Determinants of Behavioral Intention and Use of Interactive Whiteboard by K-12 Teachers in Remote and Rural Areas
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Interactive Whiteboard (IWB) has recently been used to replace the TWB (traditional whiteboard), with many of its features being observed to help teachers in educational activities. This is based on effectively and efficiently increasing the teacher-student interaction. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the determinants of Behavioral Intention (BI) and the use of interactive whiteboards by K-12 teachers, in remote and rural Chinese areas. The Modified-Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology 2 (UTAUT2) model was used in this analysis, as a learning medium to deliver the subject matter to students. The sample and population were also the teachers in the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, China, where 171 voluntary respondents participated in this study. Furthermore, the obtained data were processed using a Structural Equation Model (SEM) approach, through the Smart-PLS software. The results showed that Habit and Hedonic Motivation had a significant influence on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of teachers, toward the utilization of IWB in remote and rural areas. Besides this, Facilitating Conditions (FCs) and BI also had a significant positive effect on Usage Behavior. Based on these results, important information was provided to school principals, local governments, and teachers for education quality improvement, regarding the patterns of increasing IWB utilization in remote and rural areas.
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INTRODUCTION

All factors are found to be influenced by information technology in the 21st Century, including the education sector. In developing countries, the government also focuses on improving the quality of education in rural and remote areas, which is one of the main priorities of the Ministry of Education in China (Aixia et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020). In this condition, many methods have been developed by this educational sector, such as providing training to each school to improve teacher pedagogical and technological knowledge (Qin et al., 2019; Chai et al., 2020). This indicates that information technology is included in teaching and learning activities, and creates a rich educational environment with various technological media. Improving the quality of education in rural and urban areas proves that the main goal of the government is to ensure the technological integration of all teaching and learning activities in the regional educational field (Liu et al., 2021). Based on the Chinese government data, the use of digital learning media was found to be less than 50%, which is a utilization challenge for regional principals (Huang et al., 2020). Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2018) also stated that the use of technology in learning
activities was closely related to the improvement of students’ abilities, subsequently revealing that school principals need to critically consider the use of these media in every classroom. They also need to remind teachers and provide training on the utilization of technology in teaching and learning activities. One of these learning media is based on the use of Interactive Whiteboard (IWB), which is still not optimally utilized by the teacher when transferring knowledge to students (Morgan, 2010; Shi et al., 2021). To effectively utilize the Interactive Whiteboard, the analysis of the most important influential usage factors is highly necessary.

IWB is one of the potential technology-based media used to improve the quality of learning activities when the embedded features are maximally utilized (Sumak and Sorgo, 2016). However, the main problem emphasizes the suitable influential factors used for the Behavioral Intention (BI) and usage attitude of teachers in remote and rural areas (Pujiastuti and Haryadi, 2019). Increasing the use of IWB is also difficult in these regions, especially the maximization of educational activities. Based on many previous studies, several differences were observed in the perceptions and attitudes of urban and rural teachers, toward the use of technology-based learning media (Kim and Jung, 2010; Siaw et al., 2018; Niens et al., 2021). Some of them also showed the factors influencing these teachers’ utilization intentions, with the integration of IWB in poor rural and remote areas found to be limited (Seyono and Cahyo, 2017; Siaw et al., 2018; Shao and Lee, 2020). This verifies that a subsequent report is still needed to obtain a deeper understanding of the models and methods responsible for the factors influencing teachers toward using IWB in remote and rural areas. Therefore, this study aims to determine and predict the potential factors influencing the Behavioral Intention and attitude of the teachers using IWB in remote and rural areas. This is carried out by using the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT2) model (Venkatesh et al., 2012), with the results being expected to help the regional government and schools toward the broad utilization of IWB. The formulation of the study problems is shown as follows,

- What factors influence the Behavioral Intention of K-12 teachers to use IWB in remote and rural areas?
- What is the biggest significant positive factor influencing the Behavioral Intention of teachers in remote and rural areas, based on using IWB in teaching and learning activities?
- What factors influence the K-12 teachers’ usage behaviors in using IWB within remote and rural areas?
- What is the biggest significant positive factor influencing the Usage Behavior of K-12 teachers in remote and rural areas, based on the utilization of IWB in teaching and learning activities?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Interactive Whiteboard

Interactive whiteboard (IWB) has reportedly shown significant changes and feature additions in recent years, with the first version being a virtual electronic of the traditional blackboard (Türel, 2011; Bardakci and Alkan, 2019). This is widely used in important events, as in conferences, and in virtual classrooms, to observe the written or graphical knowledge being gained by the teachers or students. Meanwhile, the second latest version combines computer, microelectronics, and electronic communication technologies, to display PowerPoint, interactive learning media, micro-games, or micro-lectures (Morgan, 2010; Shi et al., 2021). It is also equipped with a pen to enable teachers to write important points on the IWB screen when providing new materials to students. In this study, the utilized samples are the schools having the second version of IWB, which has many features to support interactive teaching methods. Each class is also equipped with a tablet, computer, IWB, and Internet connection, for the adequate integration of technology in teaching and learning activities, as shown in Figure 1.

Many previous studies showed that IWB was recognized by various teachers as one of the technology-based presentation learning media, which had many advanced and easily-operated features to improve the quality of educational activities (Campbell and Kent, 2010; Sumak and Sorgo, 2016). Using classroom IWB, a Singapore study on 124 preservice teachers showed increased learning involvement and activeness (Divaharan and Koh, 2010). This was in line with a qualitative study, where the utilization of the learning media increased student engagement (Timothy and Sharon, 2013; Shi et al., 2021). Furthermore, IWB facilitates and enhances the teaching effect of teachers, with many studies revealing an effective increase and decrease in learning impacts and burdens, respectively, due to the combination of appropriate educational methods and strategies (Alsawaie and Alghazo, 2010; Bardakci and Alkan, 2019). The University of Virginia Center for Teacher Education and Technology also found that the learning media based on technology helped in maintaining the coherence, reduction, and elevation of thinking, stress, and confidence, respectively (Juersivich et al., 2009). Learning media on technology also improved students’ creativity, understanding, and mastery of teaching content (Sautière et al., 2019; Desania et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Suryawan et al., 2021). In addition, a good visual presentation effect on IWB effectively improved students’ cognition and understanding of teaching content in the learning process (Morgan, 2010). These conditions confirmed that the learning media were suitable for utilization in remote and rural areas, where teachers have low technological knowledge. Despite this, Shi et al. (2021) argued that not all traditional whiteboards were still likely to be replaced with IWB in future. Many studies also showed the effectiveness of IWB when used to deliver teaching materials, although only a few examined the factors influencing teachers’ usage behaviors (Türel, 2011; Shi et al., 2021). This indicated that the effectiveness of IWB was unable to be maximized without understanding the influential factors.

### The Situation of Interactive Whiteboard in Remote and Rural Areas of China

The Chinese government shows great importance to the development of educational information technology in remote
and rural areas, due to the numerous visitations to observe the quality of education (Hu et al., 2016). This is because the adopted policy advocacy is based on the provision of materials, technology, teachers, and other resources, to promote the development of education in these areas (Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2021). In recent years, the government strengthened classroom construction and equipped teaching sites with appropriate technology-based equipment, in response to the weak development of schools (Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2017; Zhu, 2019). These pieces of equipment included campus networks, IWB, physical booths, audio, and cameras. This was subsequently carried out by promoting equal educational distribution and improving regional teaching quality through technology integration. In this case, many international studies showed that the application of information technology had certain positive effects on education and teaching (Wijaya et al., 2020, 2022; Weinhandl et al., 2021). According to a regional study in Chinese remote and rural areas, the integration of technology into educational activities provided a new atmosphere and experience for students, which affected increasing learning interest and Motivation (Wang et al., 2018; Zhou and Li, 2020). However, several problems, such as the reluctance of teachers to use digital learning media were based on the non-maximization of institutional technology integration (Peng et al., 2014). Some Chinese remote and rural area reports also showed that information technology had specific educational teaching values, although several problems are often observed such as the utilization reluctance of teachers.

Interactive whiteboard is one of the easiest digital learning media utilized by novice teachers and in urban-rural areas (Campbell and Martin, 2010). This is observed as an early beginning before the integration of other classroom technologies, to improve active learning compared to conventional teaching methods (Campbell and Martin, 2010; Mun et al., 2019). It also helps teachers to display interesting animations and use
interactive digital textbooks, micro-games, micro-lectures, and other teaching methods capable of increasing students’ interest and Motivation (Türel and Demirli, 2010; Şumak and Şörgü, 2016; Shi et al., 2021). In addition, many previous studies showed that IWB was widely used as one of the most basic technology-based learning media, which improved teacher innovation and creativity (Türel, 2011).

### The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT-2) and Study Hypothesis

Based on previous reviews, technological acceptance theories and models were developed to explain and analyze the factors influencing users’ intentions toward new technologies. According to Davis (Venkatesh et al., 2003), the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) was proposed, to primarily explain and predict the use of information technology through the factors of performance and effort expectancies. Subsequently, many models were created through continuous revision and expansion, to observe the factors using new technologies, such as the TRA (Theory of Reasoned Action) (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975), MPCU (Innovation Diffusion Theory and Model of Personal Computer Utilization) (Fang and Liu, 2017), TPB (Theory of Planned Behavior) (Cheng, 2017), IDT (Innovation Diffusion Theory) (Rogers, 1995), SCT (Social Cognitive Theory) (Bandura, 1986), C-TAM-TPB (TAM Model with extension Model TPB), and MM (Motivational Model) (Bagozzi et al., 1992). Based on these theoretical models, Venkatesh et al. (2003) also integrated the UTAUT- (Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology), which analyzed 2 dependent variables, namely BI (Behavior Intention) and UB (Usage Behavior). These were then influenced by 4 core variables, namely PE (Performance Expectancy), EE (Effort Expectancy), SI (Social Influence), and FCs (Facilitating Conditions). To subsequently expand the applicability and explanatory power of the UTAUT model, Venkatesh et al. (2012) then proposed the UTAUT-2 model (Figure 2). From the variables in the UTAUT model, this new method also provided three core variables, namely, Hedonic Motivation (HM), Price Value (PV), and Habit (HB). Although the UTAUT-2 model was proposed in 2012, it is still widely used to explain user factors toward new technologies. Moreover, some studies directly used the UTAUT-2 model as a basic method or a combination with other approaches, where core or extensive variables are observed (El-Masri and Tarhini, 2017; Choi and Hoo-Jo Hoog, 2018; Abdul Rabu et al., 2019; Cao and Nguyen, 2022). Besides the consideration of the innovative technology acceptance, the UTAUT-2 model also emphasizes the usage behavior of the user (Faqih and Jaradat, 2021). Based on previous studies, the fundamental difference between both models focused on the applicability of UTAUT by creating new structures and new relationships (Moorthy et al., 2019).

UTAUT is considered to be more suitable and useful for analyzing the factors within the use of new educational technology ( Mashrooifa et al., 2019; Lavidas et al., 2022). This explained that the UTAUT and UTAUT-2 models were used to analyze user intentions in the education sector, information systems, e-commerce, and other technological fields (Tan, 2013; Cheung et al., 2018; Garg, 2021). Under these conditions, several experimental topics included (1) e-learning platforms (Alismaiel, 2021), (2) distance education platforms (Nikou, 2021), (3) multimedia learning-space stations, and (4) online communities (Liao et al., 2016). These studies indicated that when the use of urban-rural IWB became a habit, its effectiveness in improving students’ abilities was subsequently enhanced. However, McLean (2005) showed that teachers were very reluctant to use a new teaching technology in these areas. This led to the need to analyze the factors influencing teachers to integrate new technologies in the rural and remote areas, especially IWB. Under these conditions, UTAUT-2 was used to predict technological adoption to approximately 70% (Gellerstedt et al., 2018), compared to the TAM model whose explanation was observed at 40% (Drueke et al., 2021). Another reason for using the UTAUT-2 model was that no other suitable method has analyzed the utilization of new educational technologies. To compare the TAM and UTAUT models, empirical tests were also carried out, with the UTAUT being more suitable for utilization in educational fields (Abd Rahman et al., 2021).

Due to government investment, the remote and rural area schools installed free-to-use interactive electronic whiteboards, indicating that Price Value did not influence teachers in utilizing IWB. This led to the removal of PV. Besides, although the UTAUT model was more stable and widely used to predict the users’ intention (UI) of new technology utilization, the early related techniques were developed from digital and business worlds. This caused the reset of some constructs and moderators when used to predict the usage intentions in other fields (Dwivedi et al., 2019). These observations were not in line with analyses of some experts, which argued that UTAUT-2 moderating factors, such as age, gender, and experience had no effect on the UI of new educational technology usage (Dwivedi et al., 2019; Chatterjee and Bhattacharjee, 2020; Abbad, 2021). However, it was supported by several studies, where the model’s moderator effect had no significant effect on the educational sector (Liebenberg et al., 2018; Bardakci and Alkan, 2019).

The UTAUT-2 model is divided into the following variables:

1. **Independent Variables:** PE (Performance Expectancy), EE (Effort Expectancy), SI (Social Influence), FC (Facilitating Condition), HM (Hedonic Motivation), and HB (Habit).
2. **Intermediate Variable:** Behavioral Intention (BI)
3. **Dependent variable:** Usage Behavior (UB)

The six independent variables were found to casually affect the use of interactive electronic whiteboards in remote and rural areas, as comprehensively observed as follows:

1. **Performance Expectancy (PE)**

   Performance Expectancy is defined as the degree to which individuals believe that new technology helps to improve their job performances. According to Venkatesh (Venkatesh et al., 2003), a significant positive effect of PE was observed on a person’s intention to adopt new technology (Wu et al., 2021). This indicated that the notion of this variable emphasized the extent to which frontline primary and secondary school teachers believed...
that IWB helped them improve their teaching performances. In addition, some reports confirmed that PE had a direct impact on the behavioral intentions of teachers to use technology (Han and Conti, 2020; Faqih and Jaradat, 2021; Shiferaw et al., 2021), due to the most important positive influential factor (Tan, 2013).

(2) Effort Expectancy (EE)

Effort Expectancy is the level of ease associated with the use of information technology (Li and Zhao, 2021). In this report, EE is the level of teachers’ efforts to use IWB in imparting new knowledge to the students in remote and rural areas. Based on previous studies, a significant positive effect of EE was observed on the BI to use new technology (Chatti and Hadoussa, 2021; Kim and Lee, 2020; Lulin et al., 2020). However, it was unclear whether the characteristics of the remote-rural teachers were in line with those in cities.

(3) Social Influence (SI)

Social Influence is the influence of people around the user, which indicates that the new technology should be used (Venkatesh et al., 2003). In previous reports, a positive effect of SI was observed on behavioral intentions (Isaias et al., 2017; Mujalli et al., 2022), although it was critically unclear whether rural and remote teachers trusted the surrounding people’s advice. Therefore, in this study, the impact of SI is defined as the acceptance level of teachers’ technology used by key figures (leaders or colleagues).

(4) Facilitating Conditions (FCs)

Facilitating Conditions are the teacher’s complete perception of the various technical support conditions needed for the successful use of information technology (Venkatesh et al., 2003). According to several previous reviews, significant positive effects of FCs were observed on UB and BI (Chao, 2019; Alowayr, 2021; Raffaghelli et al., 2022). Based on these results, this variable is the perception of frontline K-12 teachers in using IWB, regarding the convenience of use, equipment and technical support, and after-sale services, such as networking facilities and skills training. However, the Regional Chinese Government provided complete facilities to support the integration of technology in learning activities. This predicted that a significant positive effect of FC should be observed on teachers’ BI and UB to use IWB.

(5) Hedonic Motivation (HM)

Hedonic Motivation is the sense of fun and pleasure felt by the users when integrating new technology (El-Masri and Tarhini, 2017). When an individual feels a high level of happiness and satisfaction for being involved in an activity, the Behavioral Intention to use the new technology is found to become stronger (Cao and Nguyen, 2022). This was in line with many studies, where a significant positive effect was observed on the UB of technology-based learning media (Choi and Hoo-Jo Hoog, 2018; Faqih and Jaradat, 2021; Taamneh et al., 2022). The use of IWB media in remote and rural areas is also innovative as it is a new experience for teachers and students, which potentially leads to a sense of fun to utilize the information technology. In this study, HM is then defined as the belief of remote-rural teachers that the use of IWB enabled a sense of happiness or enjoyment, during teaching and learning activities.

(6) Habit (HB)

Habit is an additional variable in UTAUT-2, which has the strongest significant positive factor influencing the UB to use technology (Dahri et al., 2021; Prasetyo et al., 2021). This was in line with the study by Arain et al. (2019) and Moorthy et al. (2019), where a significant positive influence was observed on Usage Behavior. Under these conditions, the government provided IWB facilities to rural and remote schools, indicating that technology utilization has become a habit for a small group
of teachers during educational activities. Therefore, this report defined HB as the teaching behavior of remote and rural teachers, who often use interactive electronic whiteboards.

(7) Behavior Intention (BI)

Behavior Intention influences an individual’s decision whether to use new technology in the future, with several previous studies showing a relationship between BI and UB (Prasetyo et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). This indicated that the variable was a direct determinant of actual behavior (Gao and Deng, 2012). In this analysis, BI is mainly defined as the willingness of frontline primary and secondary school teachers to use IWB during educational activities.

(8) Usage Behavior (UB)

Usage Behavior is the actual use of IWB by frontline primary and secondary school teachers during teaching processes.

Based on these descriptions, the influential relationships between 6 independent, 1 intermediate, and 1 dependent variable were combined into 8 hypotheses, as shown in Table 1 and Figure 3.

## STUDY METHODOLOGY

Based on the influential factors, a quantitative approach was used to test the hypotheses of this report (Shukla, 2021). The UTAUT-2 model was also used to determine the BI and UB of teachers in China’s remote and rural areas, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. These areas are located in the western part of China, which is an underdeveloped area with relatively poor economic, technological, and educational levels (OECD, 2016; Xu et al., 2021). A purposive sampling technique was also used to obtain data from February to March 2022, through an online questionnaire filled out by teachers at the remote and rural schools in Guangxi, China. Before the collection of data, permission and informed consent were obtained from all teachers and schools willing to participate in this experiment. In addition, data were obtained through the online Wenjuanxing application, and disseminated through principals and teachers using email, WeChat, and QQ.

### Respondent

The objects were the primary and secondary school teachers in China’s remote and rural areas, such as Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. Under these conditions, a valid sample of 171 people participated in the study, with questionnaire distribution adopting a combination of the online and on-site methods due to the pandemic. This was conducted to ensure the efficiency and quality of the data instrument recovery. According to Gorusch (1983), the sample size was related to the problem of measurement and respondents’ proportion, with the ratio being approximately 1:5. Furthermore, a total of 8 core variables with 24 measurement items were observed, with the sample size not expected to be less than 120 respondents, according to the principle of proportion. This indicated that a total of 180 questionnaires were distributed and returned, as 171 of them were valid with an effective rate of 95%, which met the requirements of data analysis. The basic information of these valid samples is shown in Table 2.

### Instrument Development

The questionnaire contained two parts as follows: (1) the demographic information of respondents, including gender, age, teaching experience and period, subject, weekly utilization frequency of IWB, interactive smart whiteboards proficiency, and other basic information and (2) a UTAUT-2 questionnaire to determine the BI and Usage Behavior of IWB for remote and rural teachers. A total of 24 measurement items were also observed for PE, EE, SI, FC, HM, HB, BI, and UB, as they were adopted from previous reports and modified according to these experiments. Appendix Table 1 comprehensively shows all the measurement models and sources, with the second part of the questionnaire adopting a five-point Likert scale, to assign a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 for SD, D, N, A, and SA which represent strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree, respectively.

### Measurement Scale

The Smart-PLS software and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were used to test the proposed model and evaluate the statistical significance of the path coefficients. According to Hair et al. (2016), the advantages of PLS-SEM were based on hypothetical analyses when the distribution and sample size are not normal and small, respectively. The evaluated measurement model also reflected and analyzed the reliability and validity of the construct, with the structural evaluation being used to identify the hypotheses (Alvi, 2021; Leow et al., 2021). Firstly, the reliability and validity of the MM (measurement model) were tested, with the ICR (Internal consistency reliability), and CV (convergent validity) being used for the item analysis. Secondly, the structural model was analyzed by statistical evaluation methods, such as the VIF value, path coefficient, t-statistics, and P-value, with the influential factors of each variable being explored (Altukr and Aldraiweesh, 2022). In addition, the t-test was used to compare the actual behavior of teachers in China’s remote and rural areas, regarding the use of IWB to carry out learning activities.
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

To analyze the overall situation of the questionnaire and the effect of all independent variables, descriptive statistics were initially used to test the normality of the data. This indicated that the mean score, standard deviation, kurtosis, and other basic information were derived from the 24 measurement items (Lei and Lomax, 2005). The measurement model, reliability, validity, and collinearities model analyses were also carried out in this study. Subsequently, the R2 model, effect size, and 8 hypotheses were analyzed.

Descriptive Statistics and Normality Test of Measurement Items

Table 3 shows that the highest and lowest average scores of the items were HM3 and SI3 with 4.047 and 3.468, respectively. This proved that most teachers believed in some games, music, animation, and other functions of the IWB, which enabled more class fun. From the mean dimensions (PE = 3.98, EE = 3.79, SI = 3.74, FC = 3.71, HM = 3.99, HB = 3.73, BI = 3.91, and UB = 3.63), most of the teachers provided positive answers, with an average score of 3.91 and 3.63 in BI and UB, respectively. This revealed that they were optimistic about the willingness and behavior of using the blackboard. According to previous studies (Hair et al., 2012), the normality test of the data was | 1 |, with the skewness and kurtosis appropriately within the range of acceptable values. This verified that all data were normally distributed.

Measurement Model Evaluation

The analysis of the instrument's reliability and validity was carried out using the Smart-PLS 3.0 software. This showed that the convergent validity was verified from the measurement model, by testing the item and composite reliabilities, average variance extracted (AVE), and Cronbach's alpha (Hair et al., 2016). Table 4 confirms that the Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, and AVE values of the 8 latent variables ranged from 0.818 to 0.949, 0.891–0.962, and 0.735–0.908, which exceeded the standard 0.7, 0.7, and 0.5, respectively (Hair et al., 2016). These satisfactory results indicated that the study scale was very reliable. Meanwhile, the loading factor of all items was greater than 0.5 in the validity test, which subsequently met the standard. For discriminant validity, the criteria Fornell and Larcker (1981) were adopted, using the square root of AVE for each latent variable. Table 5 shows that the diagonal element of the AVE square root (numbers in bold) was greater than the other correlation values among other latent variables, verifying that discriminant validity was established between the constructs of this scale.

Collinearity Test

A certain correlation was also observed among the model variables, which led to the necessity for a collinearity test in regression analysis (Latan and Noonan, 2017). This was conducted to exclude the reciprocal effect observed among the independent variables (Al-rahmi et al., 2021). Furthermore, VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) is the ratio of the variance when multicollinearity is present and absent between the explanatory
Structural Model Evaluation

After the measurement model, a structural model assessment was conducted by calculating the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and SRMR, path coefficient, and effect size (Latan and Noonan, 2017; Mulyani et al., 2021). The significance level of 5% and run bootstrapping were also used for size variations through the Smart-PLS software (Latan and Noonan, 2017). Moreover, the hypothetical analysis was determined by the value of the t-statistic and $p$-value, with results being obtained after bootstrapping calculations (Figure 3). This confirmed that the inner and outer model values were the path coefficient/internal T-values and the weight/external T-values, respectively.

Table 6 shows that the latent variable of the model did not have strong collinearity (VIF $< 5$), indicating the following: (1) the items of the 7 constructs did not overlap, (2) each item independently reflected the indicators to be measured, and (3) the setting of the questionnaire was reasonable.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The assumptions of the model's latent variables were subsequently tested, especially the path coefficient, t-value, and $p$-value, to verify the hypotheses of the theoretical method and empirical data, as shown in Table 7 and Figure 5.

Table 7 shows the path coefficient, sample-mean standard deviation, t-statistics, and the level of significance ($p$-value). This proved that H5, H6, H7, and H8 had t-statistics $> 1.96$ and $p$-values $< 0.05$, subsequently indicating that they had a significant effect.

Based on these results, PE, EE, SI, and FC had no positive effects on BI by using IWB ($\beta = 0.12$, $t = 1.34 < 1.96$, $p = 0.18 > 0.05$; $\beta = -0.09$, $t = 0.834 < 1.96$, $p = 0.40 > 0.05$; $\beta = 0.108$, $t = 1.26 < 1.96$, $p = 0.21 > 0.05$; and $\beta = 0.06$, $t = 0.74 < 1.96$, $p = 0.46 > 0.05$), indicating the rejection of H1, H2, H3, and H4, respectively. Meanwhile, HM and HB had positive effects on BI by using IWB ($\beta = 0.41$, $t = 4.58 > 1.96$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.32$, $t = 2.87 > 1.96$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$), leading to the acceptance of H5 and H6, respectively. For Usage Behavior (UB), FC and BI were also observed to have positive effects by using IWB ($\beta = 0.265$, $t = 2.607 > 1.96$, and $p = 0.01 < 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.55$, $t = 6.28 > 1.96$, and $p = 0.00 < 0.05$), verifying the acceptance of H7 and H8, respectively.

Table 8 summarizes the direct, indirect, and total effects of each variable on the behavioral intention and usage behavior of remote and rural teachers, toward the use of IWB during learning activities.

Table 8 shows that the determinants with the greatest and second-largest influences on BI were HM and HB at total effect...
TABLE 3 | Descriptive statistics.

| Items               | Mean statistic | Standard deviation statistic | Excess kurtosis statistic | Skewness statistic |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Performance Expectancy |                |                               |                          |                    |
| PE1                 | 4.018          | 0.914                         | -0.015                   | -0.637             |
| PE2                 | 4.023          | 0.917                         | 0.707                    | -0.972             |
| PE3                 | 3.895          | 0.924                         | -0.012                   | -0.595             |
| Effort Expectancy   |                |                               |                          |                    |
| EE1                 | 3.725          | 0.872                         | 0.109                    | -0.446             |
| EE2                 | 3.766          | 0.900                         | -0.454                   | -0.295             |
| EE3                 | 3.877          | 0.880                         | 0.166                    | -0.536             |
| Social Influence    |                |                               |                          |                    |
| SI1                 | 3.866          | 0.837                         | -0.170                   | -0.449             |
| SI2                 | 3.895          | 0.866                         | -0.170                   | -0.645             |
| SI3                 | 3.468          | 1.136                         | -0.661                   | -0.294             |
| Facilitating Conditions |            |                               |                          |                    |
| FC1                 | 3.778          | 0.996                         | -0.042                   | -0.616             |
| FC2                 | 3.737          | 1.000                         | 0.019                    | -0.582             |
| FC3                 | 3.626          | 0.967                         | -0.357                   | -0.321             |
| Hedonic Motivation  |                |                               |                          |                    |
| HM1                 | 3.965          | 0.830                         | 0.753                    | -0.677             |
| HM2                 | 3.959          | 0.868                         | 0.352                    | -0.625             |
| HM3                 | 4.047          | 0.884                         | 0.297                    | -0.707             |
| Habit               |                |                               |                          |                    |
| HB1                 | 3.801          | 0.959                         | -0.435                   | -0.394             |
| HB2                 | 3.713          | 0.901                         | -0.189                   | -0.318             |
| HB3                 | 3.690          | 0.957                         | -0.264                   | -0.352             |
| Behavior Intention  |                |                               |                          |                    |
| BI1                 | 3.901          | 0.863                         | -0.338                   | -0.357             |
| BI2                 | 3.930          | 0.869                         | -0.225                   | -0.456             |
| BI3                 | 3.895          | 0.859                         | -0.207                   | -0.410             |
| Usage Behavior      |                |                               |                          |                    |
| UB1                 | 3.661          | 0.974                         | -0.366                   | -0.345             |
| UB2                 | 3.602          | 1.017                         | -0.624                   | -0.281             |
| UB3                 | 3.637          | 1.013                         | -0.404                   | -0.380             |

values of 0.411 and 0.322, respectively. Meanwhile, the two main factors affecting UB were BI and FC, at direct effect values of 0.554 and 0.299, respectively.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Using the UTAUT-2 model, this study aimed to identify the factors influencing the behavioral intention and usage behavior of K-12 teachers on the utilization of IWB. It also determined the strongest significantly-positive effect on teachers’ BI and UB by using IWB learning media.

The Effect of Hedonic Motivation on Behavioral Intention

From the results, HM highly focused on the enjoyment of remote and rural K-12 teachers regarding the usage of IWB as a very interesting application. Based on their beliefs, certain games, music, animations, and other IWB functions increased the classroom fun and ensured students’ happiness during educational activities. Furthermore, HM was observed as the most powerful independent variable in the BI of these teachers, although no previous scholarly reports were found (Martins et al., 2018; Moorthy et al., 2019). These results were supported by a previous ICT study, where the HM of teachers’ information-technology use had a positive impact (Choi and Hoo-Jo Hoog, 2018; Nikolopoulou et al., 2021). This led to the following implications: (1) software developers need to increase the interest and pleasure of the application during the design of the functions, for the teachers to utilize them more and (2) managers such as schools and education bureaus should train teachers toward using IWB to develop interesting teaching games.

The Effect of Habit on Behavioral Intention

Habit was observed and predicted to have a significant positive and moderate effect on K-12 teachers’ behavioral intention to use IWB. This showed that the variable led the teachers’ BI toward using the learning tool in teaching processes, exhibiting similarities to previous consistent studies (Nikolopoulou et al., 2021; Taamneh et al., 2022). Therefore, good habits were important for helping teachers adapt to the use of information technology in the new era, where, the utilization of educational network platforms has become a common learning method (Taamneh et al., 2022). Some previous studies explained that when students or teachers have poor habits in using these platforms (Martins et al., 2018; Moorthy et al., 2019; Taamneh et al., 2022), they eventually quit due to a lack of self-control.
TABLE 4 | Loading factor, validity, and reliability.

| Latent variable             | Indicator | Loading  | T-value | Cronbach's alpha | Composite reliability | Average variance extracted (AVE) |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Performance Expectancy      | PE1       | 0.944    | 64.387  | 0.928            | 0.954                 | 0.873                            |
|                            | PE2       | 0.927    | 50.669  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | PE3       | 0.932    | 66.486  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Effort Expectancy           | EE1       | 0.872    | 27.352  | 0.883            | 0.928                 | 0.811                            |
|                            | EE2       | 0.895    | 45.092  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | EE3       | 0.933    | 84.820  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Social Influence            | SI1       | 0.916    | 67.953  | 0.818            | 0.891                 | 0.735                            |
|                            | SI2       | 0.922    | 71.925  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | SI3       | 0.717    | 11.963  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Facilitating Conditions     | FC1       | 0.883    | 32.023  | 0.885            | 0.929                 | 0.812                            |
|                            | FC2       | 0.919    | 60.719  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | FC3       | 0.902    | 53.122  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Hedonic Motivation          | HM1       | 0.953    | 111.435 | 0.923            | 0.951                 | 0.867                            |
|                            | HM2       | 0.940    | 85.760  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | HM3       | 0.900    | 36.966  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Habit                       | HB1       | 0.904    | 39.942  | 0.905            | 0.940                 | 0.840                            |
|                            | HB2       | 0.920    | 66.324  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | HB3       | 0.925    | 64.241  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Behavioral Intention        | BI1       | 0.951    | 89.921  | 0.949            | 0.967                 | 0.908                            |
|                            | BI2       | 0.958    | 90.027  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | BI3       | 0.949    | 89.606  |                  |                       |                                  |
| Usage Behavior              | UB1       | 0.937    | 76.088  | 0.934            | 0.958                 | 0.883                            |
|                            | UB2       | 0.940    | 67.521  |                  |                       |                                  |
|                            | UB3       | 0.941    | 77.217  |                  |                       |                                  |

in the learning process. Although teachers are active builders, they presently have insufficient initiatives as they are still more accustomed to using traditional blackboards for educational activities. Therefore, schools need to provide teachers with conditions for using IWB, while helping them develop active habits by setting indicators, such as a check-in system, point reward, and teaching assessment.

The Effect of Facilitating Conditions on Usage Behavior
Facilitating conditions predicted had significant positive and moderate effects on teachers’ Usage Behavior, although no influence was observed on their Behavioral Intentions toward using information technology in the classroom. Despite these results, Facilitating Conditions variable still affected the utilization of IWB, which showed consistency with the study of Ma et al. (2019). This indicated that most of the remote and rural K-12 teachers were not proficient in using the learning media in educational activities. It also proved that 50% of them were over 35 years of age as indicated in Table 2, and were not very proficient in the use of technology to teach. This is because the educational resources in remote rural areas are not very good (Shao and Lee, 2020; Sulisworo et al., 2020), accompanied by unsystematic pieces of training and ignorance of institutional information technology. Although the educational information infrastructures in remote and poverty-stricken areas have been significantly improved, the occurrence of their utilization effects was still observed compared to relatively developed sites. In

TABLE 5 | Fornell-Larcker criterion.

| PE | EE | SI | FC | HM | HB | BI | UB |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

| PE | EE | SI | FC | HM | HB | BI | UB |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 0.934 | 0.806 | 0.901 | 0.857 | 0.697 | 0.695 | 0.693 | 0.901 |

| Performance expectancy | 4.384 |
| Effort expectancy      | 3.588 |
| Social influence       | 3.542 |
| Facilitating conditions| 2.828 |
| Hedonic motivation     | 3.454 |
| Habit                  | 3.718 |

TABLE 6 | The VIF values of the internal model.

| Behavioral intention | Usage behavior |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Performance expectancy| 4.384         |
| Effort expectancy    | 3.588         |
| Social influence     | 3.542         |
| Facilitating conditions| 2.828    |
| Hedonic motivation   | 3.454         |
| Habit                | 3.718         |

Frontiers in Psychology | www.frontiersin.org | 10 | June 2022 | Volume 13 | Article 934423
this condition, some schools did not even carry out special IWB training, although arranged for teachers to personally learn through online teaching videos. This seriously affected the information technology UB of primary and secondary school teachers in remote and rural areas. Therefore, decision-makers such as schools and the regional education department need to provide systematic and professional IWB-based skills to K-12 teachers in remote and poverty-stricken areas, to support teaching and learning activities.

The Effect of Behavioral Intention on Usage Behavior

Behavioral Intention was the biggest predictor affecting the use of IWB by primary and secondary school teachers in remote and impoverished areas. This indicated that BI had a high-level impact on Usage Behavior, with thinking and action maintaining a high degree of consistency. These results were in line with many previous reports, where performances were always predicted when a strong desire and will were observed (Efiloğlu Kurt and Tingöy, 2017; Bardakci, 2019). Therefore, these underdeveloped teachers should be strengthened in future to cultivate the BI to use IWB, as well as HM and HB.

Performance and Effort Expectancies and Social Influence Predictors Do Not Have a Significant Effect on Behavioral Intention

Based on the results, the BI and UB of K-12 teachers in remote and rural areas were not influenced by PE, EE, and SI. This was slightly different from other previous reports, as PE and EE were often significantly affected (Estriegana et al., 2019; Almaiah et al., 2021; Alturki and Aldraiweesh, 2022). Meanwhile, Social Influence was predicted to have an impact on technology in some studies (Maduku, 2017; Asghar et al., 2021). These differences were due to the particularity of the sample, as the objects in

![Figure 4: The structural model with inner and outer models.](image-url)
TABLE 7 | Hypothesis analysis.

| Hypothesis       | Relationship                     | Path coefficient (B) | Sample mean | Standard deviation (STDEV) | tStatistic | p values | Decision |
|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------|----------|----------|
| H1               | Performance Expectancy - Behavioral Intention | 0.123                | 0.125       | 0.092                      | 1.339      | 0.181    | Refuse   |
| H2               | Effort Expectancy - Behavioral Intention | −0.078               | −0.077      | 0.093                      | 0.834      | 0.404    | Refuse   |
| H3               | Social Influence - Behavioral Intention | 0.108                | 0.112       | 0.086                      | 1.257      | 0.209    | Refuse   |
| H4               | Facilitating Conditions - Behavioral Intention | 0.061                | 0.059       | 0.083                      | 0.743      | 0.458    | Refuse   |
| H5               | Hedonic Motivation - Behavioral Intention | 0.411                | 0.412       | 0.090                      | 4.579      | 0.000    | Supported|
| H6               | Habit - Behavioral Intention | 0.322                | 0.317       | 0.112                      | 2.870      | 0.004    | Supported|
| H7               | Facilitating Conditions - Usage Behavior | 0.265                | 0.268       | 0.102                      | 2.607      | 0.009    | Supported|
| H8               | Behavioral Intention - Usage Behavior | 0.554                | 0.552       | 0.088                      | 6.282      | 0.000    | Supported|

this study were underdeveloped K-12 teachers in remote and impoverished areas, with more comprehensive explanation as follows:

**Performance Expectancy Has No Significant Effect on Behavioral Intention and Usage Behavior**

It was a surprise finding that PE was not significant to the BI and UB of K-12 teachers in remote and rural areas, regarding the use of IWB. This was not in line with many studies, which predicted that performance expectation was the strongest factor influencing users to use new technologies (Sánchez-Prieto et al., 2017; Garg, 2021). In this condition, the following explanations were determined: (1) teachers were located in remote and rural areas lacking educational resources and inadequate training. Besides this, they also believed that traditional classes with teacher-centered learning were more effective than using various technology-based media, (2) these teachers had low-performance expectations and assumed that...
TABLE 8 | The direct, indirect, and total effects in the path model.

| Factor          | Determinant | Effect          |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
|                 | Direct      | Indirect        | Total |
| Behavioral Intention = 0.761 | PE          | 0.123           | 0     | 0.123 |
|                 | EE          | −0.078          | 0     | −0.078 |
|                 | SI          | 0.108           | 0     | 0.108 |
|                 | FC          | 0.061           | 0     | 0.061 |
|                 | HM          | 0.411           | 0     | 0.411 |
|                 | HB          | 0.322           | 0     | 0.322 |
| Usage Behavior = 0.585 | PE          | 0               | 0.068 | 0.068 |
|                 | EE          | 0               | −0.043| −0.043 |
|                 | SI          | 0               | 0.060 | 0.060 |
|                 | FC          | 0.265           | 0.034 | 0.299 |
|                 | HM          | 0               | 0.228 | 0.228 |
|                 | HB          | 0               | 0.178 | 0.178 |
|                 | BI          | 0.554           | 0     | 0.554 |

IWB did not help improve the quality of their learning, and (3) some applications and learning media, such as micro-lectures and micro-games, were not suitable for operation on the IWB system. To overcome this problem, the schools and the regional government should jointly provide training and guidance to teachers in remote and rural areas, to increase learning effectiveness. Regarding students, the software developers also need to improve the system for efficient and effective performance.

**Effort Expectancy Has No Significant Effect on Behavioral Intention and Usage Behavior**

Some K-12 teachers in remote and rural areas assumed that the operation of using IWB was more complicated in teaching and learning activities. Our finding was in line with the study by Ayaz and Yanartaş (2020), which predicted that EE did not have a significant impact on the use of educational technology. In this condition, the following explanations were determined: (1) the ease of use factor was insufficient to increase the usage intention of new educational technology and (2) the users were more willing to use this technology in the classroom based on the availability of adequate infrastructure, as well as related implementational training and tools.

**Social Influence Does Not Have a Significant Effect on Behavioral Intention and Usage Behavior**

In this condition, teachers in remote and rural areas often assumed that their teaching methods were good and considered useless when using technology-based learning media. This was because approximately 50% and more of the respondents in this study were over 35 years of age with 10 years of teaching experience (Table 2). Regardless of whether they were recommended by colleagues, school leaders, or the neighborhood in remote and rural areas, IWB was still selected according to their preferences and habits. Furthermore, more than 50% of the respondents had teaching experience > 10 years, indicating that these teachers had their respective suitable habits and styles for classroom application. Based on these results, social influence did not have a significant effect on the intentions used in new learning media. This was in line with that reported by Nikolopoulou et al. (2021), who argued that SI was not related to the preference of teachers toward Information Technology utilization.

**CONCLUSION**

To support government and school programs toward improving information technology integration in learning activities, especially in remote rural areas, the UTAUT-2 model was used to explore the factors influencing the Behavioral Intentions and Usage Behaviors of K-12 teachers. The data were analyzed using the smartPLS software, with hypothetical analysis being carried out through the partial least squares structural equation model (PLS-SEM). Of the 8 analyzed hypotheses, only HM/HB and FC/BI had significant positive effects on Behavioral Intentions and Usage Behaviors, respectively. Therefore, the government and schools should have practical and constructive solutions to increase the use of IWB in remote and rural areas. In this case, the principals and government need to provide teachers with training and design learning models, which have the capability of being combined with the use of IWB. Through the performance of some training processes, schools should also popularize the ease of using IWB and other technology-based interactive learning media. Therefore, these processes take a long time for teachers to believe that IWB has the ability to improve their learning performances. The government should also form a group or community capable of supporting teachers to use IWB in remote and rural areas. This group should be useful when the teachers have complaints or difficulties in using the learning media during the performance of educational activities. The community should also create social influence, toward the improvement of using IWB to teach. Considering continuous facilities and support from the government and schools, the use of technology-based learning media should essentially increase in remote and rural areas, especially the utilization of IWB.

**LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDY**

First, despite the results, several limitations were still observed, including the relatively small scope of the questionnaire obtained from the K-12 teachers, where the data obtained did not sufficiently represent all of them in China. Second, the data were only analyzed using a quantitative approach and a structural equation model. This indicates that subsequent reports need to use qualitative and quantitative methods to deeply explain the factors influencing the teachers’ BI and UB toward the utilization of IWB in teaching and learning activities. Third, future studies should extend UTAUT-2 and provide several moderator variables to affect the Behavioral Intention and Usage Behavior of teachers. Finally, comparative reports need to be carried out in rural and
developed areas, to deepen the understanding of the analysis and different suggestions provided for each region.
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## APPENDIX

### TABLE A1 | Detailed questionnaire items.

| Variable construct     | Code | English version                                                                 | Chinese version                                                                                         | Source        |
|------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| **Performance Expectancy (PE)**                                   |      | **PE1** IWB helped me to quickly complete my teaching preparation                | 交互式智能白板帮助我更快地完成教学任务                                                              | Venkatesh et al., 2003 |
|                        |      | **PE2** IWB improved my teaching quality                                          | 交互式智能白板可以提升我的教学质量                                                                    |               |
|                        |      | **PE3** Using IWB to teach improved my position in the school                     | 交互式智能白板帮助我提升我的专业发展                                                                  |               |
| **Effort Expectancy (EE)**                                       |      | **EE1** It is easy for me to operate IWB to teach                                | 我可以顺利地操作交互式智能白板                                                                       | Venkatesh et al., 2003 |
|                        |      | **EE2** Learning to use IWB is very easy                                          | 我可以非常容易地使用交互式智能白板                                                                     |               |
|                        |      | **EE3** Teaching using IWB is easier than traditional methods                      | 使用交互式智能白板比传统方法更容易                                                                 |               |
| **Social Influence (SI)**                                       |      | **SI1** Other teachers recommended that I use IWB in teaching and learning activities | 同事的推荐促使我使用交互式智能白板在教学和学习活动中enuinecessary | Venkatesh et al., 2003 |
|                        |      | **SI2** The principal recommended that I use IWB when teaching                    | 学校领导推荐我使用交互式智能白板                                                                 |               |
|                        |      | **SI3** Students recommended that I use IWB when teaching                          | 学生推荐使用交互式智能白板                                                                 |               |
| **Facilitating Conditions (FC)**                                |      | **FC1** Local governments and schools conduct a lot of training on the use of IWB | 教育局和学校提供了大量的培训，教学上使用交互式智能白板                                               | Venkatesh et al., 2003 |
|                        |      | **FC2** Every class in the school has available IWB                                | 每个教室都有可用的交互式智能白板                                                                  |               |
|                        |      | **FC3** There is a team that is ready to help when I have difficulties in using IWB | 有一个团队可以帮助我解决使用交互式智能白板的问题                                                   |               |
| **Hedonic Motivation (HM)**                                     |      | **HM1** I think IWB is an interesting app                                          | 我认为交互式智能白板是一个有趣的应用                                                                 | Venkatesh et al., 2012 |
|                        |      | **HM2** Using IWB to teach is fun                                                  | 我使用交互式智能白板的时候感到愉快                                                                 |               |
|                        |      | **HM3** Using IWB to teach is enjoyable                                            | 我认为使用交互式智能白板的过程中比较愉快                                                       |               |
| **Habit (HB)**                                                   |      | **HB1** I am used to teaching through IWB                                          | 我习惯使用交互式智能白板教学                                                                     | Venkatesh et al., 2012 |

(Continued)
TABLE A1  (Continued)

| Variable construct | Code | English version | Chinese version | Source |
|---------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|
| HB2                 | I    | I am addicted to teaching through IWB | 我沉迷于使用交互式智能白板进行教学 |        |
| HB3                 | I    | I have to use IWB to teach | 我不得不使用交互式智能白板进行教学 |        |
| Behavioral Intention (BI) | BI1 | I use IWB to teach in the future | 在未来，我将使用交互式智能白板进行教学 | Venkatesh et al., 2003 |
| BI2                 | I    | I intensely use IWB to teach in the future | 在未来，我强烈地使用交互式智能白板进行教学 |        |
| BI3                 | I    | I try to use IWB when teaching | 在未来的教学中，我尝试使用交互式智能白板进行教学 |        |
| Use Behavior (UB)  | UB1  | I regularly use IWB to teach in class | 在课堂中，我有规律地使用交互式智能白板进行教学 | Venkatesh et al., 2003 |
| UB2                 | Using IWB to teach is a pleasant experience | 使用交互式智能白板进行教学是我一个愉快的经验 |        |
| UB3                 | I    | I spend a lot of time on IWB use in my class. | 在我的教学中，我花费很多时间在交互式智能白板使用上 |        |