

# User Acceptance of Virtual Technologies

**Heshan Sun**

*Syracuse University, USA*

**Xue Xiao**

*Syracuse University, USA*

## INTRODUCTION

Driven by market competitiveness enhancement, service improvement, and working effectiveness promotion, more and more organizations have realized their potentials and paid a lot of attentions to them (Chau & Hu, 2002). As estimated, about 50% of new capital investment has been put in information technology (Westland & Clark, 2000). Despite its great potentials, users' acceptance or adoption of these technologies does not live up to the initial expectations (Sun & Zhang, 2004). It is obvious that ITs are useless unless users accept and subsequently use them. Therefore, user technology acceptance becomes a hot topic and much effort has been made in order to obtain a deep understanding of how and why users accept certain technologies. Several models have been proposed in the last 2 decades and subsequent studies tested them (Table 1).

New virtual technologies, especially collaborative technologies, enable some new forms of interaction. For example, members in virtual teams can work simultaneously on a document together as a distributed team, remotely access shared information from anywhere, or record team activities (Majchrzak et al., 2000). Virtual technologies, like other types of technology, have to be accepted and used by users first. However, virtual technologies, while sharing certain characteristics with other technologies, have special features. Therefore, this article is an attempt to identify the structure and factors influence user acceptance of virtual tech-

nologies based on existing user technology acceptance models.

In general, the existing technology acceptance models can still be used for virtual technologies. Prior studies have confirmed that users accept virtual technologies in a similar way as other technologies (Moon & Kim, 2001; Yager, 1999; Chen et al., 2002). For example, Moon and Kim (2001) studied the acceptance of the World Wide Web (WWW). According to their study, the results about key factors in extant models are consistent with prior studies, which means that the factors influencing user acceptance of general technologies, although a little different, are also suitable for virtual technologies. Another example is Yager's study (1999), in which many factors, such as usefulness, ease of use that are traditionally considered to be important for technology acceptance in general, are still valid for virtual technologies. Therefore, we can borrow factors from existing models.

However, virtual technologies have their own characteristics. Therefore the factors contributing to user acceptance are likely to be different (Moon & Kim, 2001). So we need to propose new factors pertaining to the new type of technology. For example, playfulness is considered as an additional factor that is especially influential for virtual technologies (Moon & Kim, 2001).

In summary, we can refer to existing models while considering the characteristics of virtual technologies. Actually, it is a highly valid approach (Chen et al., 2002).

*Table 1. A summary of models of user technology acceptance*

<b>Models</b>	<b>Representative Work</b>
Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	Davis, 1989; Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000
Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)	Mathieson, 1991; Taylor & Todd, 1995
Motivational Model (MM)	Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1992
Computer Self-Efficacy (CSE)	Compeau & Higgins, 1995a, 1995b
United Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT)	Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003

## DISCUSSION

### Reference Models

Table 1 shows a summary of existing models about user technology acceptance. All the listed models are well known in the field of human computer interaction (HCI). In addition, they are all confirmed to be valid in terms of explaining user acceptance.

We can borrow factors of interest from these models or theories (Table 2). All the factors split into three categories: indicators of use acceptance (dependent variables), factors contributing to user acceptance (independent variables), and moderating factors. Figure 1 also shows the basic structure of these factors.

### Dependent Variables: Indicators of User Acceptance

First, we have to identify the indicators of user acceptance. Usually, three factors have been used as indicators of user technology acceptance: attitude, behavioral intention, and actual usage (Sun & Zhang, 2005).

#### Attitude

Attitude is not a very good indicator of user acceptance since in real world many factors besides attitude have impacts on user usage (Sun & Zhang, 2005). For example,

a user without a positive attitude toward a technology may still accept and use it because of its high usefulness (Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989).

Attitude usually includes two aspects, affect and cognition. Prior studies usually focus on the cognitive aspect. That may be one of the reasons that the impacts of attitude are inconsistent among prior studies (Sun & Zhang, 2005). Therefore, several recent research use behavioral intention rather than attitude as the dependent variable.

#### Behavioral Intention

Behavioral intention is confirmed to be a highly valid indicator of actual usage (Sun & Zhang, 2005). Compared with attitude, BI intentionally ignored some internal complexity, especially the affective aspect of attitude. Just as mentioned above, behavioral intention gradually replaces attitude as the indicator of user technology acceptance.

#### Actual Usage


Several studies also use actual usage as the indicator of user acceptance (e.g., Gefen & Straub, 1997; Karahanna & Straub, 1999). Sometimes, it is relatively difficult or even impossible to get the data about users' actual usage. Therefore BI is more frequently used as the indicator.

Sometimes, it is relatively difficult or even impossible to get the data about users' actual usage. Therefore BI is more frequently used as the indicator.

Table 2. The factors of interest

Indicators of User Acceptance (Dependent variables)	Factors Contributing to User Acceptance (Independent variables)	Moderating Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attitude</li> <li>• Behavioral intention</li> <li>• Actual usage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usefulness</li> <li>• Ease of use</li> <li>• Playfulness</li> <li>• Subjective norms</li> <li>• Facilitating conditions</li> <li>• Others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Experience</li> <li>• Voluntariness of use</li> <li>• Intellectual capacity</li> <li>• Type of technology</li> </ul>

Figure 1. The basic structure of user technology acceptance



4 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/user-acceptance-virtual-technologies/18125](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/user-acceptance-virtual-technologies/18125)

## Related Content

---

### Optimal Camera Placement in a Virtual Environment

Hocine Chebi (2021). *Multimedia and Sensory Input for Augmented, Mixed, and Virtual Reality* (pp. 247-260).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/optimal-camera-placement-in-a-virtual-environment/268544](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/optimal-camera-placement-in-a-virtual-environment/268544)

### Fast Single Image Haze Removal Scheme Using Self-Adjusting: Haziness Factor Evaluation

Sangita Roy and Sheli Sinha Chaudhuri (2019). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 42-57).

[www.irma-international.org/article/fast-single-image-haze-removal-scheme-using-self-adjusting/228945](http://www.irma-international.org/article/fast-single-image-haze-removal-scheme-using-self-adjusting/228945)

### Exploring Liminal Practices in Art, Technology, and Science

Denise Doyle (2018). *Virtual and Augmented Reality: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 65-83).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploring-liminal-practices-in-art-technology-and-science/199680](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploring-liminal-practices-in-art-technology-and-science/199680)

### Networks of Excellence as Virtual Communities

A. Draghici, N. Matta, G. Molcho and G. Draghici (2008). *Encyclopedia of Networked and Virtual Organizations* (pp. 1022-1030).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/networks-excellence-virtual-communities/17720](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/networks-excellence-virtual-communities/17720)

### The New Trends and Applications in E-Learning Environments and E-Technologies

Luis A. Alfaro, Claudia P. Rivera, Jorge Luna-Urquizo, Castañeda Elisa, Jesús Zuñiga-Cueva and Maribel Urquizo-Abril (2022). *Methodologies and Use Cases on Extended Reality for Training and Education* (pp. 269-299).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-new-trends-and-applications-in-e-learning-environments-and-e-technologies/308905](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-new-trends-and-applications-in-e-learning-environments-and-e-technologies/308905)