

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3464
Title of the Manuscript:	USING TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL TO PROMOTE STUDENTS ADOPTION AND USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN THE SUNYANI TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specificity of Research Scope: The abstract could benefit from more specific details about the research setting or sample. For example, specifying the educational level, region, or type of digital technologies investigated would provide a better understanding of the study's context. 2. Clarification of TAM Elements: Although TAM is referenced, the abstract could briefly mention which TAM constructs (e.g., perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use) were measured or emphasized in this study. This would help how the model was applied in detail. 3. Results Detail: While the findings are summarized, the abstract could benefit from a slightly more detailed description of the quantitative results. For instance, mentioning any specific metrics or changes in attitudes/usage patterns would strengthen the evidence provided. 4. Rephrasing for Clarity: Some phrasing is unclear or could be simplified. For example, "confronting some undesirable behavioral and perceptual traits" could be rephrased to more clearly state which behaviors or perceptions were barriers to technology acceptance. 5. Implications for Future Research: Adding a sentence on the implications of the findings, or potential areas for further research, could enhance the abstract's impact and suggest broader relevance. <p>1 – Introduction (Comments):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Conciseness: The introduction contains several instances of redundancy. For instance, the concept of TAM is explained multiple times in different sections, which could be streamlined for better clarity and readability. Reducing redundancy would make the introduction more concise. 2. Specificity of Problem Statement: The introduction could more clearly specify the research problem by stating the exact research questions or hypotheses. While it mentions the importance of understanding attitudes and perceptions, a clearer, more specific problem statement would make the study's focus more evident. 3. Integration of Sources and Citations: Several sources are cited, but it would be beneficial to integrate these references more seamlessly within the text. Some statements (e.g., "attitudes are fundamentally separated into likes and dislikes") would benefit from a more nuanced discussion or additional supporting evidence to clarify their relevance to the study. 4. Detailed Explanation of Constructs: While TAM is explained, the sections on "Perceived Usefulness" and "Perceived Ease of Use" could be further refined. It would be helpful to provide a more straightforward explanation of how these constructs are specifically relevant to students at Sunyani Technical University and how they will be measured in the study. 5. Logical Structure: The structure could be improved by grouping related content more cohesively. For example, the detailed explanation of TAM constructs (1.1.1 and 1.1.2) could be placed immediately after introducing TAM to avoid interrupting the flow. 6. Grammar and Syntax: There are minor grammatical and stylistic errors that could be improved for clarity. For instance, phrases like "extremely importantly" could be revised to "extremely important" for grammatical correctness. A careful review for grammar and syntax would enhance the readability and professionalism of the text. 7. Figure Reference: The reference to "Fig. 1" lacks proper integration. It should be 	

[Review Form2](#)

	<p>introduced more naturally within the paragraph, perhaps by explaining briefly what the figure demonstrates about TAM before citing it. Additionally, ensuring the figure is referenced consistently with the rest of the text would improve coherence.</p> <p>2 – Methodology (Comments):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Sampling Technique Explanation: While stratified random sampling is mentioned, it would be beneficial to briefly explain why this technique was chosen for this particular study. For instance, clarifying how stratified random sampling helps in capturing diverse attitudes across departments could strengthen the rationale.2. Sample Size Justification: The section mentions using 30% of the accessible population as the sample size but does not provide sufficient justification for this choice beyond stating that 30% is "minimum sample size." Including a more precise reason (e.g., statistical power analysis or representativeness concerns) would strengthen this part.3. Lack of Detail on Experimental Procedures: The term "experimental research" is used, yet it is unclear what specific experimental conditions or interventions were applied to influence students' attitudes and perceptions toward technology. Clarifying the experimental aspect (e.g., whether a specific instructional delivery system was tested) would provide a better understanding of the study's methodology.4. Further Explanation of TAM Constructs Measurement: While the items on perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and attitudes toward use are mentioned, it would be helpful to specify if these items were directly adapted from TAM literature or developed for this study. Additionally, brief examples of questions could provide more insight into how these constructs were operationalized.5. Description of Digital Competency Assessment: The section briefly mentions that participants rated their level of digital competencies, but does not explain how these competencies were assessed. Providing a few examples of the skills and knowledge items or describing the criteria for digital competencies would improve clarity.6. Formatting and Grammar: There are minor grammatical errors and formatting issues (e.g., "bothered on questions" should likely be "focused on questions"). Ensuring consistent formatting and clear sentence structure would improve readability.7. Encourage for more samples: Increasing the sample size would significantly improve the accuracy and reliability of findings within this framework. More samples offer a broader representation, leading to deeper insights into diverse student attitudes and perceptions toward digital technology. This enhances both the statistical strength and generalizability of the study, providing more robust conclusions for effective technology integration in education. <p>3 - Discussion or Findings (Comments):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarification of the Intervention's Impact: Although the section mentions that the intervention led to improved digital skills, it lacks detail on how the intervention was structured and what specific activities contributed to this improvement. A more detailed explanation would help clarify the mechanisms behind the positive impact on students' attitudes.2. Expansion on the Relationship between Ease of Use and Usefulness: The study finds a "unique closeness" between perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness, yet this is not fully explained. It would be beneficial to elaborate on this relationship and discuss how ease of use may enhance the perceived utility of digital technologies, offering more nuanced insights.3. Elaboration on Behavioral Intention: While the discussion briefly mentions that attitude influences behavioral intention, it could benefit from expanding on this point. Discussing how behavioral intention may translate to actual technology	
--	---	--

[Review Form2](#)

	<p>adoption among students would add depth to the findings.</p> <p>4. Evidence for the Learning-by-Doing Approach: Although the “learning-bydoing” approach is mentioned, there is limited information on how this was assessed. Explaining whether students reported improved engagement or understanding due to this approach would make this finding more substantial.</p> <p>5. Grammar and Clarity: There are a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings (e.g., "This is because, per the Technology Acceptance Model") that could be improved for readability. A careful review for grammar and sentence structure would enhance clarity.</p> <p>4 - Conclusions (Comments):</p> <p>1. Refinement of Language and Grammar: The phrase “results after the of the Technology Acceptance Model” is unclear and should be revised for clarity. Additionally, some sentences are lengthy and could benefit from restructuring for readability.</p> <p>2. Addressing Limitations and Future Research: The conclusion does not address any limitations of the study or suggest areas for future research. Including a brief mention of limitations (e.g., sample size, geographic limitation to a specific university) and recommendations for future studies would provide a more balanced perspective.</p> <p>3. Reiteration of Practical Implications: While the conclusion summarizes findings, it could be strengthened by briefly discussing the practical implications of these results for educators or policymakers. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the study’s relevance.</p> <p>4. Clarification of Student Engagement and Understanding: The sentence about students gaining “more understanding and insight through the lively course content” is slightly vague. It would be clearer to specify that the interactive nature of digital content enhances comprehension, if that is the intended meaning.</p> <p>References (Comments):</p> <p>1. Need to follow APA format with alphabetical order</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kelly Wee
Department, University & Country	International University of Malaya-Wales, Malaysia