Joel E. Asuncion
Asian College of Technology Educational Foundation
AB, MBA, PH.D.
Director, Office Standards, Accreditation and Research
Joel.asuncion@act.edu.ph

Norberto M. Secretaria
Cebu Technological University
AB, MBA, PH.D.
Social Sciences and Management Department, Main Campus
norbertosecretaria@gmail.com

INNOVATED TECHNOLOGY OF THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR ACADEMIC HEADS

Abstract: *Advancement of technology is the language of the modern society. With the rapid evolution of computers where Internet of Things, Big Data, Cloud Computing and the like are the universal direction, appraisal and evaluation of human resources, in similar manner have to cope with such change. This paper tested an innovated technology system for the evaluation of academic heads in an educational institution. In the testing of this new technology utilization the researchers used the Technology Acceptance Model. The result showed that the respondents agreed to the usability of the features of the system, easy to use, and functional as desired. It was concluded that there is a need to shift from web-based design to a mobile application and adopt the Innovated Technology Model of the Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System using an Android platform that would operate through smartphones for evaluation. The new mobile application would help the employees evaluate their academic heads with lesser time consumptions which would lead to the productivity of every faculty for the benefit of all shareholders.*

Key words: *Innovated Technology, Performance Evaluation, Human Resources Management.*
Language: *English*
Citation: Asuncion, J. E., & Secretaria, N. M. (2019). Innovated technology of the performance evaluation system for academic heads. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 08 (76),* 64-74.
Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-76-11   *Doi*: cross ref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.08.76.11
Classifiers: *Management.*

Introduction

Performance evaluation is always of imperative concern in every organization across the globe, even in the academic community, higher education institutions while managing its people and resources. It is considered as one of its primary duty, which is to evaluate whether it's human capital, the employees, are performing well above organization's expected target. Although higher education institutions depend upon both teaching and non-teaching staffs working on it, yet major responsibility comes upon the academic heads who are the source of leadership and academic direction of a department or the college. Therefore, the need for academic head evaluation compels higher educational institutions to have a systematic approach, to administer, evaluate and enhance academic heads' performance and leadership for the benefit of all shareholders. The performance evaluation is designed to guide the human resource department for possible promotions, salary increase, transfers, additional benefits and other incentives as well as helping poor performers to achieve and develop their potentials (Alston & Marschke, 2008).

In the academic community, academic heads' performance evaluation has received renewed attention as a mean to improve schools. However, several

authors (e.g. Danielson and McGreal, 2000; Frase and Streshly, 1994; Heneman and Milanowski, 2003) notice the practice of performance evaluation often is nothing more than a perfunctory exercise which takes a lot of time from the school administration and teachers. It is worth noting that people are the lifeblood of colleges and universities. If there are no students, faculty, administrators, and staff, there cannot be a college or university. People are their primary resource, and the development of these people is their reason for existence. Due to the paramount importance of the people who are in higher education, it is essential to understand how well this personnel is performing in their roles and if they are fulfilling the responsibilities for which they were hired (Flaniken, 2009).

Asian College of Technology International Educational Foundation, with its commitment to provide quality education always adheres to the general concept of performance evaluation to make sure that its academic personnel perform its duties and obligations and to maximize their potential. However, this tedious process as authors like Danielson and McGreal, (2000); Frase and Streshly, (1994); Heneman and Milanowski, (2003) noted that it takes time to accomplish and is therefore often the cause of the problem with slow processes and lack of time to complete the evaluation, given the fact that it was mainly done prior to the first semester of the academic year 2016- 2017 until the researcher, after the assessment of the process suggested for its automation.

It is a well-established fact that schools like Asian College of Technology, is moving towards a more modern approach such as e-learning, computer-aided instructions, evaluations, mobile applications and in several processes. The recent move to make it more accessible is to develop a mobile app and make it work using an Android platform and an Android Operating System that primarily use in smartphones.

The android applications have a preference for the web-based solutions because they are more transformative than the web and are growing at a much faster rate. The mobile application development space is dominated by the smartphones and among the smartphones, 84.7 % comprised of Android-based devices (Amhad, 2016). Information Technology researchers across the continent have seen a massive increase in the use of mobile apps, particularly in the developing countries like the Philippines. It is essential to note that teachers at Asian College of Technology used smartphones in their daily activities. For lessons, presentations, assignments, and notes. It helps them to monitor students' attendance regularly by just visiting the teachers' portal. With these current trends, it is but rightful not to be dependent on ordinary desktop computers and laptops to perform obligations for the improvements of the school wherever they are.

Thus, the researcher assessed the innovated performance evaluation system of the academic heads of Asian College of Technology International Educational Foundation is using the famous Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) of Fred Davis (1989), the and proposed an Android application.

Methodology

There were a total of 172 respondents from the Asian College of Technology International Educational Foundation. These respondents were divided into three groups such as higher administration; academic heads, and the faculty (see Table 1). These respondents were asked to answer an adapted questionnaire which was modified according to the purpose of the study on the innovated academic head performance evaluation system (AHPES) and the perceptions of an ideal AHPES.

Results and discussion
Features

A key measure of the effectiveness of any proposed system is the accuracy and reliability of its information (Markgraf, 2016). According to mallbusiness.chron.com (a business website), the accuracy of the data a system uses and the calculations, it applies to determine the effectiveness of the resulting information. The sources of the data determine whether the information is reliable. Historical performance is often part of the input, and also serves as a good measure of the accuracy and reliability of its output accordingly.

Table 3. Features of the System

	FEATURES	ADMIN	ACAD	FACULTY	INNOVATED	ADMIN	ACAD	FACULTY	PREVIOUS	TOTAL	DV
1	I can easily access the system using smartphones	2.25	2.23	2.24	2.24 (A)	1.93	1.97	1.95	1.95 (A)	2.10	**A**

2	I can complete the evaluation quickly using the system	2.43	2.33	2.36	2.37 (SA)	2.01	1.97	1.98	1.99 (A)	2.18	A
3	I trust the security features of the system	2.56	2.01	2.27	2.28 (A)	1.74	2.24	1.97	1.98 (A)	2.13	A
4	The system provides user authentication	2.47	2.33	2.38	2.39 (SA)	2.05	2.01	2.02	2.03 (A)	2.21	A
5	The system provides completeness of data	2.49	2.32	2.37	2.39 (SA)	2.01	1.99	2.03	2.01 (A)	2.20	A
	Mean	**2.44**	**2.24**	**2.32**	**2.33 (A)**	**1.98**	**2.04**	**1.98**	**1.99 (A)**	**2.16**	A

Legend:

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
DA - Disagree
DV - Descriptive Value

As shown in Table 3, the average weighted mean of the features of the previous system used by Asian College of Technology was 1.99 which could be interpreted as **AGREE** while the Innovated system, on the other hand, had an average weighted mean of 2.33 which could be interpreted as **AGREE.** The result shows that users even though the interpretation shows that they agreed it can be noticed with careful observation of the results that users preferred the features of the Innovated Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System over the previously used system. This is in agreement with Cumiskey and Hjorth, (2013) that the new generation preferred the use of a mobile application to help them make the transaction easier with accurate results and better security.

Functions

Functions are usually among the major consideration in using a certain system. Table 4 shows the responses of the users on the functions of the system for both the previous and the innovated.

Adebayo (2007) explained that the existence of functions is needed to improve and enhance decision making on the issues affecting human and material resources. This includes the productivity an individual employee may attain by using certain management systems. That dedicated employee preferred to do things fast for them to move and do another.

Table 4. Functions of the System

FUNCTIONS	ADMIN	ACAD	FACULTY	INNOVATED	ADMIN	ACAD	FACULTY	PREVIOUS	TOTAL	DV
1 Can effectively complete evaluation using	2.35	2.43	2.55	2.44 (SA)	2.09	2.10	2.11	2.10 (A)	2.27 (A)	Agree

	the system.									
2	Can complete evaluation quickly using the system	2.50	2.20	2.36	2.35 (SA)	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00 (A)	2.18 (A)	**Agree**
3	Can efficiently complete head evaluation using the system.	2.68	2.03	2.35	2.35 (SA)	2.03	2.00	2.00	2.01 (A)	2.18 (A)	**Agree**
4	Became productive quickly using the system.	2.34	2.14	2.25	2.24 (A)	1.95	2.00	1.97	1.97 (A)	2.10 (A)	**Agree**
5	The information is effective in helping the user to complete the tasks and scenarios	2.43	2.23	2.33	2.33 (A)	1.75	2.31	2.03	2.03 (A)	2.18 (A)	**Agree**
	Mean	**2.46**	**2.21**	**2.37**	**2.34 (SA)**	**1.96**	**2.08**	**2.02**	**2.02 (A)**	**2.18 (A)**	**Agree**

Legend:

SA	-	Strongly Agree
A	-	Agree
DA	-	Disagree
DV	-	Descriptive Value

In Table 4, displays the responses of the users of the systems in the previous and the innovated as to the functions of the systems. In the previous system, it has an average mean of 2.02 which could be interpreted as **AGREE** while the innovated system users **STRONGLY AGREED** to its functions as they rated the predictors with an average mean of 2.34 (Strongly Agree). The difference as shown in the Table was clear that respondents summing up the two could do more regarding productivity than the previous system. The innovated system helped them to improve their productivity without sacrificing their other duties such as evaluating their academic heads for the betterment of the organization.

User Satisfaction

User satisfaction responses determine how satisfied are the users with the previous system given some certain criteria. The users' responses to their satisfaction of the previous and the innovated system are displayed in Table 5.

.

Management theorists underscore the importance of satisfaction for success in any undertaking, whether its business or in information technology through management systems (Kennedy and Schneide, 2000). It is through the satisfaction that a user will continue to accept and use the systems

Table 5. User Satisfaction

USER SATISFACTION		ADMIN	ACAD	FACULTY	INNOVATED	ADMIN	ACAD	FACULTY	PREVIOUS	TOTAL	DV
1	I am satisfied with how easy to use the system	2.41	2.33	2.38	2.37 (SA)	2.14	2.21	2.17	2.17(A)	2.27 (A)	**Agree**
2	I feel confident in using the academic head performance evaluation system	2.43	2.14	2.28	2.28 (A)	2.00	2.09	2.04	2.04 (A)	2.16 (A)	**Agree**
3	I can accomplish the evaluation quickly using this system	2.25	2.34	2.31	2.30 (A)	2.00	2.02	1.99	2.00 (A)	2.15 (A)	**Agree**
4	I am satisfied with how the system functions	2.47	2.01	2.25	2.24 (A)	2.02	1.99	2.01	2.01 (A)	2.13 (A)	**Agree**
5	I can access the evaluation online at any time; thus provides convenience for me	2.23	2.18	2.28	2.23 (A)	1.97	2.08	2.01	2.02 (A)	2.13 (A)	**Agree**
Mean		**2.36**	**2.20**	**2.30**	**2.29 (A)**	**2.03**	**2.08**	**2.04**	**2.05 (A)**	**2.17 (A)**	**Agree**

Legend:

SA	-	Strongly Agree
A	-	Agree
DA	-	Disagree

As shown in Table 5, users were still satisfied with the previous system with an average mean of 2.05 which could be interpreted as **AGREE.** However, it can be noticed that it differs as to the mean. With the innovated system, as to satisfaction level, users were satisfied with an average mean of 2.29 which could be

interpreted as **AGREE**. However, much higher than the previous system.

Perception of the users on the innovated academic heads performance evaluation system as to tam

Seigel (2008) in citing Davis (1985) wrote that Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), a model that describes user determinants for technological acceptance based on perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use in deciding whether or not they will use the technology. In this study, users were asked to evaluate the innovated Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System of Asian College of Technology International Educational Foundation regarding perceived usefulness, perceived, ease of use and its behavioral intention to use the system.

Perceived Usefulness

Usefulness of an application refers to the comfort ability of the system to provide notifications and information to the user (Salman et al., 2014). In this study, the users were asked to evaluate the perceived usefulness of the innovated academic head performance evaluation system.

As presented in Table 6, the users find it comfortable using the innovated academic head performance evaluation system with an average mean of 3.06 which could be interpreted as **USEFUL.** The overall result of the survey supports Davis (1989) as cited by Sun et al. (2013) which specifically mentioned that the perceived usefulness would always rely on the degree to which a person using the system is comfortable and believes that it would enhance his or her performance. Further, the Since what users are up to here is to increase productivity as explained by Adebayo (2007) and that the proposed system will not hinder the effective performance of their duty. This observation is supported by the results given in Table 4, the functions of the system to which we could say that as perceived by the respondents in this study, with an interpretation of STRONGLY AGREE, we can conclude that the innovated system help them improve productivity which is one primary objective in developing a system like this Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System.

This implies that users perceived the innovated system as useful in improving the performance of their academic heads.

Table 6. Perceived Usefulness

	Perceived Usefulness	VGE	GE	ME	LE	Mean	DV
		4	3	2	1		
1	It is comfortable using the system	74	68	27	3	3.24	**Useful**
2	Easy to learn how to use the system.	54	99	18	1	3.20	**Useful**
3	The system gives error messages that clearly tell how to fix problems.	53	78	34	7	3.03	**Useful**
4	Recovery is easy and quick.	48	80	34	10	2.97	**Useful**
5	The information provided by this system is clear such as online help, on-screen messages, and other documentation.	47	87	31	7	3.01	**Useful**
6	The organization of information on the system screens is clear.	47	87	33	5	3.02	**Useful**
7	Using the interface of this system is more likeable.	48	75	40	9	2.94	**Useful**
	MEAN					**3.06**	**Useful**

Legend:

VU	-	Very Useful
U	-	Useful
SU	-	Somewhat Useful
NU	-	Not Useful

Perceived Ease of Use

The users' responses to the perceived ease of use are presented in Table 7.

Perceived ease of use as hypothesized by Davis (1993) and mentioned Seigel, (2008) refers to the degree to which the individual believes that using the system would require little or no mental and physical effort. This would mean that whether the use of the system would really easy and not to add burden on the part of the users (Marangunic´ and Granic, 2014). As shown in the Table, the average mean of the predictors was 3.08 which could be interpreted as **EASY TO USE**. It could be understood based on the given data presented in Table 7 that the Innovated system is easy to use and likable thus attract users to further use the system. The result presented in Table 7 could be interpreted about the features in Table 3 and functions in Table 4 which respondents agreed and preferred the innovated system.

Table 7. Perceived Ease of Use

	VEU	EU	SEU	NEU	Mean	DV
Perceived Ease of Use	4	3	2	1		
1 Satisfied with how easy to use the system.	55	84	32	1	3.12	Easy to Use
2 It is simple to use the system.	54	92	24	2	3.12	Easy to Use
3 It is easy to learn to use the system.	50	92	27	3	3.15	Easy to Use
4 It is easy to find the information needed.	48	82	39	3	3.1	Easy to Use
5 The information provides for the system is easy to understand	54	81	34	3	3.02	Easy to Use
6 The interface of the system is pleasant	48	82	37	5	3.08	Easy to Use
7 The system has all the functions and capabilities that the user is expecting to have.	60	78	27	7	3.01	Easy to Use
8 I would find the system to be flexible to interact with	55	78	28	11	3.11	Easy to Use
MEAN					**3.08**	**Easy to Use**

Legend:

VEU - Very Easy to Use
EU - Easy to Use
SEU - Somewhat Easy to Use
NEU - Not Easy to Useful

Perceived ease of use as hypothesized by Davis (1993) and mentioned Seigel, (2008) refers to the degree to which the individual believes that using the system would require little or no mental and physical effort. This would mean that whether the use of the system would really easy and not to add burden on the part of the users (Marangunic´ and Granic, 2014). As shown in the Table, the average mean of the predictors was 3.08 which could be interpreted as **EASY TO USE**. It could be understood based on the given data presented in Table 7 that the Innovated system is easy to use and likable thus attract users to further use the system. The result presented in Table 7 could be interpreted about the features in Table 3 and functions in Table 4 which respondents agreed and preferred the innovated system.

With all the positive responds from the respondents of this study, it can be pointed out not mentioning the result of Table 5 (User Satisfaction) that all the respondents were satisfied and are therefore easy to use base on the features and its functions.

Behavioral Intention to Use

TAM postulates that user behavior in using any system is determined by the behavioral intent (Knight, 2004). This Behavioral intent is commonly termed as Behavioral Intention to Use Technology. It is defined as the degree to which a person has formulated conscious plans to perform or not perform some specified future behavior as explained by Davis (1989) and cited by Fathema, Shannon, and Ross (2015).

As displayed in Table 8, it presents the users' responses to the behavioral intention to use the innovated academic head performance evaluation system of Asian College of Technology International Educational Foundation.

In Table 8, it shows the users' behavioral intention to use the innovated system which by the users' perception got an average weighted mean of **3.20** which could be interpreted as HIGH ATTITUDE.

This affirms that if users find a specific technology as a useful one (PU) as shown in **Table 6**, then they develop a positive intention of using it (Fathema, et al., 2015).

Table 8. Behavioral Intention to Use
(n=172)

Behavioral Intention to Use	VHA	HA	LA	VLA	Mean	DV
	4	3	2	1		
1. I intend to use the system in the future	73	76	17	6	3.26	Very High Attitude
2. I expect my use of the system in the future	55	93	19	5	3.15	High Attitude
3. It is worth it to use the evaluation system	70	78	19	5	3.24	High Attitude
4. Given that I have access to the system at anywhere, I plan to use it	67	78	20	6	3.20	High Attitude
5. I predict I would use the system in the next two (2) semesters	58	86	21	7	3.13	High Attitude
Mean					**3.20**	**High Attitude**

Legend:

VHA	-	Very High Attitude
HA	-	High Attitude
LA	-	Low Attitude
VLA	-	Very Low Attitude

It could be said that the predictors had the same interpretation (basically the same behavioral intention to use) with regards to the overall average weighted mean. Further, Fathema et al. (2015) study further affirm our findings as shown in Table 8 that if users have the intention to use a specific technology then they use it.

Also, the behavioral intention of the users to continually use the system could help in the future improvement of the innovated system.

Summary of the perception of the users on the innovated academic heads performance evaluation system

In Table 9, from among the three indicators, perceived ease of use and behavioral intention to use. A system is said to be timely if it can deliver the needed task in a short period.

Table 9. Summary of Results on the Perception of the Users on the Innovated Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System

	Average Mean	Interpretation
Perceived Usefulness	3.06	Useful
Perceived Ease of Use	3.08	Easy to Use
Behavioral Intention to Use	3.20	High Attitude
Over all Mean =	**3.11**	**Acceptable**

3.11 with a verbal interpretation of **acceptable**. The overall average mean implies that using TAM the system is acceptable to the users and the difference

between the means only proves that users reserved a room for improvements and that the Innovated system could be improved depending on the users' need.

Thus, improvements to perfect the innovated system must continue.

Significant difference between the previous and the innovated performance evaluation system

This section presents and interprets the results of the tests of the hypothesis. The data are presented in Table 10 showing the decision and the conclusion to the hypothesis.

The gathered data were processed further to determine if there is a significant difference between the previous and Innovated Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System. A t-Test was used to determine the significant difference set at significance level of 0.05. The following are the details of the hypothesis testing.

Table 10. Result of the Test of Hypothesis at α = 0.05 Level of Significance

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances

	Innovated	Previous
Mean	2.320155	2.020543
Variance	0.004401	0.003085
Observations	15	15
Pooled Variance	0.003743	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	28	
t Stat	13.41128	
P(T<=t) one-tail	5.18E-14	
t Critical one-tail	1.701131	
P(T<=t) two-tail	1.04E-13	
t Critical two-tail	2.048407	

Decision: Reject the Null Hypothesis

Table 10 presented the significant difference between the previous and the innovated Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System. The findings show that the difference could be traced back on the respondents' experience with the previous and the innovated system based on the features, functions and user satisfaction shown in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Thus, it is important to note that the difference exists between the functions and features of both systems which the respondents preferred to boost productivity as Adebayo's (2007) findings would tell us that the existence of functions and a features are needed to improve and enhance decision whether or not to use or not to use a system. In deciding, it includes the productivity an individual employee may attain by using certain management systems. That dedicated employee preferred to do things fast for them to move and do another.

The decision as shown in Table 10 to reject the null hypothesis is supported by the different results mentioned earlier in the discussion of the features, functions and user satisfaction.

Conclusion

There is a need to shift from web-based design to a mobile application and adopt the Innovated Technology Model of the Academic Heads Performance Evaluation System using an Android platform that would operate through smartphones for evaluation. The new mobile application would help the employees evaluate their academic heads with lesser time consumptions which would lead to the productivity of every faculty for the benefit of all shareholders. This statement can be based on the result on the respondents' perception using the famous Technology Acceptance Model of Davis (1989) which the researcher used to evaluate the innovated system which turns out that the innovated system is easy to use and very useful. With this, the respondents who will become the users of the system based on table 8 will positively use the system when it is fully implemented.

References:

1. Adebayo, F.A. (2007). *Management Information System for Managers*. Ado-Ekiti: Green Line Publishers.
2. Aguinis, H. (2007). *Performance management*. Printice Hall. London.
3. Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived Behavioral Control, Self-efficacy, Locus of Control and the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Social Psychology. 32,* 665-683.
4. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2004). Questions Raised by a Reasoned Action Approach: Comment on Ogden (2003). *Health Psychology, 23(4)*, 431- 434.
5. Cleveland, J., Landy, F. J., & Zedeck, S. (1983). *Performance measurement and theory*.Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
6. Danielson, C., & McGreal, T.L. (2000). *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice, Educational Testing Service*, Princeton, NJ.
7. Davis, F.D., & Venkatesh, V. (2004). Toward preprototype user acceptance testing of new information systems: Implications for software project management. *IEEE Trans. Eng. Manage., 51,* pp.31-46.
8. Davis, F.D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Q., 13*: 319-340.
9. Davis, F.D. (2002). User acceptance of information technology: System characteristics, user perceptions and behavioral impacts. *Int. J. Man-Mach. Stud., 38*: 475-487. DOI: 10.1006/imms.2002.1022
10. Elmore, R.F., & Fuhrman, S.H. (2001). *Research finds the false assumption of accountability*.
11. Grote, R. C. (2002). *The complete guide to performance appraisal*. New York: AMACOM.
12. Grote, R. C. (2002). *The performance appraisal question and answer book: A survival guide for managers*. New York: American Management Association.
13. Heneman, H.G. III, & Milanowski, A.T. (2003). "Continuing assessment of teacher reactions to a standards-based teacher evaluation system", *Vol. 17 No. 2,* pp. 173-95.
14. Lansbury, R. (1988). *Performance Management*. A Process Approach. Hum. Resour. Manag. Australia, 46-55.
15. McColl-Kennedy, J., & Schneider, U. (2000). Measuring customer satisfaction: why, what and how. *Total Quality Management, 11 (7)*, pp.1-14.
16. Mujtaba, B. G. (2008). *Coaching and Performance Management: Developing and Inspiring Leaders.* ILEAD Academy Publications.
17. Naidu, A., Joubert, R., Mestry, R., Mosoge, J., & Ngcobo, T. (2008). *Education management and leadership: a South African perspective.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
18. Rao, T. V. (2008). *Performance appraisal theory and practice.* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
19. Pulakos, E.D. (2004). *Performance Management: A roadmap for developing, implementing and evaluating performance management systems.* SHRM Foundation. (Pages 2-3)
20. Owolabi, F.O. (2005). *Performance management – Multi-disciplinary perspective.* Nigeria: Lagos Macmillan.
21. Sanda, A.O. (2008). *Understanding higher education administration in Nigeria,* Ibadan, Fact Finders International.
22. Stronge, J.H., & Tucker, P.D. (2003). *Teacher Evaluation. Assessing and Improving Performance, Eye on Education*, Larchmont, NY.
23. White, A. (2008). *Managing academic performance: Understanding development in the academic environment*. Guardian News and Media Limited.1–29.
24. Wilson, J.P. (2005). *Human Resource Development*: 2nd edition. Kogan Page. London.
25. Aboelmaged, M.G., & Gebba, T.R. (2013). Mobile Banking Adoption: An Examination of Technology Acceptance Model and Theory of Planned Behavior. *International Journal of Business Research and Development ISSN 1929-0977. Vol. 2 No. 1*, pp. 35-50.
26. Conry, T., & Kemper, J. (1993). Performance evaluations: Bridging the gap betweentoday's goals and tomorrow's reality. *CUPA Journal, 44*(3), 29-33.
27. Creamer, D. G., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (1999). The performance appraisal paradox: An essential but neglected student affairs staffing function. *NASPA Journal, 36*(4), 248-263.
28. Fathema, N., et al. (2015). Expanding The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to Examine Faculty Use of Learning Management Systems (LMSs) In Higher Education Institutions. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, Vol. 11, No. 2, June 2015*.

29. Frase, L.E., & Streshly, W. (1994). "Lack of accuracy, feedback and commitment in teacher evaluation", *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, Vol. 8 No. 1,* pp. 47-57.

30. Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 74*(4), 473.

31. Knight, S. A. (2004). *"TAM & the Internet: An Investigation into the changing face of the TAM and its application to Internet Search Engines".* Proc. Of the 5th working with e-Business Conference; Nov 2004. Perth, Western Australia.

32. Marangunic´, N., & Granic, A. (2014). Technology acceptance model: a literature review from 1986 to 2013. *Univ Access Inf Soc, 14*: 81–95.

33. Siegel, D. (2008). *Accepting Technology and Overcoming Resistance to Change Using the Motivation and Acceptance Model.* UMI Microform 3319274, ProQuest LLC 2008.

34. Shah, J. B., & Murphy, J. (1995). Performance appraisals for improved productivity. *Journal of Management in Engineering, 11*(2), 26.

35. Franzen, K.A. (2003). Critical overview of trends and practices in performance management in South African Higher Education Environment. *SAJHE, 7(3)*: 131−138.

36. Oslow, A.D. (2007). Performance mangement and academic workload in higher education. *African Journal for Higher Education*, 74–81.

37. Amoroso, D. (2004). *Development of an Instrument to Measure the Acceptance of Internet Technology by Consumers.* San Diego State University.

38. Flaniken, F. W. (2009). *Performance Appraisal Systems in Higher Education*: An Exploration of Christian institutions.

39. Gao, S. (2011). *Developing an instrument to measure the adoption of mobile services.* Department of Management, University of Nebraska Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA

40. Ku, C. S. (2009). *Extending the Technology Acceptance Model Using Perceived User Resources in Higher Education Web Based Online Learning Courses*. University of Central Florida.

41. Tinuke, F. M. (2015). *Dimensions of Academic Staff Performance Appraisal in Selected Public University* in Nigeria.

42. Karanasios, S., & Allen, D. (2014). Mobile technology in mobile work: Contradictions and congruencies in activity systems. *European Journal of Information Systems, 23*(5), 529-542. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2014.20 https://search.proquest.com/docview/1558477555?accountid=147155

43. (n.d.). Phi Delta Kappan, 83(1): 67-72. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from http://www.gare.cree-inter.net/sites/default/files/Elmore%20et%20Fuhrman%20-%202001%20-%20Research%20finds%20the%20false%20assumption%20of%20accountabil.pdf

44. Salman, A., Abdullah, M. Y. H., Aziz, J., Ahmad, A. L., & Kee, C. P. (2014). Remodelling technology acceptance model (tam) in explaining user acceptance towards information and communication technology. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 7*(1), 159-171. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1535965611?accountid=147155

45. Wong, G. K., & W. (2016). The behavioral intentions of hong kong primary teachers in adopting educational technology. *Educational Technology, Research and Development, 64*(2), 313-338. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9426-9 https://search.proquest.com/docview/1774731122?accountid=147155