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

João Álvaro Carvalho[1]

1 United Nations University

Review of the article Adoption of Technology Acceptance and Interfaces for Academic Information System Applications

The authors carried out a study about the implementation (I would call it "implantation" :-)) of an IT application in an organization. The application is what the authors call an "Academic Information System." It has been implanted/implemented in a higher education institution – the Health Polytechnic of the city (state?) of Malang, in Indonesia.

I believe it is very important to seize the opportunity to have access to the IT phenomenon in order to carry out empirical studies that provide evidence about the performance/success of IT. So, I congratulate the authors for carrying out the study.

However, I think there are several major issues with the article. In my review, I will address those that I think are the most important.

1)

I think the authors face a language barrier that they had difficulty overcoming. The article reflects such difficulties.

It starts in the title: "adoption of technology acceptance" makes no sense. We talk about the "adoption of technology" or the "acceptance of technology." Adoption of technology acceptance is a very strange phrase that seriously affects the whole article.

The title of section 2, "The Art of Research," reinforces the perception of a language problem. This is a quite unusual sentence. "State of the art" would be a typical title for a section that summarizes what is known in a certain area.

In section 2.1, the authors describe the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The first sentences of the descriptions of the factors "Perceived Ease of Use" and "Perceived Usefulness" seem to be swapped!

The sentence "a. Perceived Ease of Use - A level where a person believes that using the system can improve his performance at work" corresponds to the definition of Perceived Usefulness. And the sentence "Perceived Usefulness - A level where a person believes that using the system does not need to bother." describes the Perceived Ease of Use.

There are other language problems, but these two reveal some deep misunderstandings.

2)

The last paragraph of section 1 suggests (language problems apart) that the aim of the study is to measure the acceptance (or adoption) of the Academic Information System. In the same paragraph, the authors justify the relevance of such measurement: "It is important for university management to know how this technology can be used well by students in supporting their academic and learning activities."

However, what comes next is not the measurement of the acceptance of the Academic Information System. The rest of the article is about establishing the antecedents (predictors) of acceptance.

Thus, there is an inconsistency between the announced objective of the study and what has been done.

The sentence in the abstract doesn't help to sort out this inconsistency: "Objective. To find out how information system technology can be accepted by students in supporting their academic and learning activities, we measure the adoption of educational information system acceptance …"

In the abstract, the objective is "how information systems technology can be accepted."

It doesn't correspond to the first situation above (measuring the acceptance of technology) or the second (establishing the antecedents of acceptance).

3)

The authors borrowed some constructs from TAM (Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, Behavioral Intention to Use) to elaborate their research model. They also included another construct that is not behavioral in nature (user interface).

This construct seems to be related to a characteristic of the system (cf. DeLone and McLean's success model).

It is not clear how these constructs are operationalized in order to be measured.

Furthermore, the way the hypotheses are written bears a high degree of ambiguity, hindering the possibility of being refuted.

4)

The article describes a particular situation, and there is no discussion about the generality of the results.

The issue is how the results of this study, which focuses on the acceptance of a particular IT application in one particular organization (Health Polytechnic of Malang), contribute to the general knowledge about the acceptance of information technologies?

There are other issues with the article.

I addressed those that I think are the most important.