SES questionnaire, they were said that confidentiality is taken into account since this questionnaire was mostly about their income and people usually avoid revealing their economic information. For technology acceptance questionnaire, they were given some information to remove their possible uncertainties regarding the items of this questionnaire. Then, the data were gathered which was followed by analyzing the data in the software SPSS.

3.4 Data Analysis

In this part, the gathered data were analyzed in the software SPSS (Version 24). First, the normality test, K-S test along with Shapiro Wilk test was run to see if the data would be normal. Since they were normal, the parametric statistical procedure of Pearson correlation test was run to find out whether there would be any relationship between the variables

4. Results

As mentioned earlier, this study sought to answer two questions. The following is the first research question:

Is there any significant relationship between socioeconomic status and technology use among Iranian EFL teachers?

To estimate the degree of relationship between two variables of research question 1, a Pearson Correlation was run. The level of significance is at 0.05. It means that if sig is lower than 0.05, then the relationship is significant and there is a correlation between the two variables.

Table 1*Pearson Correlation Between SES and Teacher Use*

		SES	TU
SES	Pearson correlation	1	.701*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.032
	N	60	60
TU	Pearson correlation	.701*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.032	
	N	60	60

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Based on Table 1, there is a positive and significant relationship between teachers' SES and teacher use among the male participants of this study since sig (.032) is lower than .05 and $r=.701$ which shows correlation is positive and nearly large. It means there is a positive and significant relationship between Iranian male EFL teachers' SES and technology use.

As mentioned earlier, this study sought to answer two questions. The following is the second research question:

Is there any significant relationship between socioeconomic status and technology acceptance among Iranian EFL teachers?

To estimate the degree of relationship between two variables of research question 2, a Pearson Correlation was run. The level of significance is at 0.05. For the relationship to be significant, sig should be lower than 0.05 then it can be said that between teachers' SES and technology acceptance among the female participants of this study.

Table 2*Pearson Correlation Between Teacher SES and Technology Acceptance*

		SES	TA
SES	Pearson correlation	1	*.653
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.004
	N	60	60
TA	Pearson correlation	*.653	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	
	N	60	60

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As seen in Table 2, since sig (.004) is lower than .05 and $r=.65$ which shows that correlation is positive, there is a positive and significant relationship between teachers' SES and technology acceptance among the female participants of this study. It means there is a positive and significant relationship between Iranian female EFL teachers' SES and technology acceptance.

5. Discussion

In this part, first the findings of the present study are discussed and explained then the previous studies are reviewed to see whether they are in line with the present study or not. As this study focused on teacher SES, technology acceptance and technology use, it was attempted to find some studies which explored these three variables.

As mentioned earlier the present study concluded that SES is correlated positively with technology use and technology acceptance. This finding can be discussed from two different facets. First, economically speaking, a person with a better and

higher level of SES is expected to be more familiar with technology and use it more since he or she can afford to buy it. On the contrary a person with a lower level of SES is thought to have difficulty using technology since he or she is not able to buy it. As a result, this finding was economically expected, however, proving it in this study provided some evidence and made great contributions to the related literature. Secondly, educationally speaking, this finding implies that the teachers with higher SES may be more successful in using technology in the class since they are more familiar with it. As a result, it can be said that teachers with lower SES level should be trained more to increase their familiarity with technology.

Now comparison and contrast with the previous studies are done. first, it is tried to discuss some studies dealing with SES. Hamid (2011) studied the relationships between secondary school students' family socio-economic characteristics and their academic accomplishment in English in a rural sub-district in Bangladesh. The outcomes showed that

the rural students had low levels of academic achievement in English and inside this generally low level of achievement, there were patterned relationships between the students' family income and parental education and their academic achievement in English. Pupils who had higher levels of parental education and family income were more probable to get higher scores on the proficiency test along with higher grades in English in the Secondary School Certificate examination. The present study is similar to Hamid (2011) to some extent since it proved a relationship between teachers' SES and their technology use and acceptance. Technology use and acceptance can lead to academic achievement. Thus, it can be said that Hamid (2011) and the present study are in line with each other.

The next study done on the relationship between SES and language achievement belongs to Shamim (2011, as cited in Hamid, 2011). He compared learners' socio-economic status with their English language scores in the latest public examination. He discovered that students in the higher income bracket regularly overtook students in the lower income support. He recommended that the positive correlation of high family income with learners' higher levels of proficiency in English might be related to their former education in private English medium schools compared to learners in the lower income bracket. As technology use and acceptance play an important role in language achievement, it is expected to see better achievement for students who have better at technology use and acceptance. As a result, in a way, both Shamim (2011, as cited in Hamid, 2011) and the present study proved the relationship between SES and technology use and acceptance.

6. Conclusion

To sum up, the present study indicated that there is a significant relationship between SES and technology use and technology acceptance among Iranian EFL teachers. The interest in doing research on SES and its role in education in general and in ELT in particular has been grown sharply recently (e.g. Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Hamid, 2011; Aikens & Barbarin, 2008). What this research added to the body of research in the related literature is the significance of SES in using and accepting technology. Since technology plays an important role in education due to widespread use of mobiles and computers everywhere by nearly all people. As a result, the findings of this study showed one factor which was correlated positively with technology use and acceptance. According to the present study, technology use and acceptance can be improved if teachers benefit from a good level SES.

Besides, since teachers are one of the most important factors in any type of education,

especially ELT, this study attempted to find one of the main barriers of using technology which was SES. Thus, it is expected that this study was taken into account by official authorities to improve teachers' SES so that they can use and accept technology in their classes which consequently will lead to a better performance in their career. Finally, this study could open new horizons in front of teachers' and researchers' eyes by proving the relationship between SES and technology use and acceptance.

References

1. Aggarwal, O. P., Bhasin, S. K., Sharma, A. K., Chhabra, P., Aggarwal, K., & Rajoura, O. (2005). A new instrument (scale) for measuring the socioeconomic status of a family: preliminary study. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 30(4), 111-114.
2. Aikens, N. L., & Barbarin, O. (2008). Socioeconomic differences in reading trajectories: The contribution of family, neighborhood, and school contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(2), 235-251.
3. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the attitude-behaviour relation: Reasoned and automatic processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 11(4), 1-33.
4. Al-hawari, M. A., & Mouakket, S. (2010). The influence of technology acceptance model (TAM) factors on students' e-satisfaction and e-retention within the context of UAE e-learning. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern*, 3(4), 299-314.
5. Amutabi, M.N. (2003). The 8-4-4 system of education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23(2), 127-144
6. Barnett, W. S. (1998). Long-term cognitive and academic effects of early childhood education on children in poverty. *Preventive Medicine*, 27(4), 204-207.
7. Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(2), 371-399.
8. Davis, P. B. (1998). The relationship between family demographic factors, personality, locus of control, and academic achievement in students who have left the family environment in order to attend college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, United States.
9. Dempsey, J. V., & Van Eck, R. N. (2007). Trends and Issues in Instructional Design and Technology Reiser, R.A. & Dempsey, J.V. (Eds.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
10. Dillon, A., & Morris, C. (2001). User Acceptance of Information Technology. In W. Karwowski (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Human Factors and Ergonomics*. London: Taylor and Francis.

11. Driscoll, M.P. (2007). Psychological foundations of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser., & J. V. Dempsey. (Eds.). Trends and issues in instructional design and technology (pp. 36-44). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
12. GOK (1983). Presidential committee on unemployment (1982/1983) (Wanjigi Report). Nairobi:
13. Grandon, E., Alshare, O., & Kwan, O. (2005). Factors influencing student intention to adopt online classes: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges*, 20(4), 46–56.
14. Hamid, M. O. (2011). Socio-economic characteristics and English language achievement in Rural Bangladesh. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, 8(2), 31-51.
15. Herbst, I., & Huysamen, G. K. (2000). The construction and validation of developmental scales for environmentally disadvantaged preschool children. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 30(2), 19-24.
16. Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Race, class, and family life*. University of California Press Government Printer.
17. Legris, P., Ingham, J., & Colletette, P. (2003). Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model. *Information & Management*, 40(5), 191–204.
18. Louho, R., Kallioja, M. & Oittinen, P. (2006). Factors affecting the use of Hybrid media applications. *Graphic arts in Finland*, 35(3), 11-21.
19. Marmot, M. (2004). *The Status Syndrome: How Social Standing Affects Our Health and Longevity*. New York: Owl Books.
20. Mungania, P., & Reio, Jr. T. G. (2005). If e-learners get there, will they stay? The role of e-learning self-efficacy. Eric ed492287. Paper presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development International Conference (AHRD), Estes Park, CO, Feb 24– 27, 2005, p. 1110–1117 (Symp. 48–2).
21. Park, S. Y. (2009). An Analysis of the Technology Acceptance Model in Understanding University Students' Behavioral Intention to Use e-Learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(3), 150–162.
22. Pituch, K.A, & Lee, Y.-K. (2006). The influence of system characteristics on e-learning use. *Computers Education*, 47(2), 222–244.
23. Saadé, R. G., Nebebe, F., & Tan, W. (2007). Viability of the technology acceptance model in multimedia learning environments: Comparative study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Knowledge and Learning Objects*, 37(2), 175–184.
24. Selim, H. M. (2003). An empirical investigation of student acceptance of course web sites. *Computers & Education*, 40(1), 343-360.
25. Sheldon, S. (2003). Linking school – family Community Partnership in urban Elementary Schools to Students Achievement on State tests. *Urban Review*.
26. Shen, J., & Eder, L. B. (2009). Intentions to use virtual worlds for education. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 20(2), 225–233.
27. Simiyu, J. W. (2001). Factors, which influence the teaching of technical and vocational Subjects in primary schools in Uasin Gishu, District. Eldoret: Moi University (Department of educational communication). MA dissertation (unpublished)
28. Teo, T. (2009). Modelling technology acceptance in education: A study of pre-service teachers. *Computers & Education*, 52(2), 302–312.
29. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(1), 186–204.
30. Waheed, M., & Jam, F. A. (2010). Teacher's intention to accept online education: Extended TAM model. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(5), 330–344.