e-ISSN: 2600-7568

PENERBIT PRESS
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

Available online at
https://journal.uitm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/

GADING Journal for the Social Sciences 29(2) 2026, 445 – 455

GADING Journal for the Social Sciences

Artificial Intelligence Acceptance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Job Performance among Academicians at UiTM Cawangan Pahang: An Exploratory Factor Analysis

Sharifah Norhuda Syed Wahid[1], Mastura Mohamad[2*], Hazlin Hasan[3]
Juhaida Ismail[4], Siti Fazilah Hamid[5], Nor Tasnim Syahera Rasak[6]

[1,4]*Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang, 26400 Bandar Tin Abdul Razak Jengka, Pahang, Malaysia.*
[2,3]*Faculty of Business and Management Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang, 26400 Bandar Tun Abdul Razak Jengka, Pahang, Malaysia.*
[5]*Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Selangor, 42300 Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.*
[6]*Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Perak, 32610 Seri Iskandar, Perak, Malaysia.*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received	08 March 2026
Revised	28 September 2026
Accepted	22 October 2026
Online first	31 October 2026
Published	31 October 2026

Keywords:
artificial intelligence
uncertainty avoidance
job performance
exploratory factor analysis

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.24191/gading.v29i2.833

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study evaluated the validity and reliability of a modified Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) incorporating Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) and Job Performance (JP) among academicians at Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan Pahang. Data were gathered through online questionnaires distributed to 32 academicians across 11 faculties in a pilot study using stratified random sampling. The measurement instrument assessed three main constructs, Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence (AI), comprising Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEoU), UA, and JP. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation confirmed strong construct validity. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures were satisfactory across all constructs (AI Acceptance = 0.867, UA = 0.899, JP = 0.903), with significant Bartlett's tests of sphericity ($p < 0.001$). All items demonstrated factor loadings above the 0.60 threshold. The total variance explained exceeded the 60% benchmark for AI Acceptance (96.39%), UA (92.81%), and JP (88.82%). Reliability testing yielded exceptionally high Cronbach's alpha coefficients for PU (0.997), PEoU (0.986), UA (0.980), and JP (0.981), demonstrating robust internal consistency. The findings confirm that the adapted instrument is valid and reliable for large-scale data collection to investigate the impact of AI acceptance on job performance, with uncertainty avoidance as a moderating factor.

1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) in education is expanding, offering new tools for teaching, research, and administrative tasks. Understanding how academicians accept these technologies is crucial, especially considering individual differences in uncertainty avoidance, which can affect their attitudes

[2*] Corresponding author. Mastura Mohamad. *E-mail address*: masturamohdd@uitm.edu.my

toward AI. Existing research has explored the factors that drive the acceptance of AI technology, highlighting the importance of user expectations and experiences (Yi & Choi, 2023). Other studies have examined the impact of personal factors, such as personality traits and AI anxiety, on attitudes toward artificial intelligence (Kaya et al., 2022). However, limited research has examined the specific context of academicians and the role of uncertainty avoidance in shaping their acceptance and perceptions of AI.

The ability for a digital computer or computer-controlled robot to carry out functions typical of intelligent people is termed artificial intelligence (AI). The term is often employed as the work of generating artificial intelligence systems that include human cognitive qualities, such as reasoning, meaning-finding, generalisation, and experience-based learning. Studies demonstrate how AI may improve instructional strategies, support customised learning, and boost administrative effectiveness (Luckin et al., 2016). Hofstede's (1980) concept of uncertainty avoidance (UA) culture, which implies a certain degree of uneasiness that people might feel in ambiguous situations, has value when discussing the implications of AI. Academicians, known for their rigorous and analytical approach to research, may exhibit varying levels of uncertainty avoidance, which could influence their acceptance of AI and its impact on their job performance.

Understanding the aspects that determine artificial intelligence's acceptance and impact on job performance has become increasingly important as it is integrated into numerous industries (Kencebay, 2019; Kaya et al., 2022; Hughes et al., 2019). According to Gartner (2024), 42% of workers are worried that AI may replace them in their current positions, while 58% of workers are hopeful that AI will enhance their job performance. Furthermore, Hanowell and Richardson (2024) also reported that 85% of employees think that AI will affect their jobs in the next two to three years. This situation happened because workers have limited knowledge about the benefits of AI (Bearman et al., 2023). Bearman et al. (2023) reported that many academics are unaware of the applications and benefits of artificial intelligence, which inhibits them from using it in their teaching and research efforts.

According to Baskaran et al. (2020), employee performance is greatly impacted by AI, which can have both beneficial and negative effects on the company. Al-Zubaidi et al. (2024) reported that when universities provide resources such as AI training, technical support, and workshops, faculty members are more likely to adopt AI tools, thus, there might be an effect on the job performance of its faculty members. The notion is further supported by George and Wooden (2023) who stated that faculty members are more willing to accept AI if they see their colleagues using it and improving their job performance. It was also found that AI directly affects job performance within certain conditions and specific experiences that characterise the employees in the organisation (Abusalma, 2021).

As for the UA, understanding how it impacts the acceptance of AI among academicians is vital as it could help them deal with any anxiety that could affect their job performance through suitable coping mechanisms (Hofstede, 1980). When a person feels threatened by uncertain situations, and in this case, the need to use AI in the workplace, there is a high likelihood that the person would avoid using it (Hofstede, 1991). As stated by Müller et al., (2018), employee reluctance to implement AI technology may exist in cultures with high levels of UA, which could restrict the potential gains in job performance that AI can provide.

Therefore, it is relevant for this research to investigate and understand the academician's perspective and the level of acceptance of AI in teaching and learning to overcome the challenges brought by AI applications. The use of AI applications depends mainly on their acceptance as already shown by the previous studies. Due to the increasing adoption of AI applications in educational settings, this study used the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to examine the acceptance of AI among academicians at UiTM Cawangan Pahang. The findings indicate that the adapted instrument is valid and reliable for large-scale data collection to explore the impact of AI acceptance on job performance, with uncertainty avoidance as a moderating factor.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence (AI) among Academicians (TAM)

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) offers a reliable structure for comprehending the acceptance of AI among scholars, particularly through the dimensions of Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEoU) (Na et al., 2022). Empirical data indicates that PU is the extent to which academicians believe AI enhances their teaching, research, and administrative functions consistently influences AI adoption significantly (Ayanwale et al., 2022). In recent years, the TAM has expanded to incorporate other elements such as trust and social influence to more effectively explore AI uptake in academic environments (Kelly et al., 2023). TAM's emphasis on PU and PEoU has been criticised for oversimplifying the intricate decision-making processes associated with AI adoption, especially in academia, where issues such as data protection, ethical considerations, and job security are also paramount (Dahabreh, 2023).

However, TAM continues to be significant in exploring the initial acceptance of AI and its inadequacies in addressing the dynamic issues of AI adoption in education have been acknowledged. Research highlights the necessity for more extensive frameworks that account for cultural and contextual variances, particularly as AI technologies grow and become integrated into academic processes. In addition, PU could predict AI utilisation; at this point concerns around job displacement and the ethics of AI-driven recommendations profoundly affect researchers' perceptions and utilisation of AI in their professional activities.

2.2 Perceived Ease of Use (PEoU) as a Dimension of TAM (Davis, 1989)

A dimension of the TAM is Perceived Ease of Use (PEoU), which is a significant factor of technology acceptance among academicians, as demonstrated by Davis et al. in the late 1980s (Davis et al., 1989). In addition, PEoU represents the Perceived Ease of Use of technology among academics during its adoption and application. In academic environments, PEoU may affect the early attitudes on the adoption of new tools, such as learning management systems, AI-driven research instruments, and online teaching platforms (Almogren et al., 2024). Thus, the academicians are more likely to embrace these technologies when they perceive them as user-friendly and seamlessly integrable into their regular routines (Gupta et al., 2024). Past researchers, Venkatesh and Davis (2000) found that PEoU explained 26% of the variance in users' intentions to embrace new technologies, highlighting its substantial impact in educational environments marked by time limitations and workload difficulties.

PEoU serves as a significant predictor of technology acceptance among academicians, though its impact may change with increased familiarity with the technology. A study by Holden and Karsh (2010) found that while PEoU significantly influenced the initial adoption of specialised academic tools, its impact diminished as users gained proficiency, with PU and other factors, such as institutional support, becoming more prominent. This indicates that in academic environments, the creation of user-friendly technologies is crucial, especially during the initial phases of implementation. Minimising complexity and providing support can enhance the PEoU among academicians, thereby fostering broader acceptance and successful integration of new technologies into academic workflows.

2.3 Perceived Usefulness (PU)

AI is revolutionising a variety of fields, including education. Academics are progressively using AI technologies in their teaching, research, and administrative activities. One important aspect impacting the adoption of these technologies is Perceived Usefulness (PU), which is defined as an individual's belief that utilising a specific system improves their job performance (Davis, 1989).

PU is a key component of the TAM, which holds that people are more inclined to adopt technology if they believe it will help them in their jobs (Davis, 1989). In academia, the perceived value of AI can emerge in a variety of ways, including improved research productivity, more student engagement, and better administrative assistance.

2.4 Uncertainty Avoidance as a Dimension of Culture (Hofstede)

The researchers decided to use Hofstede's Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) cultural dimension (Hofstede, 1980) which is best known to many researchers who have relied on his work to make meaningful comparisons between nation groups. UA is defined as how a society accommodates uncertainty and ambiguity in the environment (Hofstede, 1980). Hofstede (1980) further described that "uncertainty-avoiding cultures shun ambiguous situations and people in such cultures look for structure in their organisations, institutions and relationships, which makes events clearly interpretable and predictable" (p.148). Hofstede (1980) stressed that since uncertainty can sometimes cause anxiety in humans, all societies have developed ways of coping with this anxiety. These mechanisms include technology, law, and religion.

In short, UA has a big impact on the attitudes towards change and risk of a society, and their subsequent behaviours and beliefs. Societies that have a high level of UA are likely to adhere very strongly to their established rules and procedures. The culture emphasises rules, structure, and stability to reduce ambiguity and control predictability as much as possible. On the contrary, the cultures which embrace low UA welcome change and have a more relaxed approach to the unknown, encourage tolerance, less rigidity and foster creativity. Understanding how UA impacts the acceptance of AI among the academicians in the educational systems is vital, not only in terms of the academicians' job performance but also for maintaining and creating an ethical working environment as it should.

2.5 Job Performance

Job performance is critical to organisational success, as it influences productivity, efficiency, and overall effectiveness. In academic settings, job performance is key to achieving institutional goals, however, factors like work stress and workload can hinder academics' ability to perform optimally (Amri et al., 2021). AI has been shown to improve job performance by automating administrative tasks, streamlining research, and boosting decision-making. Specifically, AI tools can reduce the time spent on repetitive tasks, which allows academics to focus on higher-level activities, thus increasing efficiency and productivity (Laxmi & Leela, 2023). However, for AI to truly enhance academic job performance, institutions must offer adequate training and support to help faculty effectively adopt and integrate these tools (Baskara, 2024).

TAM highlights that the adoption of AI in academia is primarily driven by PU and PEoU. In fact, academics are more likely to adopt AI if they believe it will improve their job performance and if the tools are easy to use (Davis, 1989; Ayanwale et al., 2022). As academics become more familiar with AI, the PU of the tools becomes the main factor driving their continued use, rather than ease of use (Wang & Chen, 2024).

3. METHOD

All selected academicians were sent online surveys via the Google Form platform using the list of academicians' phone numbers and email addresses provided by Administrative Department of Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Pahang. Prior to conducting the actual survey, the researchers conducted a pilot study to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire among 32 selected academicians at Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang. The respondents were selected through stratified random sampling across 11 different faculties. A pilot study was conducted to assess the internal consistency of all questionnaire items and determine the dimension of each component based on Cronbach's Alpha value, factor loading, total variation explained, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity.

This study adapted instruments developed by several previous researchers and modified certain items to suit the context of the current study. According to Awang (2010; 2012), Hoque and Awang (2016) and Howard (2016), when an instrument is adapted and its statements are modified into new items, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) procedure should be conducted. This is because items that were suitable for previous studies may not be suitable in a different research context. Based on the recommendations of

these studies, the criteria for EFA included a significant Bartlett's test of sphericity (p-value < 0.05), a minimum Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of 0.6, at least 60% of the total variance explained and factor loading above 0.6 for each item. In addition, the internal reliability of the instrument was measured using Cronbach's Alpha, with a minimum acceptable value of 0.6. In line with the recommendations of previous studies (Awang, 2010; 2012; Hoque & Awang, 2016; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011), the researcher conducted Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on the items measuring each respective construct.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections: Part A consisted of questions on respondents' demographic profile; Part B comprised 12 items measuring academicians' acceptance of AI adapted from TAM questionnaire. Part C contained five items measuring academicians' uncertainty avoidance, adapted from Hofstede's (1980; 1991) questionnaires. Meanwhile, Part D consisted of eight items assessing academicians' job performance, adapted from Abbasi et al. (2022). All the items were measured using an interval scale ranging from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 10 indicating "strongly agree." The data were analysed using IBM-Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS) software version 26.

6. CONCLUSION

4.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for the "Acceptance of AI" Construct

The Acceptance of AI construct was measured using two components: Component 1 (Perceived Usefulness containing six items labelled as pu1 to pu6) and Component 2 (Perceived Ease of Use with six items labelled as peu1 to peu6) and. The mean scores and standard deviations for each item are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviation for the "Acceptance of AI" Construct

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
peu1	7.438	1.983
peu2	7.281	2.052
peu3	7.438	2.031
peu4	7.469	1.934
peu5	7.875	2.028
peu6	7.438	2.031
pu1	7.844	1.986
pu2	7.844	2.065
pu3	7.781	2.310
pu4	7.813	2.070
pu5	7.844	2.081
pu6	7.844	2.081

An EFA procedure using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax Rotation was conducted on the 12 items. The findings revealed that Bartlett's Test value is significant (p-value < 0.001) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.867, exceeding the minimum value of 0.6. Both findings reflect that the data is eligible for further EFA procedures. In addition, the total estimated variance is important to determine the percentage of the items built that can measure a study construct. Table 2 shows the total variance estimated by the items used for the Acceptance of AI construct. The analysis found that Component 1 measures 86.826% of the construct, and Component 2 measures 9.559% of the construct with accumulated total estimated variance for the Acceptance of AI construct is 96.385%. This value exceeds the minimum requirement of 60% meaning that all 12 items for the construct are good for the study. In addition, all items have a factor loading exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.6 as shown in Table 3.

Table 2. Estimated Total Variance Explained for "Acceptance of AI" Construct

Component	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.419	86.826	86.826	6.002	50.018	50.018
2	1.147	9.559	96.385	5.564	46.367	96.385

Table 3. Factor Loadings for the Acceptance of AI Construct

Item	Component 1	Component 2
peu1		0.892
peu2		0.882
peu3		0.907
peu4		0.863
peu5		0.775
peu6		0.817
pu1	0.893	
pu2	0.901	
pu3	0.885	
pu4	0.888	
pu5	0.890	
pu6	0.892	

Another important element to be considered is the reliability value of the items. Instrument reliability was estimated through Cronbach's Alpha, which must exceed the minimum threshold of 0.7 to be accepted for further study. The result indicates that both components have Cronbach's Alpha values exceeding 0.7 and are acceptable for this study (Component 1 = 0.997 and Component 2 = 0.986).

4.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for the "Uncertainty Avoidance" Construct

The Uncertainty Avoidance construct was measured using a single component containing five items labelled as ua1 to ua5. The mean scores and standard deviations for each item of this construct are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviation for the Uncertainty Avoidance Construct

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
ua1	8.000	1.867
ua2	8.000	1.884
ua3	8.000	1.918
ua4	7.438	2.031
ua5	8.000	1.968

An EFA procedure using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax Rotation was conducted on the five items. The findings revealed that Bartlett's Test value is significant (p-value < 0.001) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.899, exceeding the minimum value of 0.6. Both findings reflect that the data is eligible for further EFA procedures. The analysis found that the Uncertainty Avoidance measures estimated total variance explained about 92.811% of the construct which is more than the minimum requirement of 60%. The factor loadings for all five items measuring uncertainty avoidance are presented in Table 5, with all values exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.60.

Table 5. Factor Loadings for the Uncertainty Avoidance Construct

Item	Component 1
ua1	0.980
ua2	0.975
ua3	0.969
ua4	0.920
ua5	0.972

The Cronbach's Alpha value for Uncertainty Avoidance is 0.980, exceeding 0.7 indicating that all five items for Uncertainty Avoidance construct are very good and acceptable for this study.

4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for the "Job Performance" Construct

The Job Performance construct was measured using one component containing eight items labelled as jp1 to jp8. Table 6 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for each item for the Job Performance construct.

Table 6. Mean and Standard Deviation for the Job Performance Construct

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
jp1	8.125	1.845
jp2	8.156	1.816
jp3	7.813	1.731
jp4	7.781	1.641
jp5	7.938	1.645
jp6	7.906	1.748
jp7	7.7189	1.783
jp8	8.000	1.951

An EFA procedure using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax Rotation was conducted on the eight items. The findings revealed that Bartlett's Test value is significant (p-value < 0.001) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.903, exceeding the minimum value of 0.6. The results indicate that the current data is eligible for further EFA procedures. This study found that the estimated total variance by all eight items used is about 88.818% for the Job Performance construct, exceeding the minimum requirement of 60%. In addition, all items have a factor loading exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.6 as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Factor Loadings for the Job Performance Construct

Item	Component 1
jp1	0.913
jp2	0.921
jp3	0.916
jp4	0.961
jp5	0.968
jp6	0.968
jp7	0.950
jp8	0.940

The result for instrument reliability indicates that the component has Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.981, exceeding 0.7 which means that all eight items for Job Performance construct are acceptable for this study.

4.4 Discussion on Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Reliability Analysis

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) results show that the constructs used in this study have high validity and reliability, indicating that the measurement items are appropriate for assessing academicians' acceptance of artificial intelligence (AI), job performance, and uncertainty avoidance. The high factor loadings, strong Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) values, and high Cronbach's Alpha coefficients demonstrate that the measuring items accurately represent their respective constructs and are suitable for future research (Awang, 2010; 2012; Hoque & Awang, 2016).

Furthermore, Howard (2016) also stressed that EFA is an effective technique used to determine the concept of validity and reliability. Based on the finding, factor loadings that are greater than 0.6 and with the acceptable value of KMO, indicate that the questionnaire is appropriate for the actual data collection. Furthermore, the reliability value obtained which is above the level of 0.70 shows good internal consistency among measurement items, indicating that the questionnaire is strong and reliable for further study (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

In a nutshell, the findings of the pilot study indicate that the questionnaire items demonstrated satisfactory validity and reliability, supporting their use in the main study to examine the relationship between AI acceptance and job performance, with uncertainty avoidance serving as a moderating variable among academicians at UiTM Cawangan Pahang.

5. CONCLUSION

The overall results of the study demonstrated an exceptionally high internal consistency of Cronbach's Alpha values and high factor variance confirming that the research instrument is both highly reliable and precise in measuring all the constructs. The study also confirmed that beyond technical ease or utility as indicated in the constructs, AI acceptance also shows a strong influence on uncertainty avoidance. The academicians' acceptance is deeply tied to their cultural comfort with technological change and structured regulations.

As for the job performance, the result suggested that when academicians perceive AI as a valuable tool for teaching, research, and administration, it directly translates into improved professional output. In conclusion, the study conducted has successfully validated a modified Technology Acceptance Model tailored to the academic environment of UiTM Cawangan Pahang. Hence, making it a valid tool for measuring the adoption of AI among the academics of UiTM Cawangan Pahang. Overall, these results provide a reliable foundation for UiTM policy makers to design targeted training and support systems that mitigate cultural resistance and leverage AI to enhance institutional efficiency.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS/FUNDING

This research was supported by Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang through the Geran Penyelidikan Dana Dalam Negeri (DDN) - Geran Special Interest Group (GSIG) 202. No. Fail 600-TNCPI 5/3/DDN (06) (001/2025).

7. CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this research.

8. AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Sharifah Norhuda Syed Wahid: prepared the research methodology, conducted the statistical analysis and interpretation of the results; **Mastura Mohamad:** wrote the abstract, introduction, literature review part as well as finalising the paper; **Hazlin Hasan:** was involved in writing the literature review, conclusion, refining the structure and improving the language quality; **Juhaida Ismail**, **Siti Fazilah Hamid**, **Nor Tasnim Syahera Rasak:** worked collaboratively on collecting data and writing literature reviews.

9. DECLARATION OF THE USE OF GENERATIVE AI

This manuscript was generated with the assistance of Gemini for the purpose of strengthening language, grammar, clarity, academic writing style, and the arrangement of the work. The tool assisted the author(s) in reviewing and refining the content, and the writers are solely responsible for the final version submitted for publication.

10. DATA AVAILABILITY/SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

11. ETHICS STATEMENT

This study received formal ethical approval from the Research Ethics Committee of Universiti Teknologi MARA (Reference Number: REC/05/2026 (ST/MR/93)).

12. REFERENCES

Abusalma, A. (2021). The effect of implementing artificial intelligence on job performance in commercial banks of Jordan. *Management Science Letters*, 2061–2070. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2021.3.003

Almogren, A. S., Al-Rahmi, W. M., & Dahri, N. A. (2024). *Exploring factors influencing the acceptance of ChatGPT in higher education: A smart education perspective*. Heliyon.

Al-Zubaidi, S. M., Muhammad Shaikh, G., Malik, A., Zain Ul Abideen, M., Tareen, J., Alzahrani, N. S. A., … & Ahmed Siddiqui, A. (2024). *Exploring faculty preparedness for artificial intelligence-driven dental education: A multicentre study.* Cureus. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.64377

Amri, R. J., Utami, S., & Chan, S. (2021). The role of work stress in mediating the effect of performance pressure and workload on employee performance in Universitas Muhammadiyah Aceh. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Review, 04*(03). https://doi.org/10.35409/ijbmer.2021.3259

Ayanwale, M. A., Sanusi, I. T., Adelana, O. P., Aruleba, K. D., & Oyelere, S. S. (2022). Teachers' readiness and intention to teach artificial intelligence in schools. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 3*, 100099.

Awang, Z. (2012). *Research methodology and data analysis*. Penerbit Universiti Teknologi MARA Press.

Awang, Z. (2010). *Research Methodology for Business and Social Sciences*. Kelantan: Universiti Teknologi MARA.

Baskara, F. R. (2024). Chatgpt and personalised learning: Reshaping pedagogical approaches in the vuca age. *Jurnal Educative: Journal of Educational Studies, 8*(2), 167. https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v8i2.7620

Baskaran, S., Lay, H. S., Ming, B. S., & Mahadi, N. (2020). Technology adoption and employee's job performance: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarems/v9-i1/7443

Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education, 86*(2), 369-385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2

Dahabreh, F. M. (2023). *The continued usage of artificial intelligence in the United Arab Emirates public sector organisations: An extended information system success model* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northumbria at Newcastle (United Kingdom).

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319-340.

Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). Technology acceptance model. *J Manag Sci, 35*(8), 982-1003.

Gartner. (2024, September 11). *Gartner survey shows 58% of finance functions using AI in 2024*. https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2024-09-11-gartner-survey-shows-58-percent-of-finance-functions-use-ai-in-2024

George, B., & Wooden, O. (2023). Managing the strategic transformation of higher education through artificial intelligence. *Administrative Sciences, 13*(9), 196. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13090196

Gupta, A. K., Aggarwal, V., Sharma, V., & Naved, M. (2024). Education 4.0 and Web 3.0 Technologies Application for enhancement of distance learning management Systems in the Post–COVID-19 ERa. In *The Role of Sustainability and Artificial Intelligence in Education Improvement* (pp. 66-86). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Hanowell, B., & Richardson, N. (2024, June 10). *Most workers think AI will affect their jobs. They disagree on how.* ADP Research. https://www.adpresearch.com/worker-sentiment-ai-impact/

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.* Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Organizations and Cultures: Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Holden, R. J., & Karsh, B. T. (2010). The technology acceptance model: Its past and its future in health care. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 43*(1), 159-172.

Hoque, A. S. M. M., & Awang, Z. (2016). The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of Entrepreneurial Marketing Scale - Development and Validation. *Tourism Conference 20-22 APRIL 2016* (p. 22). Proceedings of the International Social Sciences and Tourism Research Conference 2026.

Howard, M. C. (2016). A review of exploratory factor analysis decisions and overview of current practices: What we are doing and how can we improve? *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 32*(1), 51–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2015.1087664

Hughes, C., Robert, L., Frady, K. and Arroyos, A. (2019). *"Artificial Intelligence, Employee Engagement, Fairness, and Job Outcomes", Managing technology and middle- and low-skilled employees (The changing context of managing people)*. Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 61 68. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-077-720191005

Kaya, F., Aydin, F., Schepman, A., Rodway, P., Yetişensoy, O., & Demir Kaya, M. (2022). The roles of personality traits, ai anxiety, and demographic factors in attitudes toward artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 40*(2), 497–514. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2151730

Kelly, S., Kaye, S. A., & Oviedo-Trespalacios, O. (2023). What factors contribute to the acceptance of artificial intelligence? A systematic review. *Telematics and Informatics, 77*, 101925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2022.101925

Kencebay, B. (2019). User acceptance of driverless vehicles and robots with aspect of personal economy. *Journal of Transnational Management, 24*(4), 283–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/15475778.2019.1664234

Laxmi M, Dr. Leela M H. (2023). A study on impact of artificial intelligence on employee's performance. *European Economic Letters (EEL), 13*(4), 1248–1255. Retrieved from https://www.eelet.org.uk/index.php/journal/article/view/819

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.

Müller, J. M., Kiel, D., & Voigt, K.-I. (2018). What drives the implementation of industry 4.0? The role of opportunities and challenges in the context of sustainability. *Sustainability*, 10(1), 247. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10010247

Na, S., Heo, S., Han, S., Shin, Y., & Roh, Y. (2022). Acceptance model of artificial intelligence (AI)-based technologies in construction firms: Applying the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) in combination with the Technology–Organisation–Environment (TOE) framework. *Buildings, 12*(2), 90. https:// doi.org/10.3390/buildings12020090

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53–55. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186-204.

Wang, S. F., & Chen, C. C. (2024). Exploring Designer Trust in Artificial Intelligence-Generated Content: TAM/TPB Model Study. *Applied Sciences*, 14(16), 6902. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14166902

Yi, M., & Choi, H. (2023). What drives the acceptance of AI technology?: The role of expectations and experiences. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13670. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.13670



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-ND) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

About the Authors

Sharifah Norhuda Syed Wahid is a Senior Lecturer at Universiti Teknologi MARA. She holds a Bachelor of Science (Hons.) (Statistics) from Universiti Teknologi MARA and a Master of Science (Statistics) from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Her research interests include Bayesian statistics, quality control analysis, regression analysis and statistical modeling. She has contributed to various academic publications and can be reached via email at: sha_norhuda@uitm.edu.my.

Mastura Mohamad is a lecturer at the Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang, Malaysia. She holds a Master's in Office Systems and Management from UiTM. She is passionate about raising the quality of teaching and learning of students and their development in the schools and in the higher education settings. Her research focuses on job performance, presenteeism, ergonomics, digital innovation, and artificial intelligence. She has published several journal articles and has expertise in office management, business management, and administrative systems. She can be contacted at masturamohdd@uitm.edu.my.

Hazlin Hasan is a Senior Lecturer at the Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang, Malaysia. She is passionate about raising the quality of teaching and learning of students and their development in the higher education settings. Her research interests lie in the business management education, event organisation, online teaching and learning, and youth practices and their education and her papers have been published in both indexed and non-indexed journals. She can be contacted at email: hazlin665@uitm.edu.my.

Juhaida Ismail, PhD is a Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pahang, Malaysia. She has been actively involved in teaching, research, and academic development. She obtained her Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (Hons.) from Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS, and a Master of Science in Information Technology from Universiti Teknologi MARA. She earned her Doctor of Philosophy in Information Technology in 2022, with her doctoral research focusing on the development of a Techno-Spiritual Design Model from an Islamic perspective. Her primary research interests lie in Human-Computer Interaction (HCI), particularly User Experience Design (UXD), user-centred design, and the integration of human values and spiritual perspectives into technology design. She can be contacted via email juhaida_ismail@uitm.edu.my.

Siti Fazilah Hamid, PhD is a Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Business Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Selangor. She obtained her education from Universiti Teknologi MARA in Diploma of Office Management and Technology, Bachelor of Office Systems Management (Hons.), Master of Office Systems Management and PhD of Office Systems Management. Her research interests include Entrepreneurship, Human Resources, and Technology Management. She has made peers reviewed research papers and been involved as innovation project jury at national and international level. She serves as a member of the Editorial Board for journals and conferences namely International Journal of Advanced Research in

Education and Society, Education Journal, Gading Journal for Social Sciences and Journal of Professional and Business Studies. She also serves as a committee member for Academic International Dialogue Academy (AID). She also is a fellow of the Institute Administrative Management (IAM) United Kingdom. She can be contacted at email: sitifazilah@uitm.edu.my.

Nor Tasnim Syahera Rasak is a lecturer at the Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Perak Branch, Seri Iskandar Campus, Malaysia. She holds a master's degree in Office Systems. Her teaching focuses on business and management. Her research interests focus on the social sciences. She can be contacted at tasnimsyahera@uitm.edu.my.