







Factors Affecting Electrical and Electronic Product Acceptance

Noraslinda Fauzi¹^{*}, Kamal Imran Mohd Sharif², Mohamad Ghozali Hassan³,
Mohamed Suhaimi Yusof⁴ and Syafiza Hanim Said⁵

^{1*,4,5} Universiti Poly-Tech Malaysia, Jln 6/91 Taman Shamelin Perkasa,
56100 Cheras, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

^{2,3} Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, 06010 Bukit Kayu Hitam, Kedah,
Malaysia

*Corresponding author: noraslinda@uptm.edu.my

Abstract. This study investigated factors influencing the acceptance of electrical and electronic products among Malaysian consumers, aiming to enhance awareness and understanding of these factors. Using quantitative analysis and quota sampling, data were collected from 488 respondents through questionnaires. This study used the Smart PLS for data analysis. Findings revealed that product technological capability and product ease of use affecting product acceptance. The study holds implications for consumers, academicians, companies, and researchers, and is expected to contribute to the improvement and wider acceptance of electrical and electronic products in Malaysia.

Keywords: *Product Technological Capability, Product Ease of Use, Product Acceptance*

1 Introduction

Consumer acceptance of electrical and electronic (E&E) products today reflects a complex mix of performance expectations, technological trends, price sensitivity, and evolving social values. Modern consumers are no longer impressed by innovation alone. They expect products to perform reliably, offer genuine convenience, and integrate faultlessly into their lifestyles. Performance and durability are critical. Technological advancements such as smart connectivity, artificial intelligence, and automation are driving interest, but only when paired with intuitive, user-friendly designs that do not overwhelm the average user. Price value perception is becoming more important as rising living expenses force consumers to consider if the advantages outweigh the costs, even in premium markets. Sustainability has also emerged as a key consideration, with many buyers favoring eco-friendly, energy-efficient products that reflect their values. Customer loyalty and continued product usage are significantly impacted by brand trust, which is strengthened by clear policies, robust warranties, and prompt after-sales

© The Author(s) 2026

N. A. Ishak et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Cross-Disciplinary Academic Research 2025 - Track 1 Advances in Computing, Electronics, Engineering, and Mathematics (ICAR-T1 2025)*, Advances in Engineering Research 296,

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-636-4_12

service. However, issues including intentional obsolescence, technology fatigue, and data privacy problems can severely restrict adoption.

At the same time, the E&E industry faces a range of issues that affect both consumer satisfaction and long-term sustainability. One of the most pressing concerns is the short product lifespan, often linked to planned obsolescence, where devices quickly become outdated or fail hastily due to design choices, poor component quality, or incompatible software updates. Rapid technological change worsens this issue, as new models damage quickly compared to old models forcing consumers into frequent and costly upgrades. High repair costs and limited access to spare parts further discourage maintenance, creating a replace rather than repair culture that contributes to growing e-waste. The rise of smart, connected devices has also brought data privacy and cybersecurity risks, with some products exposed to hacking, data misuse, or unauthorized surveillance. Environmental challenges remain significant, as certain products still consume high energy or use hazardous materials, while proper recycling and e-waste management lag behind production growth. Additionally, the market is flooded with low-quality or counterfeit items, which damage brand reputation and present safety risks including chemical exposure or electrical fires. Furthermore, poorly designed user interfaces and excessive design complexity irritate less tech-savvy customers, which lowers usability and long term adoption. On the production side, shortages of semiconductors, global supply chain disruptions, and growing raw material costs have resulted in higher prices, restricted availability, and uneven quality control, further straining consumers and producers.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Product Acceptance

Consumer acceptance reflects individual responses to technology and innovation, which affect the purchase and use of the products (Heuveln *et al.*, 2021). Besides, product innovation has been discovered as an element of a new product's success. According to Sidek *et al.* (2015), product innovation is a significant element of product acceptance in the current market. Meanwhile, Mansori *et al.* (2015) stated that product innovation is the main contributor to maintaining customer demands. For example, product innovation is required for the acceptance of digital cameras (Chuang & Liao, 2018). Consumers will choose and acquire the best products in terms of high value, quality, lower price, and attractive sales promotions because there are many products from various companies to be chosen from (Janakiraman & Senthikumar, 2020). However, Ali *et al.* (2020) mentioned that consumer product acceptability is strongly influenced by religiosity, perfectionism, brand, price, and brand loyalty.

Customers are sometimes eager to purchase expensive electronic products, such as smartphones, even though the product might be broken, as long as they have significant peace of mind. Additionally, customers will use a product frequently if it is valuable and satisfies their requirements. According to Atlason *et al.* (2017), women prefer to use electrical and electronic products until the end of their lifetime compared to males,

and they are more willing to pay a higher price for the products. Thus, a designer must be aware of various determinants that affect product acceptance to readily fulfil consumer needs and, eventually, attract them to buy the product. According to Singhal *et al.* (2019), consumers can be encouraged to engage in the design of electrical and electronic (E&E) products to satisfy their needs. Therefore, consumers may assist companies in developing the emerging E&E products that are suited for them, hence expanding E&E product acceptance among buyers.

In keeping with the time, consumers use various electrical products that are available in the market, and most of the items have a good-looking appearance, are appealing, and have many sophisticated functions where they may be replaced with other electrical products that do not meet their needs and expectations (Jie, 2017). Thus, people are less likely to buy electrical and electronic products that are not visually attractive. Furthermore, people would not recommend electrical products to their friends if the product's performance is poor, such as being difficult to charge or being quickly damaged after a few usages. For example, people are advised not to buy air fryers if their performance is poor, such as when they cannot cook food better than a regular oven and are also considered excessively pricey. Therefore, a consumer will not recommend it to others if the product causes them problems and is too expensive.

2.2 Product Technological Capability

Veryzer (2003) defined product technological capability as an extension of a product's abilities in which a product function performs beyond its existing limits. According to Kim (2001), technological capabilities are the ability of a company to successfully utilise technological knowledge in manufacturing products and innovation to become more competitive in terms of price and quality. It shows that product technological capability enables a company to offer a customer a lower price while maintaining high quality. Caniëls and Romijn (2004) also explained that product technological capabilities could improve product quality because the company invests much in improving existing technologies and developing new ones. Meanwhile, Sobanke, Ilori, and Adegbite (2012) defined product technological capability as the ability to successfully apply knowledge and skills to create and improve products and current technology in a competitive business environment. However, Patel and Pavitt (1997) argued that product technological capabilities can be used to gain a competitive advantage. Companies with technological advantages can gain higher profits and develop new product lines more quickly (Azubuike, 2013). It demonstrates that companies that produce technologically advanced products are accepted by their customers.

Nonetheless, Lall (1992) stated that product technological capability refers to a company's ability to absorb, process, make, adapt, and create achievable specialised applications (new technology and new products) within the knowledge frontier. Effectively using technological capability enables firms to create an innovative product that provides maximum value to customers, allowing them to survive and thrive. Furthermore, previous studies have shown that product technological capability allows a client to enjoy lower prices (Kim, 2001) and high-quality products as it upgrades product quality

(Caniëls & Romijn, 2004), improves existing technology (Sobanke *et al.*, 2014), enables a customer to have a better product that applies new technology (Lall, 1992), generates maximum value for customers (Wang *et al.*, 2006), and provides high profitability to the company (Azubuike, 2013). As a result of looking at all of these benefits, the researcher wants to focus on product technological capability to determine if it can have a positive relationship with product acceptance because previous researchers indicated that product technological capability provides various benefits to customers.

According to Wang *et al.* (2006), technological capability has the potential to produce and provide high customer value, empower an organisation to fulfil customer needs, offer customers happiness, and eventually create solid customer connections. It shows that a product's technological capabilities deliver benefits and better choices to customers and the ability to keep customers, resulting in high product acceptance. Moreover, Danneels (2002) mentioned that the customer demands may inspire the customer to seek out certain product benefits, and a company with technological capability may be able to develop a product with exceptional attributes that can offer certain benefits to the client. In reality, consumers may embrace high-tech products if they provide them with valuable benefits and they are happy using the product (Kulviwat *et al.*, 2007). Therefore, from the above discussion we assume that:

H1: There is a positive relationship between product technological capability and product acceptance

2.3 Product Ease of Use

Brucks *et al.* (2000) defined ease of use as the ability to start, run, and use a product, which involves the clarity of utilising a product by providing a user manual since ease of use has become a crucial dimension of product quality in the eyes of consumers. In other words, product ease of use is defined as the efficiency and effectiveness of using a product (Bennett, 1984; Shackel, 1984). Moreover, Wallace, Reid, Cliniciu, and Kang (2013) stated that ease of use involves effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction of a product. However, Davis (1989) indicated that ease of use means that it is easy to learn, control, understand, and adaptable. Ease of use also refers to how easy it is to learn, how efficient it is to use a product, how easy it is to memorise, how easy it is to reduce the product errors, and how easy it is to become a favourite (Shneiderman, 2010; Hix & Hartson, 1993). In addition, Dzida (1995) further stated that user-friendly can be interchangeable with ease of use where ease of use or user-friendly are informal terms, and usability is a common term for the product. Therefore, in this study, the researcher considers ease of use to be synonymous with user-friendly and usability in terms of definitions and functions.

According to Brucks *et al.* (2000), ease of use entails clear instrumentation, with buyers believing that ease of use is an essential component of product quality. The ease of use can be utilised to improve the electronic health record system (EHR). Addition-

ally, ease of use can help EHRs to overcome their slowness, disappointment, and scepticism (Meehan *et al.*, 2016). Moreover, Han *et al.* (2000) connected two dimensions of product ease of use, namely form and function. Both of these qualities generate value VB BNJKOFLT;and give satisfaction to customers (Roozenburg & Eekels, 1995). Consumers are willing to pay a greater price for things that are simple to use, even if it means paying a higher price for a product that is regarded as high-quality and capable of pleasing customers. According to the researcher, product ease of use has a positive link with product acceptance.

Babbar *et al.* (2002) stated that customers anticipate products to perform effectively, meet their needs, and are easy to use once they purchase them. Customers are more pleased with the use of products that offer adequate information, are controllable, and are easy to use. Nevertheless, numerous products are troublesome and confusing to use (Norman, 1988), resulting in user dissatisfaction (Nussbaum & Neff, 1991). The design process regularly causes products to fall short of customer expectations (Bailetti & Litva, 1995). Therefore, products must be simple to use and adapt to the needs of the consumer (Bevan, 1999). Therefore, from the above discussion we assume that:

H2: There is a positive relationship between product ease of use and product acceptance

3 Research Methodology

This study used a quantitative, self-administered survey questionnaire to examine relationships between variables. The questionnaires were distributed through customer service managers in electrical and electronic retail outlets to consumers across Peninsular Malaysia, excluding Sabah and Sarawak, who had prior experience purchasing or using such products. Based on the statistics from Malaysian Statistics Department, 2016, there were 25 million consumers in thirteen states of Peninsular Malaysia located in the four regions. Respondents were categorized by four regions which are Northern, Central (Klang Valley), Southern, and East Coast.

A quota sampling technique was employed to ensure equal regional representation and to reduce sampling error in the large population of approximately 25 million. Based on Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table, the required sample size was 384 respondents but it has increased to 488 samples. This study used the Smart PLS for data analysis because of a few reasons. PLS path modelling is the most suitable applications and provides more benefits, especially for complex models (Hulland, 1999; Akter, D'Ambra, & Ray, 2011). In comparison to other methods of analysis, PLS-SEM provides a more concrete and reliable results (Bollen, 1989). PLS path modelling also does not require data to be normal (Chin, 1998). It was chosen to avoid any normality issues that might arise during this study's data analysis.

4 Result and Discussion

Once the validity of the outer model has been confirmed, the next stage was to test the hypothesized relationships among the variables. By running PLS bootstrapping using SmartPLS, the hypothesized model was tested. Therefore, the T Statistics were generated to test all hypotheses as illustrated in the Table 1. The threshold value of T Statistics for one tail test is 1.645. Therefore, hypothesis which falls above 1.645 should be accepted, while hypothesis which falls below 1.645 should be rejected (Tomczak et al., 2014).

After confirming the validity of the outer model, PLS bootstrapping was conducted in SmartPLS to test the hypothesized relationships. Using a one-tailed test with a T Statistics threshold of 1.645 (Tomczak et al., 2014), results showed that product technological capability has a positive relationship with significant effect on the product acceptance ($\beta = 0.113$, $t = 1.838$, $p < 0.05$), supporting H1. Similarly, product ease of use also has a significant positive effect on product acceptance ($\beta = 0.095$, $t = 1.953$, $p < 0.05$), supporting H2 as illustrated in Table 1.

In the electrical and electronic (E&E) sector, this capability is a critical determinant of product acceptance, as consumers are more likely to adopt products that deliver superior performance, energy efficiency, convenience, and unique technological advantages. It can be explained through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) which highlight that perceived usefulness, ease of use, and relative advantage drive consumer adoption. Advanced technology enhances perceived value and quality, builds trust, and increases customer satisfaction, which in turn leads to higher purchase intentions, repeat usage, and positive word-of-mouth. Empirical evidence also shows that products with cutting-edge technology often achieve stronger market traction, as seen in high-demand innovations such as smart home devices, energy-saving appliances, and next-generation smartphones. However, technological capability must align with consumer needs and be user-friendly, as overly complex innovations without clear benefits may hinder acceptance. Therefore, firms should invest in continuous research and development, adopt user centered design approaches, and communicate the practical value of technology effectively to maximize product acceptance.

Consumers are more likely to adopt and continue using products that are simple and require minimal effort to operate. When a product is easy to use, it reduces the learning effort and eliminates frustration, allowing users to quickly experience its benefits. This directly aligns with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which identifies *perceived ease of use* as a key driver of technology adoption where the easier a product is to operate, the more likely users are to perceive it as useful and integrate it into their daily routines.

In the context of electrical and electronic (E&E) products, ease of use can include clear instructions, logical controls, ergonomic design, and integration with other devices. A user-friendly product also enhances the overall customer experience, leading to higher satisfaction, lower return rates, and stronger brand loyalty. Moreover, in a

market where technology can sometimes feel overwhelming, simplicity becomes a competitive advantage. Consumers who find a product easy to use and pleasant to operate are more inclined to recommend it to others, further strengthening its acceptance in the market.

Table 1. The result of the inner structural model

Hypothesis	Relationship	Standard Beta	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	*T Statistics	P Value	Decision
H1	PRODUCT TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITY -> PACC	0.113	0.062	1.838	0.0000	Supported
H2	PRODUCT EASE OF USE -> PACC	0.095	0.049	1.9530	0.000	Supported

Note: * $p < 0.05$ ($1.645 < T$ Statistics) for 1-tailed test

Table 2. Summary of the results

Hypothesis	Hypothesis Path	Decision
H1	There is a positive relationship between product technological capability and product acceptance	Supported
H2	There is a positive relationship between product ease of use and product acceptance	Supported

To summarize from Table 2, it is shown that hypothesis 1 was accepted and it is proved that the research gap is now filled as product technological capability has the ability to influence product acceptance. Subsequently, hypothesis 2 was also accepted and it is proved that the research gap is now filled as product ease of use does have the ability to influence product acceptance.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study identified product technological capability and product ease of use as the key factors influencing the acceptance of electrical and electronic products among Malaysian consumers. The results highlight those consumers are more likely to adopt and continue using products that offer advanced technological features, superior performance, and practical functionality, while also being intuitive and user-friendly. These findings suggest that manufacturers and retailers in the Malaysian E&E sector should prioritize continuous innovation and ensure that products are designed with simplicity and convenience in mind to enhance market acceptance and customer satisfaction.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the University Poly-Tech Malaysia for providing the supports for this study.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

- Akter, S., D'Ambra, J., & Ray, P. (2011). *An evaluation of PLS based complex models: The roles of power analysis, predictive relevance and GoF index. Proceedings of the Seventeenth Americas Conference on Information Systems, Detroit, Michigan. August.*
- Ali, S., Ullah, H., Danish, M., & Sipra, M. A. H. (2020). An investigation of Consumer Decision Making Styles on Intentions to Purchase Energy Efficient Home Appliances in Pakistan. *International Journal of Economics, Management and Accounting*, 28(2), 297–325. <https://journals.iium.edu.my/enjournal/index.php/enmj/article/view/719>
- Atlason, R., Giacalone, D., & Production, K. P. (2017). Product design in the circular economy: Users' perception of end-of-life scenarios for electrical and electronic appliances. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 168, 1059–1069. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652617320711>. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.082>
- Azubuike, V. M. (2013a). Technological Innovation Capability and Firm's Performance in New Product Development. *Communications of the IIMA*, 13(1), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.58729/1941-6687.1206>
- Babbar, S., Behara, R., & White, E. (2002). Mapping product usability. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(10), 1071–1089. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570210446315>
- Bailetti, A. J., & Litva, P. F. (1995). Integrating customer requirements into product designs. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 12(1), 3–15.
- Bennett, J. L. (1984). Managing to meet usability requirements: establishing and meeting software development goals. *Visual Display Terminals*, 161–184.
- Bevan, N. (1999). Quality in use: Meeting user needs for quality. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 49(1), 89–96. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0164-1212\(99\)00070-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0164-1212(99)00070-9)
- Bollen, K. A. (1989). A new incremental fit index for general structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 17(3), 303–316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124189017003004>
- Brucks, M., Zeithaml, V. A., & Naylor, G. (2000). Price and Brand Name As Indicators of

- Quality Dimensions for Consumer Durables. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(3), 359–374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070300283005>
- Caniëls, M. C., & Romijn, H. A. (2004). *Technological learning in small-enterprise clusters: conceptual framework and policy implications*. In *Innovation, learning, and technological dynamism of developing countries* (pp. 135-157). United Nations University Press.
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. *Modern Methods for Business Research*, 295(2), 295–336.
- Chuang, H. K., & Liao, C. S. (2018). Consumer preferences for green digital camera attributes to inform electrical and electronic equipment design and development. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 61(12), 2186–2206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2017.1389700>
- Danneels, E. (2002). The dynamics of product innovation and firm competences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(12), 1095–1121. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.275>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Dzida, W. (1995). *Standards for user-interfaces*. *Computer Standards & Interfaces*. 17(1), 89–97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0920-5489\(93\)E0069-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0920-5489(93)E0069-E)
- Han, S. H., Yun, M. H., Kim, K. J., & Kwahk, J. (2000). Evaluation of product usability: development and validation of usability dimensions and design elements based on empirical models. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 26(4), 477–488. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-8141\(00\)00019-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-8141(00)00019-6)
- Heuveln, K. van, Ghotge, R., & Annema, J. (2021). Factors influencing consumer acceptance of vehicle-to-grid by electric vehicle drivers in the Netherlands. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 24, 34–45. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214367X20302519>. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2020.12.008>
- Hix, D., & Hartson, H. R. (1993). *Developing user interfaces: ensuring usability through product & process*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573\(95\)80030-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573(95)80030-W)
- Hulland, J. (1999). Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: A review of four recent studies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 195–204. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199902\)20:2<195::AID-SMJ13>3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199902)20:2<195::AID-SMJ13>3.0.CO;2-7)
- Janakiraman, R. Senthikumar, V. (2020). Customers' Satisfaction On Household Appliances With Reference To Vriddhachalam Town - Google Search. *Journal of Information and Computational Science*, 10(2).
- Jie, H. (2017). The appearance of the electrical appliances product design and consumer aesthetic psychological analysis of the correlation Hu Jie. 34(Icified), 110–112. DOI:10.2991/icified-17.2017.21
- Kim, L. (2001). The dynamics of technological learning in industrialisation. *International Social Science Journal*, 53(168), 297–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2451.00316>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
- Kulviwat, S., Bruner, I. I., Gordon, C., Kumar, A., Nasco, S. A., & Clark, T. (2007). Toward a unified theory of consumer acceptance technology. *Psychology & Marketing* 24, no. 12 (2007): 1059-1084. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20196>
- Lall, S. (1992). Technological capabilities and industrialization. *World Development*, 165–186. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(92\)90097-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(92)90097-F)
- Mansori, S., Sambasivan, M., & Md-Sidin, S. (2015). Acceptance of novel products: the role of religiosity, ethnicity and values. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(1), 39–66. <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-03-2013-0050>
- Meehan, R. A., Mon, D. T., Kelly, K. M., Rocca, M., Dickinson, G., Ritter, J., & Johnson, C. M. (2016). Increasing EHR system usability through standards: Conformance criteria in the HL7 EHR-system functional model. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 63, 169–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2016.08.015>

- Norman, D. (1988). *The Psychology of Everyday Things*. Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Nussbaum, B., & Neff, R. (1991). *I can't work this thing*. *Business Week*, April 29. 58-66.
- Patel, P., & Pavitt, K. (1997). The technological competencies of the world's largest firms: complex and path-dependent, but not much variety. *Research Policy*, 26(2), 141–156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(97\)00005-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(97)00005-X)
- Roozenburg, N. F., & Eekels, J. (1995). *Product Design: Fundamentals and Methods*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Shackel, B. (1984). The concept of usability. *Visual Display Terminals: Usability Issues and Health Concerns*, 45–87.
- Shneiderman, B. (2010). *Designing the user interface: strategies for effective human-computer interaction*. Pearson Education India. DOI:10.1075/idj.17.2.14mar
- Sidek, K., Ibrahim, A., Alif, M. M., Jamaluddin, F., & Amlus, M. H. (2015). *New innovation product design strategic in manufacturing. Looking at increasing customer acceptance*. 1(1), 42–51. *Journal of Global Business and Social Entrepreneurship (GBSE)*, Volume 1, No. 1, pages 42–51.
- Singhal, D., Jena, S. K., & Tripathy, S. (2019). Factors influencing the purchase intention of consumers towards remanufactured products: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Production Research*, 57(23), 7289–7299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2019.1598590>
- Sobanke, V. O., Ilori, M. O., & Adegbite, S. A. (2012). Technological capability in metal fabricating firms in southwestern Nigeria. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 2(04), 176. DOI: 10.4236/ajibm.2012.24023
- Sobanke, V. O., Ilori, M. O., & Adegbite, S. A. (2014). Determinants of technological capability of firms in a developing country. *Procedia Engineering*, 69, 991–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2014.03.081>
- Tomczak, M., Tomczak, E., Kleka, P., & Lew, R. (2014). Using power analysis to estimate appropriate sample size. *Trends in Sport Sciences*, 21(4).
- Veryzer, R. W. (2003). Marketing and the Development of Innovative New Products. *The International Handbook on Innovation*, 845–855. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044198-6/50058-9>
- Wallace, S., Reid, A., Clinciu, D., & Kang, J. S. (2013). Culture and the importance of usability attributes. *Information Technology & People*, 26(1), 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09593841311307150>
- Wang, Y., Lo, H. P., Zhang, Q., & Xue, Y. (2006). How Technological Capability Influences Business Performance: An integrated framework based on the contingency approach. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 1(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17468770610642740>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

