

Review of: "Adoption of Technology Acceptance and Interfaces for Academic Information System Applications"

Alain Somat¹

¹ University of Rennes 2

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors set out to measure the intention of potential users (students) to adopt an educational technology device. The aim is to identify the dimensions that predict adoption of this technology, presented as a tool to facilitate learning. The authors make 4 hypotheses, not all of which are very precise:

H1: Perceived ease of use is able to help students accept academic information systems technology. What does "able to help" mean here?

H2: Perceived usefulness can encourage students to accept academic information systems technology. What does "may encourage" mean here?

H3: Good interface design can encourage acceptance of academic information systems technology. What does "may encourage" mean?

H4: Simultaneously, PU, PeOU, and interface can encourage acceptance of academic information systems technology. Here, what is the importance of each of these variables in "may encourage"?

The research presented is well conducted, with a real concern for statistics to guarantee the validity of the results presented. The tools used are well constructed and validated from a measurement standpoint. My major criticism of this article is the way the authors use their results to make statements that are not really in line with the results obtained. Several illustrations of this criticism will follow. I therefore propose that the editor reject this article in this version.

1. The authors should clarify the notion of "best educational experience".
2. The authors need to develop and argue the last sentence of the intro point: "As a result, by understanding, and, measuring the adoption of this technology, university management can evaluate and improve the use of educational technology and ensure that this system is more readily accepted by students by offering maximum more to support their academic outcomes."
3. Why not make assumptions about attitude?
4. Why use only TAM 1 and not TAM 2 and TAM 3?
5. In hypothesis 3, what does "a good interface" mean?
6. Hypothesis 4 deals with behavioral attention, but we wonder why the author doesn't make an assumption about attitude?
7. I don't understand why the number of questionnaires processed is limited to 171. As far as I'm concerned, I've come up with 173 questionnaires, i.e., 182 - 9.
8. With regard to the results, why does the author support the idea of a very strong link for perceived usefulness and a

strong link only for perceived ease?

9. Why doesn't the author say anything about his regression calculation?
10. In the discussion, the authors argue that perceived usefulness had the strongest influence in sustaining student interest. How do the authors manage to support the idea that this influence is the strongest?
11. The discussion does not match the results, since the authors only repeat the results and refer to a bibliographical reference. It is regrettable that the authors say nothing about the reasons that might justify the links they observe.
12. Neither the discussion nor the conclusion refers to the limitations of this research, which is regrettable.
13. The conclusion does not open up new perspectives. This is regrettable.