Although nowadays complex computer applications become feasible in terms of technology and price, many managerial workers still find repulsive in using them. Therefore, designers need to look for ways in evaluating and predicting users' reactions towards systems, so as to improve user acceptance by changing the nature of systems. This has always been one of the hardest research areas in information systems and past research findings are considered inconclusive.

The theory of reasoned action (TRA), a well-established intention model which can explain general human behaviors, was thus suggested as an evaluating tool. It theorizes that one's behavior is determined by the strength of his intention (BI), that is jointly determined by his attitude (A) and subjective norm (SN) with regard to that behavior. A refers to one's feelings towards performing that behavior and can be calculated by summing up all his subjective probability about consequences of performing the behavior multiplied with respective evaluative weights. SN is obtained by summing up all other individuals' perceptions towards that behavior multiplied the concerned individual's motivation to comply with them respectively. TRA model asserts uncontrollable external ones or controllable interventions influence behavior through indirectly influencing A, SN, or their relative weights.

Subsequently Davis introduced the technology acceptance model (TAM), derived from TRA to specifically explain user behavior towards a broad range of computer technologies and enables the tracing of how external factors impact on internal beliefs, attitudes and intentions. It supposes that perceived usefulness (U) and perceived ease of use (EOU) are most pertinent beliefs to computer acceptance behaviors. U is illustrated as user's expectation about how much the application can increase his job performance within an organizational setting. EOU is how much the application is expected to save the user's efforts.

In TAM, the computer usage behavior is again determined by relevant BI, while BI is considered to be jointly determined by one's attitudes towards the system (A) and U, with relative weights approximated by regression. In this equation, the A-BI relationship infers that people's intentions to perform certain behaviors are shaped when their attitudes towards them are positive; The U-BI relationship suggests that the expectations on behaviors useful in improving people's job performance are more influential on people's behavioral intention than their feelings towards the behaviors, because improved performance is crucial in earning rewards extraneous to the content of the work itself.

TAM excludes SN as one determinant of BI. This is not only because SN may influence BI via A, or directly influence BI through submitting to their superiors' will towards the system, but also because SN is ambiguous in its standing in both theory and psychometrics.

U and EOU are two main factors governing A. Here the U-A link is due to the knowledge that positively evaluated outcomes always enhance one's attitude towards the behaviors which leads to the outcomes; for the effect of EOU on A, two basic explanations for this are (1) the fact that the ease of using a system increases user's satisfaction in his ability to carry out the job well and thus enhances his feeling as a competent person (2) as well as the fact that such an ease also enables a person to do more jobs for the same effort and thus directly affect U. The second point above implies that U and EOU are related constructs. Not only that, some external variables, such as design characteristics or feedback learning in educational programs, influence U with effects greater than EOU. Furthermore, some external variables, such as system features that aim to augment usability, are formulated to influence EOU.

Comment [S1]: Content: A-
Organization: A-
Writing: A-

Comment [S2]: Grading Criteria
Content: Does your summary contain the most important information presented in the paper? Is the content correct, or does it contain technical errors?
Organization: Do you have good ordering of the sections/subsections? Are the sections linked together well or do they appear abruptly? Does the paper flow? Did you motivated/introduce/define items appropriately before using them?
Writing: Did you use words and grammar correctly. Does the writing have a clear and easy to understand style?

Comment [S3]: find them repulsive to use. Repulsive is a strong word, 'resist using them' is preferable.

Comment [S4]: evaluation

Comment [S5]: Use different font, otherwise confusing

Comment [S6]: What's this?

Comment [S7]: Are the most

The main difference between TRA and TAM is the way they set the determinants of A. In TRA, salient beliefs are drawn fresh for each new; whereas in TAM only two determinants of user acceptance, U and EOU, are modeled to obtain a more generalized belief set across diverse computer systems and user populations. Also, TRA mixes all beliefs multiplied by their relevant evaluation in a sole construct; whereas TAM separates U and EOU as two distinct important factors in order to help investigators analyze different impacts of these two on users' attitudes, as well as figure out any external variables hidden.

Some reasoning are given to clarify why U and EOU in TAM are not multiplied by self-reported evaluative weights just as same as the case in TRA. First is that it is unclear the relation of A with a product of evaluation and belief, both of which are not linear-scaled. Second is that although people hold different views towards the same outcome, we assume that in TAM people hold similar positive views towards U and EOU. So instead of taking self-reported values, TAM statistically estimates relative influences of the valuables, even though this estimation may be distorted when individuals' view differ significantly.

In order to evaluate both models, we conducted an research study from the usage data of how first year MBA students in University of Michigan use WriteOne, a word processing application. Salient beliefs are gathered from second year students since they are similar to freshmen and have familiarized themselves with the program. Later, a questionnaire which operationalizes TAM' U and EOU with 4-item instruments is set and results are tabulated to analyze each determinant's reliability. It is shown that BI was greatly correlated with usage and it is strongly influenced by A. Also belief is unexpectedly found to have direct relation with intention. Results also confirms a significant portion of variance in attitude. Subsequently a factor analysis conducted implies the existence of belief dimensions concerning U, EOU, dependency and accessibility. This leads to a hybrid intention model, in which three main ideas are: computer usage behaviors could be forecasted from their intentions; perceived usefulness influence intentions the most; and perceived ease of use is secondary important in determining intentions.

Such a model is important in managerial practice as managers may apply it to get an early understanding on their systems' user acceptability in order to alter the design before the implementation stage.

Comment [S8]: Better to use the authors as you are describing their work not yours

Comment [S9]: confirm