

## DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Abdul Razak Munir., 2013., Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Behavioral Intention Nasabah Untuk Menggunakan Layanan Mobile Banking Di Sulawesi Selatan, Disertasi, Universitas Hasanuddin

Aida Budrevičiūtė , Ramunė Kalėdienė, Liudmila Bagdonienė, Renata Paukštaitienė, Leonas Valius., 2019., Perceptions of Social, Emotional, and Functional Values in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Their Satisfaction with Primary Health Care Services, Primary Health Care Research & Development., Volume 20 e122

Anwar, Anas Iswanto (Ed), 2020. Perekonomian Indonesia dan covid 19. Publisher : Program Doktor Ilmu Ekonomi FEB UNHAS

Augusty T. Ferdinand, A, 2002, “Structural Equation Modelling Dalam Penelitian Manajemen”, Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang

Aistė Dovalienė, Regina Virvilaitė.,2008., Customer Value and Its Contribution to the Longevity of Relationship with Service Provider: the Case of Theatre Industry EngineeringEconomic.1 (56)

Andi Tenri Nur Fatimah , Dian A.S Parawansa , Abdul Razak Munir.,2020.,The Influence Of Useful, Ease, Trust and Convenience Interest In Customer Behavior and decision Using Internet banking In The Unit Of PT. Bank Rakyat Indonesia TBK Branch Ahmad Yani Makassar. Hasanuddin Journal of Applied Business and Entrepreneurshi., Vol. 3 No 3

Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020, laporan Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Tangerang Selatan, <https://tangselkota.bps.go.id>

Dian,A.S.Parawansa.2012.,The Mediating Effect Of Trust, Satisfaction and Commitment On The Relationship Between Service Quality and Customer Loyalty In IslamicBanking Of Indonesia.,Transformation Of Research In Islamic Studies. Posgraduates Division Academy Of Islamic Studies University Of Malaya.Kuala Lumpur

Dian A.S Parawansa, fauziah Umar, Andi Reni, Muhammad Toaha, 2020., Trust and Customer Value As a Strategig Business on Islamic Banking”, IAETSD Journal For Advanced Reaserch in applied science, Volume VII, IssueXI , November, Issn no:2394 - 8442

Dinas Kesehatan, 2019, Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah (LKIP) Kota Tangerang Selatan, <https://dinkes.tangerangselatan.kota.go.id>

Eun Jung Choi 1 and Soo-Hyun Kim .,2013, The Study of the Impact of Perceived

Quality and Value of Social Enterprises on Customer Satisfaction and Re-Purchase Intention., International Journal of Smart Home. Vol. 7, No. 1, January

Ghozali, I. 2011., *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 19* (5th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang.

Griffin, J. 2005., Customer Loyalty: How To Earn It, How To Keep It. McGraw Hill Irwin. New York. Terjemahan Dr. D.K. Yahya.. *Customer Loyalty : Menumbuhkan dan Mempertahankan Kesetiaan Pelanggan*. Erlangga. Jakarta.

Haemoon Oh, 2000., The Effect Of Brand Class, Brand awareness and Price On Customer Value and Behavior., Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, Vol. 24, No. 2

Indrianty Sudirman, Nurdjanah Hamid., Indahwaty Sidin, 2017, The Manifestation Of Physician's NonVerbal Communication Towards Patient's Satisfaction, DOI: 10.18488/journal.73/2017.5.2/73.2.29.35

Kotler, P dan G. Armstrong. 2008. Principles Of Marketing. 12<sup>th</sup> ed. Prentice Hall International by Pearson Education. New Jersey. Terjemahan B. Sabran. 2014. Prinsip – prinsip Pemasaran. Edisi 12. Erlangga. Jakarta

\_\_\_\_\_ dan K.L. Keller. 2009. Marketing Management. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Pearson Education, Inc. New Jersey. Terjemahan H. Teguh, R.A. Rusli dan B. Molan. 2012. Manajemen Pemasaran. Edisi ke-13. PT. Indeks. Jakarta

Mubashra Maqsood, Humera Maqsood, Robina kousar, Chanda jabeen, Ali Waqas, Prof.Dr.Syed Amir Gillani., 2017., Effects of hospital service quality on patients satisfaction and behavioural intention of doctors and nurses, Saudi Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Saudi Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences, DOI: 10.21276/sjmp

Myeong-Jo Choo, Yeon-Sung Jung., 2015., Effects of Traditional Market Service Quality Factors on Customer Value, Relational Quality, and Behavioral Intention., Journal of Distribution Science, 13-11

Nasreen Khan., Abdul Kadir., Sharifah L., Yong Hoe Hong., 2013 ., Exploring Multi-Dimensions Of Customer Value in Service Industry., Austrian Journal Of Basic and applied Sciences, 7(4): 43-55

Netty Laura., 2016, The Effect Of Trust and Service Quality Toward patient Satisfaction With Customer Value as Intervening Variable, Binus Business Review, 7(2), August 2016, 157-162

Nor Hazlin Nor Asshidin., Nurazariah Abidina., Hafizzah Bashira Borhanb.,2016., Perceived quality and emotional value that influence consumer's purchase intention towards American and local products., 2015., Procedia Economics and Finance 35 ( 2016 ) 639 – 643

Po Young Chu, Gin Yuan LEE, YU Chao 2012, “ Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, Customer Trust and Loyalty in an e-Banking Context,, Social Behaviour and persoality an international journal

Rachmana Putra,Aulia.,2019.,Analysis of behavioral intention to use a communitybased information system in the City of Banda Aceh Indonesia., Expert Journal of Marketing, Volume 7 Issue 2 pp. 93-99

Ravichandra Khrisnamurthy, 2010., Influence Of Service Quality On Banking Customer Behavioral Intention.,International Journal of Economics and Finance, Vol 2 No 4

Samaringhe Dinesh, Gayithri Kuruppu .,2016, “ The Effect Of Customer Perceived value On Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty: A Case Of SrilankanPay – TV Industry”, NCTM

Sedarmayanti ., 2002. Metode Penelitian. Mandar Maju. Jakarta

Sekaran, Uma dan Roger Bougie, .,2017, Metode Penelitian untuk Bisnis: Pendekatan Pengembangan-Keahlian, Edisi 6, Buku 1, Cetakan Kedua, Salemba Empat, Jakarta

\_\_\_\_\_, 2017, Metode Penelitian untuk Bisnis: Pendekatan Pengembangan-Keahlian, Edisi 6, Buku 1, Cetakan Kedua, Salemba Empat, Jakarta

Sheth, J.N., Newman, B.I. and Gross, B.L. (1991a), Consumption Values and Market Choice, South Western Publishing, Cincinnati, OH

Seung-Kwon Yang, Jae-Hyun Shim, 2018., The Effects of Service Qualities on Customer Satisfaction, Trust, and Behavioral Intention in Smartphone Shopping Mall., International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business, 9-12(2018) 31-4

Sirdeskmukh, Singh Jaghdip., Barry Sabol, 2002., Consumer Trust, Value and Loyalty In Relational Exchange., Journal Of Marketing, Vol 66 (January)., p.15-37

Sugiyono,2012., Metode Penelitian Bisnis, Alfabeta, Bandung

Stephen Njungna Wamayu (2016), “ Influence Of Entrepreneurial Service Recovery

On Customer Loyalty In The Hospitality Industry In Kenya”, Jommo Kenyatta University

Transylvanian (2006) “ Determinant of Customer Satisfaction and Service Quality The Case of Romanian Public Service”., Review of Administrative Sciences, 16., p.124 - 135

Tjiptono, F. 2014. *Pemasaran Jasa, Prinsip, Penerapan dan Penelitian*. Andi Offset. Yogyakarta.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Strategi Pemasaran*. Edisi Pertama. Andi Offset. Yogyakarta.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Service Management Mewujudkan Layanan Prima*. CV Alfabeta. Bandung.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. 2004. Evolving to A New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1-17.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2008. Service-Dominant Logic: Continuing The Evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 1 – 10.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2006. Service-Dominant Logic: What It Is, What It Is Not, What It Might Be. In R. F. Lusch, & S. L. Vargo (Eds.). *The servicedominant logic of marketing: Dialog, debate, and directions*. 43 – 56. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Wereds Sara Leroi, Sandra Streukens, 2011, Customer Value Measurements, marketing Science Institute Working paper Series

Yongris, Haris Maupa, Sumardi, Idrus Taba, 2018., Effects OF Marketing Mix Bank Image and Service Quality On Custoer satisfaction and Loyalty Of The People Credit Bank In South Sulawesi..Scientific Research Journal. Vol 6

Yu-Hui Chen , Stuart Barnes, 2007.. Initial trust and online buyer behaviour., Industrial Management & Data Systems, ISSN: 0263-5577

Zakaria Affis Adi, Rifelly Dewi Astuti., 2009, “ The Addition Of Spiritual Dimension On Customer Value to Investigate The Relationship Of Customer Value, Customer Satisfaction and Behaviour Intention on Islamic Banks Saving Products in Indonesia”, ASEAN Marketing Journal,, Vol1 No 1

Zubbair Hasan, 2016, “ Influence of Customer Perceived Value on Tourist Satisfaction and Revisit Intention: A study on Guesthouses in Maldives, International Islamic University Malaysia,  
DOI:[10.24924/ijabm/2016.04/v4.iss1/98.119](https://doi.org/10.24924/ijabm/2016.04/v4.iss1/98.119)

## LAMPIRAN 2

\*\*\*\*\*

\* General SEM analysis results \*

\*\*\*\*\*

General project information

-----  
Version of WarpPLS used: 7.0

License holder: Trial license (3 months)

Type of license: Trial license (3 months)

License start date: 07-Oct-2021

License end date: 05-Jan-2022

Project path (directory): C:\Users\User\Desktop\

Project file: Disertasi resti.prj

Last changed: 01-Jan-2020 00:30:43

Last saved: Never (needs to be saved)

Raw data path (directory): C:\Users\User\Desktop\

Raw data file: data resti 150.xlsx

Model fit and quality indices

-----  
Average path coefficient (APC)=0.265, P<0.001

Average R-squared (ARS)=0.444, P<0.001

Average adjusted R-squared (AARS)=0.435, P<0.001

Average block VIF (AVIF)=2.427, acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3

Average full collinearity VIF (AFVIF)=2.657, acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3

Tenenhaus GoF (GoF)=0.529, small >= 0.1, medium >= 0.25, large >= 0.36

Sympson's paradox ratio (SPR)=0.909, acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1

R-squared contribution ratio (RSCR)=0.982, acceptable if >= 0.9, ideally = 1

Statistical suppression ratio (SSR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.7

Nonlinear bivariate causality direction ratio (NLBCDR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.7

General model elements

-----

Missing data imputation algorithm: Arithmetic Mean Imputation  
Outer model analysis algorithm: PLS Mode M Basic  
Default inner model analysis algorithm: Warp3 Basic  
Multiple inner model analysis algorithms used? No  
Resampling method used in the analysis: Stable2  
Number of data resamples used: 100  
Number of cases (rows) in model data: 150  
Number of latent variables in model: 6  
Number of indicators used in model: 21  
Number of iterations to obtain estimates: 6  
Range restriction variable type: None  
Range restriction variable: None  
Range restriction variable min value: 0.000  
Range restriction variable max value: 0.000  
Only ranked data used in analysis? No

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Path coefficients and P values \*

\*\*\*\*\*

Path coefficients

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.023	0.724				
Social	0.150	0.442				
Emotion		0.160	0.398			
BehavIn		-0.080	0.130	0.050	0.491	0.272

P values

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.382	<0.001				
Social	0.023	<0.001				
Emotion		0.016	<0.001			
BehavIn		0.143	0.041	0.255	<0.001	<0.001

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Standard errors for path coefficients \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.075	0.069				
Social	0.074	0.072				
Emotion		0.074	0.072			
BehavIn		0.075	0.074	0.075	0.071	0.073

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Effect sizes for path coefficients \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.012	0.535				
Social	0.070	0.244				
Emotion		0.070	0.203			
BehavIn		0.033	0.074	0.026	0.379	0.196

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Combined loadings and cross-loadings \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust SE	Servqua P value	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn	Type (a)
Q1	0.901	-0.206 0.184	-0.032	-0.167	0.138	Reflect	0.067 <0.001
Q2	0.941	-0.088 0.038	0.106	-0.063	-0.023	Reflect	0.066 <0.001
Q3	0.854	0.308 -0.230	-0.086	0.241	-0.115	Reflect	0.067 <0.001
Q4	0.224	0.721 -0.457	0.005	0.057	-0.011	Reflect	0.069 <0.001

Q5	0.259	0.697	-0.024	-0.166	-0.289	0.474	Reflect	0.069	<0.001
Q6	0.033	0.798	-0.309	-0.177	0.472	-0.075	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q7	-0.156	0.731	0.231	0.041	-0.216	0.015	Reflect	0.069	<0.001
Q8	-0.272	0.800	0.485	0.266	-0.124	-0.287	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q9	-0.049	0.329	0.892	-0.130	-0.068	-0.052	Reflect	0.067	<0.001
Q10	-0.027	0.295	0.863	-0.038	-0.133	-0.037	Reflect	0.067	<0.001
Q11	0.081	-0.663	0.695	0.179	0.213	0.095	Reflect	0.069	<0.001
Q12	0.019	-0.267	0.332	0.805	0.028	-0.018	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q13	0.011	-0.035	-0.147	0.859	-0.230	-0.008	Reflect	0.067	<0.001
Q14	-0.026	0.266	-0.175	0.800	0.163	0.022	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q15	0.004	0.149	-0.170	0.249	0.783	-0.085	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q16	0.138	-0.523	0.475	-0.137	0.731	0.002	Reflect	0.069	<0.001
Q17	-0.117	0.273	-0.212	-0.150	0.784	0.089	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q18	-0.430	0.694	-0.401	0.089	0.179	0.825	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q19	0.260	-0.907	0.605	0.284	-0.259	0.411	Reflect	0.072	<0.001
Q20	0.183	-0.123	-0.014	0.061	-0.131	0.813	Reflect	0.068	<0.001
Q21	0.394	-0.531	0.385	-0.530	0.055	0.622	Reflect	0.070	<0.001

Notes: Loadings are unrotated and cross-loadings are oblique-rotated. SEs and P values are for loadings. P values < 0.05 are desirable for reflective indicators.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Normalized combined loadings and cross-loadings \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Q1	0.671	-0.196	0.176	-0.031	-0.159	0.131
Q2	0.662	-0.089	0.038	0.107	-0.064	-0.023
Q3	0.649	0.354	-0.265	-0.098	0.277	-0.133
Q4	0.219	0.609	-0.448	0.004	0.056	-0.011
Q5	0.328	0.608	-0.031	-0.211	-0.366	0.601
Q6	0.031	0.577	-0.286	-0.163	0.436	-0.070

Q7	-0.186	0.621	0.276	0.050	-0.258	0.018
Q8	-0.271	0.578	0.483	0.265	-0.123	-0.286
Q9	-0.056	0.372	0.645	-0.147	-0.077	-0.059
Q10	-0.032	0.356	0.638	-0.046	-0.160	-0.045
Q11	0.070	-0.574	0.587	0.155	0.184	0.082
Q12	0.022	-0.302	0.375	0.582	0.032	-0.020
Q13	0.009	-0.030	-0.125	0.663	-0.196	-0.007
Q14	-0.038	0.382	-0.252	0.565	0.234	0.032
Q15	0.005	0.204	-0.232	0.341	0.597	-0.117
Q16	0.125	-0.474	0.430	-0.124	0.635	0.001
Q17	-0.124	0.289	-0.224	-0.159	0.634	0.094
Q18	-0.394	0.637	-0.368	0.081	0.164	0.627
Q19	0.203	-0.708	0.472	0.222	-0.202	0.606
Q20	0.201	-0.135	-0.015	0.067	-0.144	0.605
Q21	0.287	-0.387	0.280	-0.386	0.040	0.580

Note: Loadings are unrotated and cross-loadings are oblique-rotated, both after separate Kaiser normalizations.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Pattern loadings and cross-loadings \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Q1	0.986	-0.206	0.184	-0.032	-0.167	0.138
Q2	0.976	-0.088	0.038	0.106	-0.063	-0.023
Q3	0.728	0.308	-0.230	-0.086	0.241	-0.115
Q4	0.224	0.883	-0.457	0.005	0.057	-0.011
Q5	0.259	0.469	-0.024	-0.166	-0.289	0.474
Q6	0.033	0.903	-0.309	-0.177	0.472	-0.075
Q7	-0.156	0.757	0.231	0.041	-0.216	0.015
Q8	-0.272	0.729	0.485	0.266	-0.124	-0.287

Q9	-0.049	0.329	0.804	-0.130	-0.068	-0.052
Q10	-0.027	0.295	0.762	-0.038	-0.133	-0.037
Q11	0.081	-0.663	0.896	0.179	0.213	0.095
Q12	0.019	-0.267	0.332	0.774	0.028	-0.018
Q13	0.011	-0.035	-0.147	1.143	-0.230	-0.008
Q14	-0.026	0.266	-0.175	0.596	0.163	0.022
Q15	0.004	0.149	-0.170	0.249	0.642	-0.085
Q16	0.138	-0.523	0.475	-0.137	0.825	0.002
Q17	-0.117	0.273	-0.212	-0.150	0.856	0.089
Q18	-0.430	0.694	-0.401	0.089	0.179	0.568
Q19	0.260	-0.907	0.605	0.284	-0.259	0.488
Q20	0.183	-0.123	-0.014	0.061	-0.131	0.871
Q21	0.394	-0.531	0.385	-0.530	0.055	1.009

Note: Loadings and cross-loadings are oblique-rotated.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Normalized pattern loadings and cross-loadings \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Q1	0.942	-0.196	0.176	-0.031	-0.159	0.131
Q2	0.987	-0.089	0.038	0.107	-0.064	-0.023
Q3	0.837	0.354	-0.265	-0.098	0.277	-0.133
Q4	0.219	0.865	-0.448	0.004	0.056	-0.011
Q5	0.328	0.594	-0.031	-0.211	-0.366	0.601
Q6	0.031	0.834	-0.286	-0.163	0.436	-0.070
Q7	-0.186	0.905	0.276	0.050	-0.258	0.018
Q8	-0.271	0.726	0.483	0.265	-0.123	-0.286
Q9	-0.056	0.372	0.910	-0.147	-0.077	-0.059
Q10	-0.032	0.356	0.918	-0.046	-0.160	-0.045
Q11	0.070	-0.574	0.775	0.155	0.184	0.082

Q12	0.022	-0.302	0.375	0.875	0.032	-0.020
Q13	0.009	-0.030	-0.125	0.972	-0.196	-0.007
Q14	-0.038	0.382	-0.252	0.856	0.234	0.032
Q15	0.005	0.204	-0.232	0.341	0.880	-0.117
Q16	0.125	-0.474	0.430	-0.124	0.748	0.001
Q17	-0.124	0.289	-0.224	-0.159	0.904	0.094
Q18	-0.394	0.637	-0.368	0.081	0.164	0.521
Q19	0.203	-0.708	0.472	0.222	-0.202	0.381
Q20	0.201	-0.135	-0.015	0.067	-0.144	0.957
Q21	0.287	-0.387	0.280	-0.386	0.040	0.735

Note: Loadings and cross-loadings shown are after oblique rotation and Kaiser normalization.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Structure loadings and cross-loadings \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Q1	0.901	0.621	0.491	0.365	0.347	0.335
Q2	0.941	0.652	0.485	0.436	0.395	0.359
Q3	0.854	0.656	0.423	0.358	0.399	0.324
Q4	0.607	0.721	0.398	0.349	0.307	0.371
Q5	0.530	0.697	0.447	0.341	0.255	0.406
Q6	0.601	0.798	0.511	0.432	0.503	0.461
Q7	0.480	0.731	0.565	0.323	0.262	0.356
Q8	0.482	0.800	0.774	0.446	0.344	0.355
Q9	0.503	0.732	0.892	0.339	0.331	0.327
Q10	0.489	0.700	0.863	0.366	0.327	0.338
Q11	0.275	0.349	0.695	0.521	0.498	0.448
Q12	0.341	0.419	0.516	0.805	0.594	0.597
Q13	0.304	0.332	0.299	0.859	0.525	0.612

Q14	0.405	0.486	0.397	0.800	0.629	0.639
Q15	0.367	0.375	0.352	0.619	0.783	0.570
Q16	0.283	0.286	0.421	0.495	0.731	0.453
Q17	0.315	0.375	0.316	0.520	0.784	0.550
Q18	0.235	0.467	0.310	0.603	0.562	0.825
Q19	0.104	0.097	0.229	0.371	0.283	0.411
Q20	0.367	0.417	0.367	0.632	0.552	0.813
Q21	0.339	0.343	0.377	0.421	0.458	0.622

Note: Loadings and cross-loadings are unrotated.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Normalized structure loadings and cross-loadings \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Q1	0.671	0.462	0.366	0.272	0.258	0.250
Q2	0.662	0.458	0.341	0.307	0.278	0.253
Q3	0.649	0.499	0.321	0.272	0.303	0.246
Q4	0.513	0.609	0.336	0.295	0.260	0.313
Q5	0.462	0.608	0.390	0.298	0.222	0.355
Q6	0.435	0.577	0.370	0.313	0.364	0.334
Q7	0.408	0.621	0.481	0.275	0.222	0.303
Q8	0.349	0.578	0.559	0.322	0.248	0.257
Q9	0.363	0.529	0.645	0.245	0.239	0.237
Q10	0.362	0.518	0.638	0.270	0.242	0.250
Q11	0.233	0.295	0.587	0.440	0.421	0.378
Q12	0.247	0.303	0.373	0.582	0.429	0.431
Q13	0.234	0.256	0.230	0.663	0.405	0.472
Q14	0.286	0.344	0.281	0.565	0.444	0.452
Q15	0.280	0.286	0.268	0.472	0.597	0.434
Q16	0.246	0.249	0.366	0.431	0.635	0.394

Q17	0.255	0.303	0.256	0.421	0.634	0.445
Q18	0.179	0.355	0.236	0.459	0.427	0.627
Q19	0.153	0.143	0.338	0.547	0.417	0.606
Q20	0.273	0.310	0.273	0.470	0.410	0.605
Q21	0.317	0.320	0.352	0.393	0.427	0.580

Note: Loadings and cross-loadings shown are unrotated and after Kaiser normalization.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Indicator weights \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust SE	Servqua P value	VIF	Function WLS	Social ES	Emotion	BehavIn	Type (a)
Q1	0.362 1	0.000 0.326	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.073 <0.001 3.042
Q2	0.394 1	0.000 0.371	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.072 <0.001 3.822
Q3	0.354 1	0.000 0.302	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.073 <0.001 2.009
Q4	0.000 1	0.230 0.166	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.074 0.001 1.741
Q5	0.000 1	0.234 0.163	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.074 <0.001 1.458
Q6	0.000 1	0.308 0.246	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.073 <0.001 1.911
Q7	0.000 1	0.243 0.178	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.074 <0.001 2.018
Q8	0.000 1	0.310 0.248	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.073 <0.001 2.186
Q9	0.000 1	0.000 0.372	0.417	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.072 <0.001 2.620
Q10	0.000 1	0.000 0.356	0.412	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.072 <0.001 2.469
Q11	0.000 1	0.000 0.272	0.391	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.072 <0.001 1.193

Q12	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.401	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	1.665
	1		0.323							
Q13	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.368	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	1.975
	1		0.316							
Q14	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.451	0.000	0.000	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	1.398
	1		0.361							
Q15	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.478	0.000	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	1.241
	1		0.374							
Q16	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.372	0.000	Reflect	0.073	<0.001	1.279
	1		0.272							
Q17	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.451	0.000	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	1.294
	1		0.354							
Q18	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.521	Reflect	0.071	<0.001	1.334
	1		0.429							
Q19	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.200	Reflect	0.074	0.004	1.069
	1		0.082							
Q20	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.415	Reflect	0.072	<0.001	1.480
	1		0.338							
Q21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.243	Reflect	0.074	<0.001	1.256
	1		0.151							

Notes: P values < 0.05 and VIFs < 2.5 are desirable for formative indicators; VIF = indicator variance inflation factor;

WLS = indicator weight-loading sign (-1 = Simpson's paradox in l.v.); ES = indicator effect size.

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Latent variable coefficients \*

\*\*\*\*\*

R-squared coefficients

-----

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
	0.560	0.314	0.276	0.640	

Adjusted R-squared coefficients

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
		0.541	0.305	0.264	0.629

Composite reliability coefficients

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
0.927	0.866	0.860	0.862	0.810	0.772

Cronbach's alpha coefficients

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
0.881	0.806	0.751	0.760	0.650	0.627

Average variances extracted

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
0.809	0.564	0.675	0.676	0.587	0.474

Full collinearity VIFs

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
2.133	3.455	2.291	2.907	2.404	2.752

Q-squared coefficients

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
		0.560	0.315	0.276	0.640

Minimum and maximum values

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
-2.484	-3.014	-2.556	-2.706	-2.950	-2.919
1.465	1.637	1.318	1.755	2.120	2.308

Medians (top) and modes (bottom)

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
-0.509	-0.122	-0.191	-0.475	-0.415	-0.044
-0.509	-0.689	-0.982	-0.475	-0.415	-0.044

Skewness (top) and exc. kurtosis (bottom) coefficients

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
0.082	-0.075	-0.086	-0.076	-0.136	-0.216
-0.471	-0.225	-1.112	0.136	0.549	1.013

Tests of unimodality: Rohatgi-Szkely (top) and Klaassen-Mokveld-van Es (bottom)

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Tests of normality: JarqueBera (top) and robust JarqueBera (bottom)

Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Correlations among latent variables and errors \*

\*\*\*\*\*

Correlations among l.vs. with sq. rts. of AVEs

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion		BehavIn
Trust	0.899	0.714	0.519	0.431	0.423	0.378	
Servqua		0.714	0.751	0.731	0.510	0.455	0.519
Functio	0.519	0.731	0.821	0.496	0.468	0.451	
Social	0.431	0.510	0.496	0.822	0.715	0.753	
Emotion		0.423	0.455	0.468	0.715	0.766	0.689
BehavIn		0.378	0.519	0.451	0.753	0.689	0.689

Note: Square roots of average variances extracted (AVEs) shown on diagonal.

P values for correlations

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion		BehavIn
Trust	1.000	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	
Servqua		<0.001	1.000	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Functio	<0.001	<0.001	1.000	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	
Social	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	1.000	<0.001	<0.001	
Emotion		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	1.000	<0.001
BehavIn		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	1.000

Correlations among l.v. error terms with VIFs

(e)Func (e)Soci (e)Emot(e)Beha

(e)Func	1.067	0.205	0.221	-0.069
(e)Soci	0.205	1.585	0.602	0.038
(e)Emot	0.221	0.602	1.595	0.028
(e)Beha	-0.069	0.038	0.028	1.008

Notes: Variance inflation factors (VIFs) shown on diagonal. Error terms included (a.k.a. residuals) are for endogenous l.vs.

P values for correlations

-----

(e)Func (e)Soci (e)Emot(e)Beha

(e)Func	1.000	0.012	0.007	0.400
(e)Soci	0.012	1.000	<0.001	0.643
(e)Emot	0.007	<0.001	1.000	0.735
(e)Beha	0.400	0.643	0.735	1.000

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Block variance inflation factors \*

\*\*\*\*\*

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	1.893	1.893				
Social	2.090	2.090				
Emotion		1.985	1.985			
BehavIn		2.280	4.245	2.554	2.993	2.683

Note: These VIFs are for the latent variables on each column (predictors), with reference to the latent variables on each row (criteria).

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Indirect and total effects \*

\*\*\*\*\*

Indirect effects for paths with 2 segments

	Trust	Servqua	Functio Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.118	0.361		

Number of paths with 2 segments

	Trust	Servqua	Functio Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		3	3		

P values of indirect effects for paths with 2 segments

	Trust	Servqua	Functio Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.057	<0.001		

Standard errors of indirect effects for paths with 2 segments

	Trust	Servqua	Functio Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.074	0.073		

Effect sizes of indirect effects for paths with 2 segments

	Trust	Servqua	Functio Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.049	0.205		

Sums of indirect effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.118	0.361			

Number of paths for indirect effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		3		3		

P values for sums of indirect effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.057	<0.001			

Standard errors for sums of indirect effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.074	0.073			

Effect sizes for sums of indirect effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
BehavIn		0.049	0.205			

Total effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.023	0.724				

Social	0.150	0.442				
Emotion		0.160	0.398			
BehavIn		0.038	0.492	0.050	0.491	0.272

Number of paths for total effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Funcatio 1		1				
Social	1					
Emotion		1		1		
BehavIn		4	4	1	1	1

P values for total effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Funcatio	0.382	<0.001				
Social	0.023	<0.001				
Emotion		0.016	<0.001			
BehavIn		0.305	<0.001	0.255	<0.001	<0.001

Standard errors for total effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Funcatio	0.075	0.069				
Social	0.074	0.072				
Emotion		0.074	0.072			
BehavIn		0.075	0.071	0.075	0.071	0.073

Effect sizes for total effects

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.012	0.535				
Social	0.070	0.244				
Emotion		0.070	0.203			
BehavIn		0.016	0.280	0.026	0.379	0.196

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Causality assessment coefficients \*

\*\*\*\*\*

Path-correlation signs

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	1					
Social	1	1				
Emotion		1	1			
BehavIn		-1	1	1	1	1

Notes: path-correlation signs; negative sign (i.e., -1) = Simpson's paradox.

R-squared contributions

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.012	0.535				
Social	0.070	0.244				
Emotion		0.070	0.203			
BehavIn		-0.033	0.074	0.026	0.379	0.196

Notes: R-squared contributions of predictor lat. vars.; columns = predictor lat. vars.; rows = criteria lat. vars.; negative sign = reduction in R-squared.

#### Path-correlation ratios

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.043	0.979				
Social	0.320	0.803				
Emotion		0.363	0.779			
BehavIn		0.192	0.230	0.094	0.636	0.378

Notes: absolute path-correlation ratios; ratio > 1 indicates statistical suppression; 1 < ratio <= 1.3: weak suppression; 1.3 < ratio <= 1.7: medium; 1.7 < ratio: strong.

#### Path-correlation differences

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.497	0.015				
Social	0.319	0.108				
Emotion		0.280	0.113			
BehavIn		0.498	0.438	0.475	0.280	0.448

Note: absolute path-correlation differences.

#### P values for path-correlation differences

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	<0.001	0.425				
Social	<0.001	0.088				
Emotion		<0.001	0.080			

BehavIn <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001

Note: P values for absolute path-correlation differences.

#### Warp2 bivariate causal direction ratios

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	1.003	1.010				
Social	0.970	0.996				
Emotion		0.985	0.953			
BehavIn		0.977	0.957	0.937	0.984	0.992

Notes: Warp2 bivariate causal direction ratios; ratio > 1 supports reversed link; 1 < ratio <= 1.3: weak support; 1.3 < ratio <= 1.7: medium; 1.7 < ratio: strong.

#### Warp2 bivariate causal direction differences

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.001	0.007				
Social	0.014	0.002				
Emotion		0.007	0.024			
BehavIn		0.009	0.024	0.032	0.012	0.005

Note: absolute Warp2 bivariate causal direction differences.

#### P values for Warp2 bivariate causal direction differences

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.494	0.466				
Social	0.431	0.489				
Emotion		0.468	0.384			
BehavIn		0.455	0.383	0.349	0.439	0.473

Note: P values for absolute Warp2 bivariate causal direction differences.

Warp3 bivariate causal direction ratios

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	1.005	1.000				
Social	1.011	0.997				
Emotion		0.970	0.973			
BehavIn		0.932	0.967	0.892	0.985	0.992

Notes: Warp3 bivariate causal direction ratios; ratio > 1 supports reversed link; 1 < ratio <= 1.3: weak support; 1.3 < ratio <= 1.7: medium; 1.7 < ratio: strong.

Warp3 bivariate causal direction differences

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.003	0.000				
Social	0.005	0.002				
Emotion		0.013	0.014			
BehavIn		0.029	0.019	0.057	0.012	0.006

Note: absolute Warp3 bivariate causal direction differences.

P values for Warp3 bivariate causal direction differences

	Trust	Servqua	Functio	Social	Emotion	BehavIn
Functio	0.488	0.499				
Social	0.475	0.492				
Emotion		0.436	0.433			
BehavIn		0.363	0.410	0.241	0.442	0.473

Note: P values for absolute Warp3 bivariate causal direction differences.