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Abstract

Purpose – This study aims to understand the antecedent of trust towards government-to-business (G2B) service in Indonesia. Trust will be viewed through four aspects, namely, cognition-based trust, personality-oriented trust, affect-based trust and experience-based trust. Then, these antecedents of trust were examined as the factors of continuance intention by extending the expected confirmation theory (ECT).

Design/methodology/approach – Data were collected through a quantitative approach, and 389 respondents were involved in the study. The respondents are the investors who represent their organization which uses e-government service to report their investment activities to the Investment Coordinating Board of Indonesia. Data were analyzed using partial least square structural equation modelling approach with WarpPLS 4.0.

Findings – The result shows that factors that determine a user’s trust in government online service are service quality, trust towards government entity, recommendation to use the service and user’s habit of using the service. Factors that do not determine a user’s trust in government online service is a disposition to trust. Another finding is that a user’s trust on an online service does not directly influence his/her continuance of use. Trust will impact the continuance of use through perceptions of benefits and perceived satisfaction of using the online service.

Research limitations/implications – ECT is applicable in G2B process. Organizations have a perception of benefit while using a public e-service and confirm the perception through their experience while using an e-service to gain satisfaction, and this will encourage them to continue using the service.

Practical implications – To improve organizations’ trust on the e-service, the government needs to improve the e-service quality (by evaluating the efficiency, privacy, user support, reliability and information quality), investor familiarity of the system (training or socialization), investor trust on the government entity (improve the employee competence) and recommendation on using the system.

Originality/value – Trust dimension has also been studied to be a factor that influences the intention or continuance of use of technology; however, it has rarely been studied towards its effect in the ECT’s context.
In e-government study, there are various studies related to government-to-citizen (G2C) concept. However, the research in government-to-business (G2B) area that has not been explored much.
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### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BKPM</td>
<td>= The Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM) in Indonesia as one of the non-ministerial government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKPM Online</td>
<td>= An online investment activity report as a communication medium between BKPM and investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor</td>
<td>= The user of LKPM Online system to report his/her organization’s investment activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESQ</td>
<td>= E-Service Quality which includes efficiency, privacy, user support, reliability and information quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTT</td>
<td>= Disposition to trust, the tendency to things in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM</td>
<td>= Familiarity is a precondition of trust that leads to an understanding of the action conducted by the entities and beliefs about future action of the entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGV</td>
<td>= Trust in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>= Recommendation communication that focuses on improving the knowledge and perceptions of people on the entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE</td>
<td>= Trust in public e-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>= Perceived usefulness is the extent to which a person feels that using an information system can improve their performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>= Satisfaction is a psychological state generated when expectations can be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>= Continuance intention is the intention to use something on an ongoing basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Introduction

E-government is the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) that support governments to provide information, services, administration or products to community to improve the relationship between the government and society. Community participation in using e-government services can be encouraged through trust factors (Park *et al.*, 2015). Trust makes people comfortable in providing personal information and conducting online transactions with the government. Trust is crucial in building a sustainable long-term relationship (Belanche *et al.*, 2014). However, there are still a few number of research studies that identify the factors of trust in e-government from a multidimensional nature of trust (Alzahrani *et al.*, 2017).

The authors aim to study trust as a factor for a sustainable relationship in the e-government’s context. The study of sustainability of use is necessary, as a digital society cannot be developed if users do not use the system on an ongoing basis (Hossain and Quaddus, 2012). Therefore, it is essential to study the continuance of use in an information system setting. Expectation Confirmation Theory (ECT) is one of the popular models in an information system research (Hossain and Quaddus, 2012). This model suggests that one’s satisfaction (SAT) in using a product or service is the main motivation to continue his/her behaviour (Hossain and Quaddus, 2012). If people are satisfied, they will show greater intention to continue using the product or service, in this case, e-government services on an ongoing basis.
Trust will be analyzed as the factor that influences the sustainable use of the government services. Thus, we will extend the expectation confirmation and trust dimension to analyze the continuance of use in an e-government service. The e-government service that becomes the objective of this study is government-to-business services (G2B). Various studies have been conducted in government-to-citizen service (G2C); DeLone McLean model of information system has been conducted in G2C context (Chen et al., 2015), technology acceptance model and theory of reason action in Jordania (Abu Shanab, 2014). In contrast, research in G2B and government-to-government’s (G2G) context has to be developed further (Sambasivan et al., 2010). Research in G2B context has been done by adopting DeLone McLean model for system acceptance in Malaysia (Sambasivan et al., 2010). Another study in the context of G2B is also conducted in Hong Kong by adopting a model of acceptance by DeLone McLean (Kwok, 2014).

The case of this study, the Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM) in Indonesia is one of the non-ministerial government agency that implements e-government to improve the performance and quality of public services. One of the e-government services implemented by BKPM is the reporting of an investment activity report (LKPM) online. Based on the Transitional Provisions Regulation of BKPM Head No. 3 of 2012, Article 33, Paragraph (4), all investors must submit all investment activity reports through an online system. However, until now, there is no regulation that describes the sanctions if the reporting conducted in a conventional way. Thus, the investors did not use the system as much as expected. In addition, there are concerns from investors when they provide the data online. Confidentiality and data security of the exchanged information becomes aspects to be considered when implementing an online system. Investors do not know whether their data will be disseminated to other government agencies (Belanger and Carter, 2008). Therefore, building trust in relationships between government agencies and investors as users of e-government services is critical to address perceptions of uncertainty (Belanger and Carter, 2008).

Based on the identification of the problem and condition, the aim of this study is to identify the factors that determine the user trust towards the systems and its impact on sustainable use. We also like to provide recommendations to the government to increase the user’s intention in using e-services provided by the government in a sustainable manner in a G2B services.

2. Literature review

2.1 E-government service

E-government is the use of ICTs that support governments to provide information, services, administration or products to communities to improve the relationship between government and society and use a strategy to add value to the communities involved and create better governance (OECD, 2003). Other goals of e-government initiatives are to increase public participation, transparency and accountability (Gulati et al., 2010; Rahman, 2010). E-government is categorized into four sectors based on parties participating (Alsaghi et al., 2009). There are G2G for all activities involving government agencies, G2B for all operations between institution or organization with government agency, G2C which covers the activity between government and citizen and government-to-employees (G2E) which involves the affairs between government agency and its employees.

Technology-based services can improve the efficiency of government only if people use these services on an ongoing basis (Belanche et al., 2014). One of the challenges that governments must face is how to safeguard and increase people’s satisfaction and expectations for use e-government services (Alruwaie et al., 2012). If the expectations are
met, people will feel satisfied, and they can demonstrate a greater intention to continue using the product or service, in this case, e-government services. In addition to satisfaction, public trust in the government is one of the factors that can encourage community participation in using e-government services (Park et al., 2015). Public trust in e-government services is an important aspect of adopting a technology-based service (Belanche et al., 2014).

2.2 Trust in e-government

Trust is a psychological condition in which a trustor takes risks by being vulnerable to a trustee based on positive expectations of trustee’s behaviour (Nepal et al., 2011). E-government characteristic makes trust an important aspect because of lack of direct interaction between society and government (Harris and Goode, 2004). This causes the government to build public trust because trust makes people comfortable in sharing personal information and doing online transactions with the government. Public trust in government is a factor that can encourage public participation in using e-government services (Park et al., 2015; Lallmahomed et al., 2017; Liang et al., 2017; Porumbescu, 2016). Although trust has been studied in various research, it has a broad and multi-faceted concept (Li et al., 2017).

Past research on trust in the e-government context has been done by identifying two factors: Trust in government (TGV) and Trust in technology (Teo et al., 2008). In addition to these two factors, information quality and familiarity (FAM) with the internet are added to research conducted by (Abu Shanab, 2014). A study of trust classification was conducted by Alzahrani et al. (2017) by viewing trusts in three aspects: cognitive trust, emotional trust and behavioural trust. Some factors were identified as the antecedents of trust such as technical factors including system quality, service quality and information quality; government agencies’ factors including reputation and past experience perceived by a citizen; and citizens factor represented by disposition to trust (DTT) (Alzahrani et al., 2017).

Another research regarding user trust in information system has been conducted by Kim et al. (2008) that defined four aspects of trust such as cognition-based trust, personality-oriented trust, affect-based trust and experience-based trust. Another study by Belanche et al. (2014) aims to investigate how public administration can influence people in using sustainable electronic public services and the different aspects of trust elements which were user trust in public administration, user trust in the internet, e-service quality (ESQ), public administration recommendations and interpersonal recommendations. From the previous study, we view trust in four aspects, covering all aspects of trust previously studied by Alzahrani et al. (2017), Kim et al. (2008) and Belanche et al. (2014), including cognition-based trust, personality-oriented trust, experience-based trust and affect-based trust.

Cognition-based trust is a trust based on cognition that is relevant to performance, such as competence, responsibility, reliability and dependence (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). In the context of trust in electronic-based public services, cognition-based trusts are when service users believe that the services they use have competence so that they can be relied upon. According to Kim et al. (2008), antecedents of trust belonging to cognition-based trust are privacy protection, security protection, system reliability and information quality.

Personality-oriented trust is a belief that develops during childhood when a child seeks and receives help resulting in a tendency to trust others (Kramer, 2006). According to Kim et al. (2008), antecedents of trust belonging to a personality-based group are DTT and style in shopping. In this study, antecedents of concern in the personality-based group were DTT. DTT is a tendency to trust others in general (McKnight et al., 2004). In some models of trust, DTT has been identified as the construct of trust variables (McKnight et al., 2004). Research
shows that the tendency to believe has a significant impact on trust in an online context (McKnight et al., 2004).

Experience-based trust is a belief that is based on past experiences and is used to help build trust (Sun et al., 2007). According to Kim et al. (2008), the antecedents of trust belonging to the experience-based group are familiarity, experience of using the internet and experience of using e-commerce. FAM is the stage where a person uses prior experience, interactions and learns to understand what, where, why and when someone does what he/she does (Gefen, 2000).

Affect-based trust is the belief of a person based on the emotional bond between individuals based on a natural expression of concern and concern for others. Affect-based trust emphasizes empathy, affiliation and relationships (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). According to Kim et al. (2008), antecedents of the trust included in the affect-based group are reputation, agreement with third party, recommendation, feedback from buyers and word of mouth. According to Belanche et al. (2014), antecedents of the belief in electronic public services include TGV and government recommendations. These two antecedents are included in the affect-based trust by definitions given by Schaubroeck et al. (2011) and examples from Kim et al. (2008) study. Individual beliefs in government can develop confidence in institutions managing e-services (Belanche et al., 2014).

2.3 Expectation confirmation theory
A customer has an initial expectation for a product or service to be purchased based on prior knowledge and experience (Zeithaml and Berry, 1990). If a customer has a perception that the product or service is useful, he/she will receive, buy and use it. During initial use, customers shape their perceptions about the product or service performance, and customers will assess performance perceptions based on initial expectations and confirm initial expectations. Positive confirmation will be produced if the performance exceeds initial expectations, and simple confirmation will be produced if the performance equals initial expectations. These two types of confirmation will form satisfaction.

Negative confirmation, i.e. performance less than initial expectations, will develop dissatisfaction (Oliver and DeSarbo, 1988). According to Hossain and Quaddus (2012), satisfaction or dissatisfaction can form post-purchase intentions, which can be a complaint, re-purchase or buying termination. Based on Hossain and Quaddus’ (2012) study, an expectation–confirmation model (ECM), a model using ECT, has been applied in testing the continuance intention (CI) of information systems. ECM replaces expectations prior to use with expansion after system use, i.e. perceived usefulness (PU) (Bhattacherjee, 2001). After using the information system, user forms a concept of PU and confirms the usability perception by comparing with the performance of the system. If the user judges the information system as useful as he perceives, satisfaction will be formed. User satisfaction encourages continuous use, while dissatisfaction will encourage not to continue using the product or service. In addition, user perceptions of usability may encourage them to immediately intend to use the product or service on an ongoing basis, as they find that the product or service is useful for their needs; therefore, there is no need to go through the confirmation process.

2.4 Research gap and model development
The authors adopt the antecedent trust grouping into four categories as proposed by Kim et al. (2008), as it represents all trust aspects by other previous research studies (Alzahrani et al., 2017; Belanche et al., 2014; Abu Shanab, 2014; Teo et al., 2008).
In Kim et al.'s (2008) study, the cognition-based category consists of information quality, perceived privacy protection and perceived security protection. The authors combine information quality and perceived privacy protection as ESQ. Perceived security protection is not included in the framework of this study because in this study, there are no economic transactions while using the investment activity report online system thus reducing the impact of perceived security protection. To enrich the ESQ, we adopt (Belanche et al., 2014) proposed variables of recommendation and ESQ as antecedents of trust. Cognition-based trust was represented by technical factors in research conducted by Alzahrani et al. (2017).

In the affect-based category, the authors do not use the presence of a third-party factor because there are no transactions, and thus, the presence of a certified third party is not required. The trust in public administration variable defined by Belanche et al. (2014) which is represented as trust in public institutions that manage online services fall into this category. From the study by Alzahrani et al. (2017), government agencies factor is the affect-based category that is denoted by reputation of the agencies themselves. Thus, we adopted TGV as the antecedent of trust towards e-service that describes individual confidence, in this case, the investor, that the government fulfills his/her obligations as expected. Citizens factor included in Alzahrani et al.'s (2017) study is grouped in personality-oriented trust that depends on citizens' DTT.

For the investigation on the sustainable use of the public e-service, we adopted a research model proposed by Belanche et al. (2014) related to ECT with satisfaction and PU as the independent variables that influence continuance of use. Satisfaction and PU have also been addressed as the drivers for intention to the continuance of use on an ongoing basis (Belanche et al., 2014; Alruwaie et al., 2012; Hernandez-Ortega et al., 2014). In addition to SAT and PU, trust was added as the variable that affects the intention of continuing using the service. However, this research only included public administration recommendation, ESQ and interpersonal recommendation as the antecedents of trust. Personality-oriented trust was missing in this study where an individual's tendency to trust others in general (McKnight et al., 2004) also must be considered as the factor that influences the trust of e-government service. Thus, this study will investigate more detailed trust factors effect in the context of intention to continue use the system provided by the government.

3. Hypothesis development
3.1 Trust in public e-service
Trust in public e-service (TPE) is defined as one's choice to be vulnerable of other action, in this case, trust is defined as service user's choice to be vulnerable of public e-service based on the expectation that the service would perform a certain action (Mayer et al., 1995). TPE reassures the users of stability in the relationship between them and government and proves that the system will not malfunction and lose its value in the future (Vatanasombut et al., 2008).

Some variables are identified as antecedents of the trust according to the four categories identified previously. In this study, cognitive-based trust is included in the quality of ESQ, which includes efficiency, privacy, user support, reliability and information quality. Based on Belanche et al.'s (2014) study, ESQ can provide an important signal for shaping one's thinking about its belief in the service. DTT is the variable that represents personality-oriented trust. Trust on institutional websites is positively influenced by the tendency to believe because someone who generally trusts people, in general, will trust an institution involving people (McKnight et al., 2004). If a person has a high tendency to trust others, in general, DTT can increase his/her confidence in service (Kim et al., 2008). FAM in the context of this research is how much a person knows the electronic public services he uses,
including his understanding of relevant procedures. FAM is a precondition of trust because FAM leads to an understanding of the activities conducted by the entities and beliefs about future action of the entities. Trust that occurs in a condition that is already familiar and habitual can lead to a possibility of developing trust in human relationships (Luhmann, 1988). A person’s closeness can be based on his/her good experience with a technology (Kim et al., 2008). With its proximity to technology, one would expect the service provider to perform his/her obligations, and thus, the e-services would be judged to be reliable (Kim et al., 2008). In the context of e-service, the recommendation is one of the important things. REC is a communication that focusses on improving the knowledge and perceptions of people on e-services (Belanche et al., 2014).

**H1.** ESQ positively influences TPE.

**H2.** DTT positively influences TPE.

**H3.** FAM positively influences TPE.

**H4.** TGV positively influences TPE.

**H5.** REC positively influences TPE.

### 3.2 Trust in public e-service and perceived usefulness

PU is the extent to which a person feels that using an information system can improve his/her performance (Venkatesh and Davis, 2000). There is a relationship between the perception of utility and trust described in the previous section. According to Gefen et al. (2003), trust plays an important role in improving the perception of utility on a shopping channel. In addition, Pavlou and Gefen (2004) found that a client who has high confidence in IT service providers will feel that IT providers are increasingly useful. Therefore, a person’s belief in using a system can increase his/her perceived of benefits that can be achieved through the use of the system.

**H6.** TPE positively influences PU.

### 3.3 Trust in public e-service and continuance intention

According to Belanche et al. (2014), continuance intention (CI) is the intention to use something on an ongoing basis. This concept is similar to loyalty. Studies show that there is a positive relationship between trust and loyalty (Singh and Sirdeshmukh, 2000). This suggests that trust is an important element of long-term relationships (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). Trust can increase the user’s desire to reuse a technology (Belanche et al., 2014). TPEs convince users about the stable relationship between government and users and provide evidence that the system will not be damaged or lose its value in the future (Vatanasombut et al., 2008). A study by Abu Shanab (2014) shows that trust has a significant influence towards intention to use e-government service in Jordan. Therefore, a person’s belief in using a system can increase his/her perceived of benefits that can be achieved.

**H7.** TPE positively influences CI.

### 3.4 Trust in public e-service and satisfaction

Satisfaction is a psychological state generated when expectations can be met. In addition, SAT is someone’s feeling from previous experience when using system (Alruwaie et al., 2018).
2012). According to Alsaghier et al. (2009), the belief in electronic public services has an influence on user satisfaction.

H8. TPE positively influences SAT.

3.5 Perceived usefulness and continuance intention
PU is a person’s perception of believing that using a system can improve his/her performance. One example of perceived usefulness in e-commerce context is buyer’s confidence that online transaction through the website will bring more benefits than the conventional transaction (Kim et al., 2008). Therefore, with the perception that a technology improves its performance and brings benefits, a person will continue to use the service on an ongoing basis. One example of perceived usefulness in e-commerce context is buyer’s confidence that online transaction will bring more benefit than the conventional transaction.

H9. PU positively influences CI.

3.6 Satisfaction and continuance intention
Based on ECT, SAT is the primary motivation of a person using a product or service on an ongoing basis. User satisfaction is an important antecedent of sustainable use of technology (Kang and Lee, 2010). The same is put forward by Bhattacharjee (2001) in his research on the behaviour of online banking service users that user satisfaction is a predictor of sustainable use. Therefore, user satisfaction can encourage users to use technology in a sustainable manner.

H10. SAT positively influences CI.

3.7 Perceived usefulness and satisfaction
PU is a person’s perception in believing that using a system can improve his/her performance (Davis et al., 1989). According to Hernandez-Ortega et al. (2014), the advantages of using the system determines PU that will affect user satisfaction. User satisfaction is determined by PU (Bhattacharjee, 2001).

H11. PU positively influences SAT.

4. Research methodology
4.1 Sample and population
The model was examined within a government organization with a public service which an online service for investment report that was handled by the BKPM in Indonesia. The online investment activity report (LKPM Online) is an information system that is a part of the subsystem of investment services in Electronic Information System and Investment Permit (SPIPISE). The LKPM Online that can be accessed through http://lkpmonline.bkpm.go.id is the automation of a business process of submitting the investment activity report by the organization including the collection, verification and evaluation of investment activity. The service was used by the investment companies to report their investment realization or to file complaints or problem they experienced when investing.

Before defining the sufficient sample of this study, we defined the population of this study. All the investment companies that have submitted LKPM through LKPM Online in the fourth quarter of 2014 until the third quarter of 2015 is included in the population. Therefore, 2,541 companies have been acquired as the population. The number of the sample
is then calculated by multiplying ten to the largest number of formative indicators or largest number of independent variable leading to a latent variable (Urbach and Ahlemann, 2010). In this study, the largest number of formative indicators is five indicators, and the largest number of independent variables that lead to a latent variable is five variables. Thus, the minimum number of samples in this study is 50 samples.

All the companies in the population were contacted through an email that has been registered in the system. The email sent contained the link to the online questionnaires. An online form was chosen because the respondents were scattered throughout the country. By the end of the data collecting period, 405 respondents had submitted the questionnaires, and 16 respondents had not used the online service yet; therefore, there were 389 valid questionnaires. These numbers already satisfy the minimum number of the sample size.

4.2 Design and measure
An empirical study had been conducted in this research. The conceptual model developed in the previous section was designed and shown in Figure 1. In total, 13 variables have been introduced, and each variable is described by indicators from previous research studies (Belanche et al., 2014; Papadomichelaki and Mentzas, 2012; Kim et al., 2008; Park et al., 2015; Teo et al., 2008). We used a quantitative approach by using questionnaires to collect the data. In total, there are 58 indicators that are represented by the statement in the questionnaires (Appendix). The statements were rated with five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In the questionnaires, some fields were also provided to be filled with respondents’ profile. Before the dissemination, we conducted a readability test of the questionnaire with the respondents to ensure respondents’ understanding towards all statements. We disseminated the questionnaires for four weeks. The questionnaires then had been analyzed with partial least square structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) using

![Figure 1. Conceptual model](image-url)
WarpPLS 4.0. PLS-SEM was chosen over covariant based – structural equation modelling (CB-SEM), as it was more better for analyzing the extension model of a proven model (Hair et al., 2013).

5. Result

5.1 Respondent demographics
Total number of questionnaires collected was 405; however, 16 of them were filled by respondents who never used the online service, and thus, 389 valid data were further analyzed. Respondents profile are shown in Table I.

5.2 Measurement and structural model evaluation
Convergent validity was evaluated by loading factor values of each indicator. Loading factors for each variable should be more than 0.707 (Urbach and Ahlemann, 2010). Average variance extracted (AVE) also examined to satisfy convergent validity, and all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of respondent</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person in charge</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the person in charge</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥10 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.
Respondents’ demographic
meet the threshold value of 0.5 as shown in Table II (Urbach and Ahlemann, 2010). Reliability testing was conducted by examining composite reliability (CR) and Cronbach’s alpha (CA). From Table II, all indicators satisfy requirement value of CR and CA which was higher than 0.7. Discriminant validity was examined by evaluating AVE square root values for each variable that must be higher than correlation values with another variable (Table II). The coefficient determination was examined to satisfy structural model evaluation. $R^2$ values for each endogenous variable was ranged from moderate to low. All endogenous variables have $R^2$ value in the range from 0.33 to 0.66, which mean that all variables have a good explanatory power (Table III).

5.3 Path coefficient and hypothesis testing
In total, 11 hypotheses were evaluated by assessing the value of path coefficient, effect Cohen ($f^2$) significant in 0.05. Path coefficient should be checked for identifying the tendencies of the relationships which could be positive or negative. A negative value means that the direction of the relationship between variables is the opposite from the proposed direction in the hypothesis. Path coefficient value expresses the strength of the relationship between two latent variables. The value of the path coefficients is expected to be more than 0.1 with significance at least or less than 0.05. The value for each hypothesis is shown in Table IV. In total, 11 paths were evaluated in this study, and there are two paths that have low path coefficient value below a predetermined threshold which was 0.1. Path with a coefficient value below the threshold is DTT → TPE (0.039) and TPE → CI (0.062). This means that the DTT and TPE has a weak relationship. And TPE has a low correlation with CI. These two hypotheses were rejected.

6. Analysis and discussion
6.1 Trust antecedents in e-public government-to-business service
Based on hypothesis test results, it is found that ESQ, FAM, TGV and REC positively affects the TPE. To increase investor’s confidence in public e-services, the government must improve the aspects related to the quality of e-services, the friendliness of the services, the investors’ trust in the government, and recommendations regarding the use of e-services. After investigating the Cohen coefficient, we found that the largest impact towards the trust of public e-service is the quality of e-services. Cohen coefficient value is 0.265 and is the largest number among other variables. It indicates that the quality of LKPM Online service has the most dominant impact on the trust of LKPM Online. In addition, if we look at the path coefficient on the path that leads to TPE, ESQ also has the greatest value compared to other path coefficient values. The explanations of each antecedent of TPE is as follows:

6.1.1 E-service quality. ESQ or quality of e-services, in this case, the quality of LKPM Online, is a factor that has a significant positive effect on investor trust on LKPM Online service ($\beta = 0.372, f^2 = 0.265, p < 0.001$). This is in line with research (Belanche et al., 2014) which states that the quality of services electronically can provide an important signal for shaping one’s thought about his/her belief in the e-service. Investors trust in the system is formed when they find that the system present qualified services. The presence of privacy protection, security, system reliability and information quality (Kim et al., 2008) are essential to form investor trust in the system. Information provided by LKPM Online services is considered clear, accurate, reliable and can meet the needs of the investor information. The quality of e-services is the most dominant factor that determines investor trust in electronic-based public services. Therefore, BKPM can prioritize improving the quality of LKPM Online service because it has the biggest impact on investor trust on LKPM Online service.
Table II. Value of CA, CR and AVE for the exogenous variable TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>PRV</th>
<th>SUP</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>PU</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>TPE</th>
<th>FAM</th>
<th>DTT</th>
<th>TGV</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFF</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRV</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTT</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGV</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.2 Familiarity. FAM in using LKPM Online services is a factor that has a significant positive effect on investor trust in LKPM Online service ($\beta = 0.204, f^2 = 0.127, p < 0.001$). The FAM factor is based on experience in using the service (Kim et al., 2008). Along with the increasing frequency of service use, investors are increasingly accustomed to using LKPM Online services. When an investor is already accustomed to using LKPM Online service, he/she will trust the service. This result is in line with the research by Kim et al. (2008) which states that with its closeness to technology, one would judge that the e-service is reliable. However, from the respondent demographics, it is shown that there are 23 per cent of them who only used the system once. Even when an investor only used the system once, the government can increase its FAM by aligning an online form with a manual form. This practice would help them to use the service and give the assurance that the service will work effectively just like a manual reporting form. Another consideration when developing the service is the user interface friendliness that can assist the user while using such a system.

6.1.3 Trust in government. TGV by the investor to BKPM is a factor that has a significant positive effect on the trust of LKPM Online service. Trusting BKPM as an agency that develops and manages LKPM Online services will make investors’ trust the services provided by BKPM, in this case, LKPM Online. This is in line with research by Belanche et al. (2014) which states that the individual’s trust in government can develop confidence in the e-services it manages.

6.1.4 Recommendation. REC is the factor that has a significant positive effect on investor trust on LKPM Online service ($\beta = 0.187, f^2 = 0.111, p < 0.001$). Investors who see BKPM’s efforts as a facilitator and key liaison between business and government will put confidence in the recommended services. This is in line with research by Belanche et al. (2014) which states that the REC is a communication focusing on improving people’s knowledge and perception of e-service and will increase public confidence in the service. RECs are given by BKPM to encourage investors for using the LKPM Online services. REC is the form of affect-based trust (Kim et al., 2008). REC can be created by the government through socialization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogen latent variable</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>TPE</th>
<th>PU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III. Value of $R^2$ of endogenous variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$f^2$</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>ESQ $\rightarrow$ TPE</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>DTT $\rightarrow$ TPE</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>FAM $\rightarrow$ TPE</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>TGV $\rightarrow$ TPE</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>REC $\rightarrow$ TPE</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>TPE $\rightarrow$ PU</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>TPE $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>TPE $\rightarrow$ SAT</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>PU $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>SAT $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>PU $\rightarrow$ SAT</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV. Path coefficient and p-value

Table and figure placeholders
related to the readiness of BKPM in the service implementation and the benefits that investors get when using LKPM Online. REC can also come from other people or users that have already used the system in form of word of mouth (Kim et al., 2008).

6.1.5 Disposition to trust. DTT, i.e. the tendency of investors to trust others, in general, does not affect their trust in LKPM Online services with p-value of 0.118. This study failed to prove that personal-based trust has influence on TPE. This is contrary to the results of research conducted by Kim et al. (2008) which states that if a person has a high tendency to trust others, in general, he/she will also have confidence in the services he/she uses. However, the study conducted by Belanche et al. (2014) did not consider personal-based trust as the variable that influences TPE. Thus, the government cannot rely on individuals' tendency to believe that the service will not perform up to their expectation. The government needs to earn citizen trust by enhancing other antecedent of trust.

6.2 Continuance intention factors
Based on hypothesis test results seen in Table IV, it is found that TPE does not directly affect the user’s intention of using the service continuously (Cl). However, TPE positively influences SAT and PU. These two variables then have significant effect towards Cl. This indicates that investor trust in LKPM Online services indirectly influences investors’ intentions to use LKPM Online on an ongoing basis. It can be argued that investors’ trust in LKPM Online services may affect their perceptions of the usefulness of the service and their satisfaction in using the service, which, in turn, will affect their intention to use the service on an ongoing basis.

The indirect effect on investors’ intentions to use LKPM Online services on an ongoing basis may be because of the investors’ perceptions about the use of LKPM Online and their satisfaction in using LKPM Online. The perception of investors regarding the use of LKPM Online is determined by the investor’s trust in LKPM Online service. The more investors believe in the service, the more they feel the usefulness gained when using LKPM Online. When the investor feels that he/she is benefitted, he/she will have the desire to re-use the LKPM Online service to re-experience the benefits. This is in line with research conducted by Kim et al. (2008) which states that a buyer will re-transact online if he/she feels the benefits of the service.

Meanwhile, investors’ satisfaction in using LKPM Online services is influenced by their trust in LKPM Online services and PU. The more investors trust the LKPM Online services, the more they feel satisfied when using LKPM Online services. In addition, if an investor gets more benefits of services, the more satisfied he/she is when using the LKPM Online service. This is in line with the research which states that PU can be a major predictor of user SAT (Hernandez-Ortega et al., 2014) and that the benefits gained in using the system determine the PU that will affect user SAT. When the investors are satisfied, they will have the desire to re-use the LKPM Online service. This is in line with the research that has been conducted by Kang and Lee (2010) which states that user satisfaction is an important antecedent of the use of technology in a sustainable manner.

7. Implications and limitation
In this study, we conclude that ECT is applicable in G2B process. The investors first have the perception of benefit of using public e-service and confirm the perception through their experience in using the e-service. When the investors find that the perceived benefit aligns with their experience (SAT) while using the e-service, it will encourage them to continue using the service. However, if the investors are dissatisfied with their experience they will not continue to use LPKM Online. On the other hand, the PU is directly able to encourage
investors to continue using the service. This is because they find that the LKPM Online service is useful for their needs so it does not require a confirmation process.

Practically, there are some implications based on this study. Trust antecedents are ESQ, FAM, TGV and REC. To improve investor trust on the e-service, the government needs to improve the ESQ, investor familiarity with the system, investor trust on the government entity and recommendation on using the system. ESQ could be enhanced by evaluating the system efficiency, privacy, user support, reliability and information quality (clear, accurate and correct).

FAM to use the system can be improved by training or socialization. LKPM Online workshop, which is a direct practice of LKPM Online, can be used as a way for investors to become accustomed to using LKPM Online service. The workshop of LKPM Online has been held by BKPM, but not all investment companies have been invited to participate in this activity because of budget constraints. By conducting LKPM Online workshop on a regular basis, it is expected that more and more investors will participate in LKPM Online workshop so that investors who have attended the workshop become accustomed to using LKPM Online. The policy-related socialization related to LKPM Online is a way for BKPM to be able to improve RECs to investors. Socialization can be done by conveying the benefits of using the system. Designing the system as easy as possible can also improve the FAM as the user only needs a little effort to memorize or use the system. To increase investor trust in BKPM, BKPM must always improve the employee competence to facilitate problems in the field of capital investment faced by investors. In addition, BKPM should serve and do best for investors with full honesty and integrity.

Investor trust in LKPM Online service does not directly affect the desire of investors to re-use LKPM Online services continuously but through investors’ perceptions of the benefits of LKPM Online and the perceived satisfaction of investors. Therefore, BKPM should be able to increase the usefulness and benefits of LKPM Online and try to increase investor satisfaction so that investors have the intention to continue to use LKPM Online continuously in every LKPM reporting period. In an effort to increase investor perception that LKPM Online services have benefits, BKPM should be able to demonstrate the paybacks of LKPM Online by providing socialization to investors related to the benefits gained by using LKPM Online services. To increase the SAT of investors in using LKPM Online, BKPM should make improvements on the shortcomings contained in LKPM Online so that investors can feel satisfied in using LKPM Online service. The limitation of this study is the sample and population which only involves a government agency in Indonesia. However, this result might still be applied to other government agencies in Indonesia that used the online system as a reporting channel.

8. Conclusion
Based on the results, we conclude that factors that determine investor trust in LKPM Online service are service quality, investor’s trust towards BKPM entity, the recommendation of the use of LKPM Online service and investor’s habit in using LKPM Online service. Factors that do not determine investor trust in LKPM Online service are the factors of DTT. The tendency of investors to trust someone or something has no effect on their level of trust in LKPM Online services. Another conclusion is that investor trust in an online service does not directly influence his/her continuance of use. Trust will impact the continuance of use through perceptions of the benefits of LKPM Online and the perceived satisfaction of using LKPM Online.
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## Appendix

### Trust and its impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LKPM Online system is easy to use</td>
<td>Belanche <em>et al.</em> (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LKPM Online system is well organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LKPM Online system has an easy way to find what I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The system makes me report the LKPM faster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The page in the website shows in short time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel that my secrecy is kept while using LKPM Online</td>
<td>Belanche <em>et al.</em> (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LKPM Online does not share my private information to other sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LKPM Online keeps my information safe from unauthorized access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papadomichelaki and Mentzas (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I have problem while reporting the LPKM, the staff will give genuine concern to solve it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>If I have question in reporting LPKM, the staff will give answer promptly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If I have question in reporting LPKM, the staff have enough knowledge to answer it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The staff is able to build user trust and confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belanche <em>et al.</em> (2014), Papadomichelaki and Mentzas (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LKPM Online has been always successfully accessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LKPM Online runs as it should be in my Web browser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Documents in the LPKM Online can be downloaded in a short time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LKPM Online is always available and can be accessed whenever I want to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teo <em>et al.</em> (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LKPM Online provides information that satisfy my need in reporting the LPKM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I get the information I need in timely manner by using LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LKPM Online provides information in useful format (e.g. the information of LPKM is ready in .pdf form so it can be used for other matters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LKPM Online provides clear information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LKPM Online provides accurate information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LKPM Online provides up-to-date information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LKPM Online provides reliable information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the accuracy given by LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the information provided by LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Overall, LKPM Online provides useful information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Overall, LKPM Online provides qualified information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim <em>et al.</em> (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Generally, I trust other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Generally, I have trust in humanity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Generally, I feel that others are reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Generally, I trust other people unless I have reason to not trusting them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TGV</td>
<td>I am assured towards BKPM</td>
<td>Park et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that BKPM has done its best for the investor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that BKPM has the competencies to solve the issues regarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that BKPM has done their jobs with honesty and integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>BKPM socializes their readiness in conducting LKPM online frequently</td>
<td>Belanche et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BKPM conveys the positive things in using LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BKPM recommends the use of LKPM online to the investors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM</td>
<td>Overall, I am familiar with LKPM Online</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am familiar with the data input process in LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am familiar with ordinance of use of the LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE</td>
<td>I trust LKPM Online</td>
<td>Belanche et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LKPM Online is reliable</td>
<td>(2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LKPM Online can be trusted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>LKPM Online is useful for me</td>
<td>Belanche et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LKPM Online gives benefit for me</td>
<td>(2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LKPM Online improves my performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am comfortable using the LKPM Online</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can cut some cost by using the LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can save some time by using the LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting through LKPM online is faster than using other method (e.g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fax, post or email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using LKPM Online can improve my tasks productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with LKPM Online</td>
<td>Belanche et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my opinion, using LKPM Online is one of the best decisions</td>
<td>(2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a satisfying experience in using LKPM Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>I intend to continue using LKPM Online in reporting the LKPM</td>
<td>Belanche et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I intend to continue using LKPM Online in reporting the LKPM without</td>
<td>(2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>considering any other method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will choose to reuse LKPM Online when I have to report the LKPM in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1.
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