IDENTIFICATION OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE ADOPTION OF THE USE OF MYGRAPARI SERVICE MACHINES IN JAKARTA WITH THE UNIFIED THEORY OF ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF TECHNOLOGY 2 MODEL (UTAUT 2)

Rio Gusman[1], Maya Ariyanti[2]

[1-2]School of Economics & Business, Telkom University,
INDONESIA.

[1]riogusman2323@gmail.com, [2]ariyanti@telkomuniversity.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Telkomsel as a telecommunication operator with the largest share in Indonesia not only makes innovation and improvement in its business core as a cellular operator, but also improves its services to customers with improvement and refinement in the location of customer touch point services such as in Grapari. In order to do shifting conventional services towards digital services, In 2015 Telkomsel presented a self-service machine named MyGrapari which is placed in Grapari outlets in all regions in Indonesia. Based on the data, there is a downward trend for utilization of MyGrapari with an average decrease in transactions up to -1.47% in opposite there was an average growth in the number of Grapari service transactions nationwide at 1.53%. The average comparison of the number of transactions in MyGrapari service machine to the number of transactions in Grapari in 2017 only reached 15.44%, so that it is considered that there is still a large opportunity for improvement to optimize the use of MyGrapari.

Through this research, MyGrapari users' perceptions are measured regarding variables of UTAUT2. In addition, this study also identifies the factors affecting the adoption of the use of MyGrapari service machines in jakarta with the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology 2 model (utaut 2) and examines the influence of age and gender as the moderating variables.

The methods used in this research were a quantitative method through consumer survey. Applied technique of sampling was a simple random sampling. There were 300 users as respondents. Meanwhile, all those data were analyzed through Structural Equation Model (SEM) and SmartPLS3 software.

Based on the results of data processing, it is known that performance expectancy, effort expectancy, facilitating condition, and hedonic motivation have significant and positive influence on the behavior intention with the greatest influence from facilitating condition. In addition, it turns out that the adoption adoption of the use of MyGrapari can be explained by performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition, hedonic motivation, habit and trust variables at 47.1%.

Keywords: Telkomsel, UTAUT2, Use Behavior

INTRODUCTION

Because of the rapid development of technology, especially the Internet, today we have entered the digital era, which also has an impact on increasing competitions among telecommunications operators. It has become irresistible that the telecommunication industry

at this time needs to shift from legacy businesses (voice and SMS) to digital ones (broadband/data services). At present, intense competition in seizing customers is more focused on internet data services. This requires operators to improve their quality from network, speed, to appropriate tariff. Technological innovations continue to be developed in order to be presented to customers. For instance, 4G technology has been presented for improving broadband services.

Telkomsel as a telecommunication operator in Indonesia with the largest market share at present creates innovation and improvement in its core business as well as improves services to customers by doing refinement in the customer touch points such as in Grapari. During 2017 there was an average growth in the number of Grapari service transactions nationwide at 1.53%.

In 2015, Telkomsel presented MyGrapari service machine scattered in Grapari outlets in all regions in Indonesia. One of the main objectives in the innovation of MyGrapari service machine is to perform shifting from legacy services namely conventional services (counters in Grapari) to digital services. However, until 2017 MyGrapari's operational performance was still not optimal in achieving that goal. Based on the data from Telkomsel internal unit, the average comparison of the number of transactions in MyGrapari service machine to the number of transactions in Grapari in 2017 only reached 15.44%. If seen from the trend of the number of MyGrapari transactions during 2017, there is a downward trend with an average decrease in transactions up to -1.47%.

Based on the decribed condition above, it is considered that there is still a large opportunity for improvement to optimize the use of MyGrapari and the Telkomsel customers are expected to become accustomed to use self-service as the main concept of MyGrapari since previously they were only accustomed to being served by conventional services (Grapari counter). Therefore, in this research, the researcher conducts identification on the factors affecting the adoption of the use of MyGrapari service machines in Jakarta with the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology 2 model (utaut 2).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participants

Respondents in this study amounted to 300 people (166 men and 134 women) who use the MyGrapary service at least once in the last 3 months.

Instruments

The data collection tool was performance expectancy questionnaire which involving 2 questions, effort expectancy which involving 3 questions, social influence which involving 3 questions, facilitating conditions which involving 3 questions, hedonic motivation which involving 2 questions, habit which involving 2 questions, trust which involving 4 questions, and behavioral intention.

Data Analysis

The analytical method used in this research is using PLS-SEM with two evaluation steps:

i.   Evaluation of measurement (outer model) to assess the validity and reliability of the model through the validity of convergent and discriminant

ii. Evaluation of structural (inner model) that aim to predict the relationship between latent variables

ISSN: 2186-845X ISSN: 2186-8441 Print
www.ajmse. leena-luna.co.jp

Leena and Luna International, Chikusei, Japan.
(株) リナアンドルナインターナショナル, 筑西市,日本

Copyright © 2019
P a g e | 2

Table 1. Operationalization of Variables

Conceptual Definition	Indicator	Measurement Scale
Performance Expectancy (PE) The level of trust that the use of technology will provide benefits in carrying out certain activities (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	The product can help meet the needs (PE1) Completion of the needs through the product is faster (PE2)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Effort Expectancy (EE) The level of ease in the use of technology (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	It is easy to learn about the product use (EE1) I feel the product is easy to use (EE 2) It is easy for me to become proficient in using the product (EE 3)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Social Influence (SI) The user's perception regarding his/her close person's suggestion that ensures him/her to use the technology (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	My relatives/close friends suggest me to use the product in fulfilling the needs (SI1) Suggestions and recommendations from friends will influence my decision to use the product (SI2) I will use the product because a lot of my friends also use the product (SI3)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Facilitating Condition (FC) User's perception related to the availability of resources and encouragement to use (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	I have knowledge related to the use of the product (FC1) I can get help from others when I have difficulty using the product (FC2) In general, the product availability can be accessed easily (FC3)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Hedonic Motivation (HM) The perceived pleasure that comes from using the technology (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	I feel happy when using the product (HM1) Using products makes me feel modern (HM2)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Habit (HA) An automatic action that occurs based on the level of experience that someone has (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	The product use has become a habit for me (HA1) I must use the product (HA2)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Trust (TR) Trust on promises that they are reliable, and the liabilities will be met (Slade et al, 2015).	I believe that the product can protect personal data (TR1) I am sure the product is safe when used. (TR2) I rely on information and transactions made through the product (TR3) I rely on the processes done through the product (TR4)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
Behavioral Intention (BI) The level of desire to continue to use the product to fulfil the needs (Venkatesh et al, 2012).	I want to continue using the product in the future (BI1) I would recommend other people to use the product (BI2)	(Likert Scale) 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

RESULTS

More comprehensive picture of the description of the respondents consisted of gender and age. The subjects consisted of 166 men (55.33%) and 134 women (44.67%). In term of age, 217 respondens (73.33%) were 18-37 years old (Y generation), 80 (26.66%) were 38-57 years old (X generation), 3 (1.01%) were 8-17 years old (Z generation).

Descriptive data shows an overview of respondent's answers to statements contained in the questionnaire and the responses of respondents. In term of performance expectancy, PE1 was the strongest component with score 85.67 and PE2 (84.75). In term of effort expectancy, EE2 was the strongest component with score 83.50 followed by EE1 (77.67) and EE3 (77.00).

In term of social influence, SI1 was the strongest component with score 77.25 followed by SI2 (76.00) and SI3 (74.17). In term of facilitating conditions, FC2 was the strongest component with score 82.25 followed by FC3 (78.50) and FC1 (76.42). In term of hedonic motivation, HM2 was the strongest component with score 82.33 and HM1 (81.17).

In term of habit, HA1 was the strongest component with score 82.67 and HA2 (82.25). In term of trust, TR1 was the strongest component with score 83.00 followed by TR2 (82.42), and TR3 & TR4 (82.33). In term of behavioral intention, BI2 was the strongest component with score 85.42 and BI (82.75).

The evaluation of the outer model measurement in this research was reflective construct. The reflective construct indicator testing used were construct validity, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

The construct validity of a specific indicator is based on loading factors and cross load values. If the load factors and the cross-load values are higher than 0.50 on two or more factors, they are considered significant (Hair et all, 2010).

Table 2. Loading Factor per Indicator

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics ($|O/STDEV|$)	P Values
BI1 <- BI	0.939	0.939	0.011	83.184	0.000
BI2 <- BI	0.950	0.950	0.008	121.900	0.000
EE1 <- EE	0.741	0.734	0.056	13.312	0.000
EE2 <- EE	0.770	0.770	0.032	23.922	0.000
EE3 <- EE	0.858	0.856	0.024	36.076	0.000
FC1 <- FC	0.765	0.760	0.046	16.806	0.000
FC2 <- FC	0.744	0.740	0.046	16.189	0.000
FC3 <- FC	0.793	0.793	0.030	26.090	0.000
HA1 <- HA	0.924	0.922	0.018	51.348	0.000
HA2 <- HA	0.938	0.938	0.011	84.402	0.000
HM1 <- HM	0.917	0.916	0.017	54.503	0.000
HM2 <- HM	0.901	0.900	0.022	40.700	0.000
PE1 <- PE	0.835	0.833	0.030	27.507	0.000
PE2 <- PE	0.922	0.922	0.012	73.969	0.000
SI1 <- SI	0.769	0.768	0.040	19.330	0.000
SI2 <- SI	0.887	0.885	0.022	40.094	0.000
SI3 <- SI	0.851	0.850	0.033	25.649	0.000
TR1 <- TR	0.917	0.916	0.017	52.492	0.000
TR2 <- TR	0.903	0.902	0.026	35.127	0.000
TR3 <- TR	0.939	0.939	0.014	67.042	0.000
TR4 <- TR	0.916	0.915	0.015	59.331	0.000

ISSN: 2186-845X ISSN: 2186-8441 Print
www.ajmse. leena-luna.co.jp

Leena and Luna International, Chikusei, Japan.
(株) リナアンドルナインターナショナル, 筑西市,日本

Copyright © 2019
P a g e | 4

The results of analysis as displayed in the table above show that all the indicators that measure the specific constructs > 0.50, thus each construct has reached a predetermined minimum standard.

The three main aspects used in assessing convergent validity are loading factor, composite reliability (CR) and extracted average (AVE) (Hair et all, 2010).

Table 3. Construct Reliability and Validity

	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Performance Expectancy	0.715	0.872	0.773
Effort Expectancy	0.704	0.833	0.626
Social Influence	0.784	0.875	0.701
Facilitating Conditions	0.653	0.811	0.589
Hedonic Motivation	0.789	0.905	0.826
Habit	0.846	0.928	0.866
Trust	0.939	0.956	0.844
Behavior Intention	0.880	0.943	0.893
Use Behavior	1.000	1.000	1.000

Based on the result, it is found that the Cronbach's Alpha values are above 0.6, the CR values are above 0.60 and the AVE value are above 0.50 (above the minimum limit). It can be concluded that the construct has good convergent validity.

Table 4. Cross Loadings of Research Variables

	BI	EE	FC	HA	HM	PE	SI	TR	UB
BI1	**0.939**	0.502	0.553	0.434	0.516	0.482	0.434	0.452	0.173
BI2	**0.950**	0.507	0.603	0.487	0.595	0.488	0.358	0.430	0.221
EE1	0.324	**0.741**	0.339	0.176	0.310	0.244	0.276	0.273	-0,084
EE2	0.469	**0.770**	0.540	0.566	0.649	0.582	0.425	0.481	-0,037
EE3	0.449	**0.858**	0.467	0.370	0.486	0.378	0.508	0.395	-0,064
FC1	0.429	0.535	**0.765**	0.418	0.483	0.353	0.570	0.395	0.040
FC2	0.466	0.412	**0.744**	0.548	0.505	0.487	0.334	0.547	0.004
FC3	0.511	0.403	**0.793**	0.384	0.510	0.332	0.411	0.369	0.106
HA1	0.429	0.437	0.490	**0.924**	0.595	0.568	0.334	0.635	-0,060
HA2	0.478	0.484	0.590	**0.938**	0.610	0,600	0.393	0.633	-0,044
HM1	0.557	0.548	0.635	0.611	**0.917**	0.543	0.512	0.605	0.027
HM2	0.514	0.603	0.545	0.563	**0.901**	0.532	0.432	0.575	0.045
PE1	0.365	0.459	0.466	0.520	0.562	**0.835**	0.414	0.504	-0.079
PE2	0.518	0.475	0.437	0.581	0.497	**0.922**	0.353	0.500	0.049
SI1	0.368	0.503	0.451	0.353	0.459	0.387	**0.769**	0.465	-0.063
SI2	0.342	0.434	0.481	0.323	0.441	0.382	**0.887**	0.412	0.028
SI3	0.331	0.367	0.483	0.302	0.402	0.293	**0.851**	0.368	0.006
TR1	0.427	0.482	0.558	0.679	0.636	0.539	0.461	**0.917**	-0.055
TR2	0.380	0.399	0.504	0.604	0.570	0.470	0.415	**0.903**	-0.086
TR3	0.434	0.459	0.496	0.615	0.579	0.532	0.445	**0.939**	-0.079
TR4	0.465	0.482	0.523	0.603	0.601	0.534	0.508	**0.916**	-0.041
UB1	0.210	-0.075	0.068	-0.055	0.039	-0.005	-0.014	-0.070	**1.000**

The next model outer evaluation is discriminant validity, the way to conduct the discriminant validity from a measurement model with reflective indicators is based on the cross-loading measurements with the constructs. If the correlation between the constructs and the measurement items is greater than the size of the other constructs, it shows that the latent constructs predict the size of their block better than the size of the other blocks.

The structural model analysis (Inner Model) aims to test hypothesis developed then further to test the influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. According to Ghozali (2014) there are criteria used to evaluate structural model such as looking at the value of R² for endogenous latent variables (0.67 = good, 0.33 = moderate, 0.19 = weak) and also conducting GoF (Goodness of Fit) assessments.

Table 5. R-Squares of Structural Model

	Without moderating	Moderating Age	Moderating Gender	Conclusion
Behavior Intention	0.471	0.480	0.492	Moderate
Use Behavior	0.077	0.078	0.096	Weak

Based on the table above, generally there are no significant differences between the models without moderating and moderating (age and gender). In the model without moderation, the R² value = 0.471 for the behavioral intention and R² = 0.077 for the use behavior. According to Hair et al (2010) and Sugiyono (2014), R² value = 0.471 is included in the moderate category and R² = 0.077 is included in the weak category. The coefficient value of R² (R-square) shows how much influence the independent variable (X) has on the dependent variable (Y). On the basis to this fact, it can be concluded that the influences of performance expectancy, effort expectancy, trust, social influence, hedonic motivation, habit and facilitating condition on the behavioral intention (dependent variable) are in the moderate category. In the meantime, the influences of behavioral intention, habit and facilitating condition on the use behavior variable are in the weak category.

Table 6. Goodness of Fit

	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	R Square	AVE x R Square	Conclusion
Behavioral Intention	0.893	0.471	0.420	Big
Use Behavior	1.000	0.077	0.077	Small

After ensuring that the model was used both outer and inner model, Assessment of Goodness of Fit or GoF is one way to verify SEM-PLS. Specifically, the GOF value can be made based on the following formula:

$$Gof = \sqrt{(\overline{R^2} \times \overline{AVE})}$$

where R² is a variant of an endogenous construct, the percentage change in the dependent variables in relation to the independent variables. Meanwhile, AVE is the average value of the variance extracted. The GoF index values as suggested by Wetzels et al (2009) are 0.1 (small), 0.25 (medium) and 0.36 (big).

ISSN: 2186-845X ISSN: 2186-8441 Print
www.ajmse. leena-luna.co.jp

Leena and Luna International, Chikusei, Japan.
(株) リナアンドルナインターナショナル, 筑西市,日本

Copyright © 2019
P a g e | 6

Table 7. Hypothesis Testing

	Hypothesis	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Conclusion
PE->BI	H1a	0.160	2.256	0.024	**Significant**
EE->BI	H2a	0.139	2.251	0.025	**Significant**
SI->BI	H3a	-0,013	0.203	0.839	Not significant
FC->BI	H4a	0.328	4.564	0.000	**Significant**
FC->UB	H4b	-0.004	0.049	0.961	Not significant
HM->BI	H5a	0.201	2.617	0.009	**Significant**
HA->BI	H6a	0.010	0.124	0.901	Not significant
HA->UB	H6b	-0.206	3.083	0.002	**Significant**
TR->BI	H7a	-0.010	0.127	0.899	Not significant
BI*Age*PE->BI	H8a1	-0.372	1.050	0.294	Not significant
BI*Gender*PE->BI	H9a1	-0.436	1.580	0.114	Not significant
BI*Age*EE->BI	H8a2	0.030	0.539	0.590	Not significant
BI*Gender*EE->BI	H9a2	-0.043	0.544	0.587	Not significant
BI*Age*SI->BI	H8a3	0.064	0.212	0.832	Not significant
BI*Gender*SI->BI	H9a3	0.068	0.281	0.779	Not significant
BI*Age*FC->BI	H8a4	-0.241	0.613	0.540	Not significant
BI*Gender*FC->BI	H9a4	-0.003	0.009	0.993	Not significant
UB*Age*FC->UB	H8b4	-0.158	0.403	0.687	Not significant
UB*Gender*FC->UB	H9b4	-0.385	1.059	0.290	Not significant
BI*Age*HM->BI	H8a5	-0.041	0.116	0.907	Not significant
BI*Gender*HM->BI	H9a5	0.145	0.345	0.730	Not significant
BI*Age*HA->BI	H8a6	0.054	0.158	0.875	Not significant
BI*Gender*HA->BI	H9a6	0.802	1.760	0.079	Not significant
UB*Age*HA->UB	H8b6	0,120	0.433	0.665	Not significant
UB*Gender*HA->UB	H9b6	-0.179	0.780	0.435	Not significant
BI*Age*TR->BI	H8a7	0.218	0.500	0.617	Not significant
BI*Gender*TR->BI	H9a7	-0.416	1.198	0.231	Not significant
BI->UB	H10	0.313	4.717	0.000	**Significant**

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The objective of this study is to test and answer the research questions. Based on hypothesis testing and findings of this study, the result of the analysis on the performance expectancy, effort expectancy, trust, social influence, hedonic motivation, habit and facilitating condition, behavior intention and use behavior of using MyGrapari is presented as follow.

Performance expectancy is defined as the level of individual trust that the use of the system will increase benefit in the work (Venkatesh et al, 2003: 446). The influence of performance expectancy on the behavioral intention is significant because the t-statistic value obtained is 2.256 greater than t-table value at 1.96. The original sample value is positive which is equal to 0.160 indicating that the direction of relationship between the performance expectancy and the behavioral intention is positive. In other words, the two variables have a directly proportional or linear relationship. This describes that the ability of the MyGrapari to provide benefits to its users has a significant and positive effect on behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the performance expectancy is in a very good category. Thus, the H1a hypothesis in this research is accepted. This is certainly similar to the results of

technology adoption studies that have been done previously by Venkatesh et al (2012), Indrawati (2012) and Indrawati et al (2014).

Effort expectancy is defined as the level of ease in using the system (Venkatesh et al, 2003: 450). The influence of effort expectancy on the behavioral intention is significant because the t-statistic value is 2.251 greater than the t-table value at 1.96. The original sample value is positive, which is equal to 0.139. This indicates that the direction of relationship between the effort expectancy and the behavioral intention is positive or in other words both variables have a directly proportional or linear relationship. This describes that the ease of use of the MyGrapari for its users has a significant and positive effect on behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the effort expectancy is in the good category. Thus, the H2a hypothesis in this research is accepted. This is certainly similar to the results of technology adoption studies that have been done previously by Venkatesh et al (2012), Indrawati (2012) and Indrawati et al (2014).

Social influence is defined as the extent to which an individual feels that other people are important, believing he must use a new system (Venkatesh et al, 2003: 451). The effect of social influence on the behavioral intention is not significant because the t-statistic value obtained is 0.203 which is lower than the t-table value at 1.96. The original sample value is negative which is equal to -0.013. This also indicates that the direction of relationship between the social influence and the behavioral intention is negative or both variables have an inverse relationship. This describes that the user's perception of the person who is important to him ensures that he must use the MyGrapari does not significantly influence and does not have a positive effect on behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the social influence is in the good category. Thus, the H3a hypothesis of this research is rejected. However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Adelyn Kuan Lai Kit (2014).

Facilitating condition is defined as the extent to which an individual believes that the existing organization and technical infrastructure encourage the use of the system (Venkatesh et al, 2003). The influence of facilitating condition on the behavioral intention is significant because the t-statistic value gained is 4.564 greater than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample value is positive which is equal to 0.328 indicating that the direction of relationship between the facilitating condition and the behavioral intention is positive or both variables have a directly proportional or linear relationship. This describes that the availability of resources and the drive to use the MyGrapari have the most significant and positive effect on behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the facilitating conditions is in the good category. Thus, the H4a hypothesis is accepted. This is certainly similar to the results of technology adoption studies that have been done previously by Venkatesh et al (2012), Indrawati (2012) and Indrawati et al (2014).

The influence of facilitating condition on the use behavior is not significant because the t-statistic value of 0.049 is smaller than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample value is negative at -0.004, meaning that the direction of relationship between the facilitating condition and the use behavior is negative or the variables have an inverse relationship. This describes that the availability of resources and the drive to use the MyGrapari do not significantly and positively affect use behavior. Thus the H4b hypothesis is rejected.

ISSN: 2186-845X ISSN: 2186-8441 Print
www.ajmse. leena-luna.co.jp

Leena and Luna International, Chikusei, Japan.
(株) リナアンドルナインターナショナル, 筑西市,日本

Copyright © 2019
P a g e | 8

However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Gonçalo da Costa Aleixo Monteiro Melhorado Baptista (2016).

Hedonic motivation is defined as motivation for pleasure derived from the use of technology (Venkatesh et al, 2003). The influence of hedonic motivation on the behavioral intention is significant because the t-statistic value of 2.617 is greater than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample value is positive at 0.201 which means that the direction of relationship between the hedonic motivation and the behavioral intention is positive or both variables have a directly proportional or linear relationship. This describes that the motivation of pleasure derived from the use of the MyGrapari has a significant and positive effect on behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the hedonic motivation is in the very good category.Thus, the H5a hypothesis is accepted. This is certainly similar to the results of technology adoption studies that have been done previously by Venkatesh et al (2012), Indrawati (2012) and Indrawati et al (2014).

Habit is defined as a perception that reflects the results of previous experience (Venkatesh et al, 2012). The influence of habit on the behavioral intention is not significant because the t-statistic value of 0.124 is lower than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample value is positive at 0.010. This means that the direction of relationship between the habit and the behavioral intention is positive or both variables have a directly proportional or linear relationship. This describes that the perception of users of the MyGrapari that reflects the results of previous experience does not significantly influence behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the habit is in a very good category.Thus, the H6a hypothesis in this research is rejected. However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Arumugam Raman & Yahya Don (2013) and NoorUl Ain, Kiran Kaur & Mehwish Waheed (2015).

The influence of habit on the use behavior is significant because it is obtained that the t-statistic value of 3.083 is greater than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample value is negative at -0.206. This means that the direction of relationship between the habit and the use behavior is negative or both variables have an inverse relationship. This describes that the perception of users of the MyGrapari that reflects the results of previous experience does not positively affect use behavior. Thus the H6b hypothesis in this research is rejected. However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Arumugam Raman & Yahya Don (2013) and NoorUl Ain, Kiran Kaur & Mehwish Waheed (2015).

Trust is defined as the basis for building and maintaining intrapersonal relationships (Dan Johnson, 2006). The influence of trust on the behavioral intention is not significant because the t-statistic value of 0.127 is lower than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample value is negative as equal to -0.010 indicating that the direction of relationship between the trust and the behavioral intention is negative or both variables have an inverse relationship. This describes that the user's confidence in reliable promises and obligations will be fulfilled with the use of the MyGrapari that does not significantly and positively affect behavior intention to adopt the MyGrapari. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the trust is in the very good category. Thus, the H7a hypothesis of this research is rejected. However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Jelena Miladinovic, Hong Xiang (2016).

The influence of behavioral intention on the use behavior is significant because the t-statistic value gained is 4.717 which is greater than the t-table value of 1.96. The original sample

value is positive, which is equal to 0.31. this means that the direction of relationship between the behavioral intention and the use behavior is positive or both variables have a directly proportional or linear relationship. This describes that the desire to continue using the MyGrapari has a positive and significant influence on user behavior in order to continue to increase usage. Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the perception of users of the MyGrapari who were respondents to the behavior intention is in the very good category. Thus, the H10 hypothesis is accepted. This is certainly similar to the results of technology adoption studies that have been done previously by Venkatesh et al (2012), Indrawati (2012) and Indrawati et al (2014).

The examination of age moderator variable was conducted by following previously listed steps which is by dividing group based on moderation, in this case is young age ranging from 18-35 years old and elderly ranging from 36-57 years old. Based on the examination result on age group moderation t-value, it is found that all variables have t-value < 1.65 have α = 5%. Therefore, it can be found that age is not the moderator. Thus, the H8a1 - H8a7, H8b4 and H8b6 hypothesis are rejected. However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Numan R Manaf, Maya Ariyanti (2017) and Mei-Hsiang Wang (2016).

The examination by involving gender moderator variable was conducted by considering gender influence involving "male" and "female" categories. Based on the examination result of gender group moderation t-value, it is found that all variables have t-value < 1.65 have α = 5%. Therefore, it can be found that gender is not the moderator. Thus, H9a1 - H9a7, H9b4 and H9b6 hypothesis are rejected. However, this result is similar to technology adoption studies from Numan R Manaf, Maya Ariyanti (2017) and Jorge Tavares, Tiago Oliveira (2016).

This research obtains the R-Square (R^2) value of behavioral intention at 0.471. This illustrates that the behavioral intention of the users in adopting the MyGrapari can be explained by performance expectancy, effort expectancy, trust, social influence, hedonic motivation, habit and facilitating condition by 47.1%, while the rest explained by other variables outside of this research.

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded as follows:

there are four (4) variables have a positive and significant determinant to Intention to use. Those variables are facilitating condition, performance expectancy, effort expectancy and hedonic motivation. The strongest predictor towards Intention to Use is facilitating condition. Meanwhile use behavior is determined by behavior intention. Thus, this means that the key determinant for the success of the MyGrapari intention to use is determined mainly by facilitating condition which is driven by ease of getting help to use and ease of finding the MyGrapari.

The differences in age and gender do not have a significant impact on the influence of performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, hedonic motivation, habit and trust on the behavior intention and use behavior in adopting the use of the MyGrapari. This is because MyGrapari is a general service for both young and adult users as well as male or female users.

Based on the results of this study, there are several things that can be suggested to the company in improving the services of the MyGrapari, as follows:

The aspect of facilitating condition is a factor that has the greatest influence for users in adopting the use of the MyGrapari. From the results of the descriptive analysis, the indicator

ISSN: 2186-845X ISSN: 2186-8441 Print
www.ajmse. leena-luna.co.jp

Leena and Luna International, Chikusei, Japan.
(株) リナアンドルナインターナショナル, 筑西市,日本

Copyright © 2019
P a g e | 10

of user knowledge of the services provided by the MyGrapari engine is the lowest, so in this case it is recommended that Telkomsel increase its socialization to its customers for any benefits or services provided by MyGrapari. In addition, related to other indicators included in this aspect, namely the ease of obtaining the location of the MyGrapari unit, it is also recommended to increase the number and location of the deployment of the MyGrapari service engine.

The effort expectancy aspect is the factor that has the smallest significant influence affecting the customers to adopt the MyGrapari, from the analysis it is known that the weakest assessment is on the ease of learning the use of the MyGrapari without the help of others, so Telkomsel recommends improvement the instructions for using MyGrapari to be easier to learn.

Although the results of this research provide additional new insights about the use of self-service machine, there is still limitation that cannot be avoided. The use of MyGrapari located in Jakarta as the target scope in this research might have influenced the generalization of the results. In this research, the construct discussed refers to the variables contained in the UTAUT2 research model. To further add to the literature regarding the factors that influence the use of the MyGrapari, in the next research it is possible to use other factors such as the type of service features on the machine and the factors of substitution technology that provides the same service features.

REFERENCES

[1]   Afni, N., & Ibnu, A. (2017). *Analisis tingkat kepuasan pengguna commuter line terhadap commuter vending machine dengan metode technology acceptance model pada*. Indoneisa: Simposium Nasional Ilmu Pengetahuan dan Teknologi.

[2]   Bachrudin, A., & Tobing, H. L. (2003). Analisis data untuk penelitian survaydenganmenggunakan lisrel 8. *Jurusan Statistika FMIPA-UNPAD*.

[3]   Hair, J. F., William, B., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. USA: Prentice-Hall.

[4]   Indrawati, R., Murali, W. C. K., Ariyanti, M., Mansur, D. M., Marhaeni, G. A. M. M., Tohir, L. M., Gaffar, M. R., Has, M. N., & Yuliansyah, S. (2017). *Perilaku konsumen individu: dalam mengadopsi layanan berbasis teknologi informasi & komunikasi*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.

[5]   Indrawati, S. R. (2016). *Factors affecting consumers' decision toward kiostiketmandiri adoption in purchasing train tickets in Indonesia*. Indonesia: ISCLO.

[6]   Indrawati. (2012). *Behavioural intention to use 3G mobile multimedia services in Indonesia*. Malaysia: Multimedia University Malaysia.

[7]   Indrawati. (2014). *Measurement for analizing instant messenger application adotion using unified theory of acceptance and use of technology 2 (UTAUT2)*. Malaysia: International Conference on GTAR. Global Illuminator.

[8]   Indrawati. (2015). *Metode penelitian manajemendan bisnis: Konvergensi teknologi komunikasidan Informasi*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.

[9]   Khalil, M. T., & Hosni, (2014). *Measurement for analizing instant messenger application adotion using unified theory of acceptance and use of technology 2 (UTAUT2)*. Malaysia: International Conference on GTAR. Global Illuminator.

[10]   (2015). *Metode penelitian manajemendan bisnis: Konvergensi teknologi komunikasidan Informasi*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.

[11]   A. Y. (2004). *Management of technology: The key to competitiveness and wealth creation*. USA: Prentice-Hall.

[12]   Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2012). *Principles of marketing (14th Ed)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[13]   Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2012). *Marketing management*. USA: Prentice Hall

[14]   Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management: 15th global edition*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

[15]   Leong, L. Y., Hew, T. S., Tan, G. W. H., & Ooi, K. B. (2013b). Predicting the determinants of the NFC-enabled mobile credit card acceptance: A neural networks approach. *Applications*, *40*, 5604-5620.

[16]   Leong, L. Y., Ooi, K. B., Chong, A. Y. L., & Lin, B. (2013a). Modelling the stimulators of the behavioral intention to use mobile entertainment: Does gender really matter? *Computers in Human Behaviour, 29*, 2109-2121.

[17]   Mas'ud, M. H. (2012). Pengaruh sikap, norma-norma subyektifdan kontrol perilaku yang dipersepsikan nasabah bank terhadap keinginan untuk menggunakan Automatic Teller Machine (ATM) Bank Bca di Kota Malang. *Jurnal Manajemendan Akuntansi*, *1* (3).

[18]   Mothersbaugh & Hawkins (2016). *Consumer behavior building marketing strategy*. USA: McGraw Hill.

[19]   Putra, A. S. (2017). *Analisis technology acceptance model (TAM) terhadap ATM mygrapari di grapari telkomsel pemuda Surabaya*. Surabaya: Universitas Narotama Surabaya.

[20]   Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. Malaysia: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

[21]   Venkatesh, M.G., & Davis, F. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly, 27*, 425-478.

[22]   Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y. L., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Quarterly, 36* (1), 157-178.

[23]   Wijanto, S.H. (2008). *Structural equation modeling dengan LISREL 8.8*. Yogyakarta: GrahaIlmu.

[24]   Yang, H. (2013). Bon appétit for apps: Young American consumers' acceptance of mobile applications. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 53*(3), 85-96.

[25]   Yang, K. (2010). Determinants of US consumer mobile shopping services adoption: Implications for designing mobile shopping services. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 27*(3), 262-270.

ISSN: 2186-845X ISSN: 2186-8441 Print
www.ajmse. leena-luna.co.jp

Leena and Luna International, Chikusei, Japan.
㈱ リナアンドルナインターナショナル, 筑西市,日本

Copyright © 2019
P a g e | 12