

Electronic Supplementary Material 1 (ESM 1)

The ESM 1 documents the results of the prior analyses conducted in the article. *Table E1* displays the descriptive statistics of the research variables as well as model fit information and standardized model results of the research model for the entire sample, forced users, and voluntary users. *Table E2* documents the results of the measurement invariance testing between forced and voluntary users separately for the antecedents (system trust, ICT self-concept), the key factors (performance expectancy, effort expectancy, behavioral intention), and for the adjusted research model. *Table E3* documents the results of the conducted *t*-tests, examining manifest mean differences between forced and voluntary users in age, gender, and crime reporting experience.

Table E1. Descriptive statistics of research variables and model fit information plus standardized model results within the research model for the entire sample, forced users, and voluntary users

	BI01/02	PE01/02	EE01/02	ST01/02/03	ICT-SCA01/02/03	ICT-SCC01/02/03
Entire sample ($\chi^2 = 257.86$, $df = 80$, $p < .001$, CFI = .962, RMSEA = .058, SRMR = .042)						
<i>N</i>	655/658	659/656	656/657	653/655/649	655/656/655	660/659/657
<i>M</i>	3.34/3.42	3.63/2.87	3.34/3.43	3.49/3.49/3.26	3.34/3.25/3.30	3.62/3.61/3.49
<i>SD</i>	0.82/0.77	0.60/0.93	0.77/0.74	0.71/0.72/0.81	0.77/0.84/0.81	0.62/0.61/0.73
λ	.89/.93	.72/.57	.89/.81	.87/.90/.85	.81/.94/.89	.86/.91/.90
R^2	.80/.87	.51/.33	.79/.66	.76/.81/.72	.65/.88/.80	.74/.84/.81
Forced ($\chi^2 = 213.99$, $df = 80$, $p < .001$, CFI = .950, RMSEA = .070, SRMR = .049)						
<i>N</i>	344/343	344/342	343/344	341/344/338	343/344/342	345/345/343
<i>M</i>	3.08/3.20	3.46/2.58	3.24/3.38	3.35/3.36/3.05	3.18/3.10/3.19	3.54/3.51/3.38
<i>SD</i>	0.91/0.86	0.70/0.97	0.82/0.79	0.77/0.78/0.87	0.84/0.88/0.86	0.67/0.67/0.80
λ	.89/.95	.70/.56	.87/.83	.89/.89/.84	.81/.94/.88	.88/.92/.89
R^2	.79/.90	.49/.31	.75/.69	.80/.80/.70	.65/.88/.78	.77/.85/.79
Voluntary ($\chi^2 = 115.81$, $df = 80$, $p < .01$, CFI = .981, RMSEA = .038, SRMR = .041)						
<i>N</i>	311/315	315/314	313/313	312/311/311	312/312/313	315/314/314
<i>M</i>	3.62/3.67	3.82/3.18	3.45/3.50	3.64/3.64/3.49	3.51/3.42/3.43	3.70/3.71/3.61
<i>SD</i>	0.59/0.56	0.39/0.78	0.70/0.68	0.59/0.61/0.68	0.64/0.76/0.73	0.55/0.53/0.62
λ	.85/.88	.66/.43	.90/.80	.81/.91/.85	.78/.93/.91	.83/.90/.90
R^2	.72/.77	.43/.19	.82/.65	.65/.83/.72	.61/.87/.82	.69/.80/.82

Note. $N_{entire\ sample} = 661$; $N_{forced} = 346$; $N_{voluntary} = 315$; BI = behavioral intention; PE = performance expectancy; EE = effort expectancy; ST = system trust; ICC-SCA = affect ICT self-concept; ICC-SCC = competence ICT self-concept; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual. Item range was always 1-4. All standardized factor loadings (λ) were significant different to zero, $p < .001$; all R^2 were significant different to zero, $p < .001$. All paths between latent factors (see Figure 1) were significant ($p < .01$) except a) the relation between EE and BI in all three models (entire sample, forced, voluntary) and b) the relation between ICT-SCC and EE among voluntary users.

Table E2. Manifest mean differences between forced and voluntary users in age, gender, and crime reporting experience

	Forced		Voluntary		T^a	df	d
	N	$M (SD)$	N	$M (SD)$			
Age	346	45.36 (15.24)	315	43.94 (14.99)	1.21	659	-0.09
Gender ^b	346	0.38 (0.49)	314	0.36 (0.48)	0.74	658	-0.04
Crime reporting experience	344	1.81 (1.48)	315	1.87 (1.24)	-0.52	657	0.04

Note. ^a $p > .05$.

^b Only male (0) and female (1) gender considered.

Table E3. Measurement invariance testing between forced and voluntary users

Model	χ^2	df	Nested models	CFI	ΔCFI
Antecedents (system trust, ICT self-concept)					
Configural (c)	116.67***	48		.973	
Metric (m)	123.39***	54	m-c	.973	.000
Scalar (s)	143.48***	60	s-m	.967	-.006
Key factors (performance expectancy, effort expectancy, behavioral intention)					
Configural (c)	28.18**	12		.985	
Metric (m)	28.38*	15	m-c	.988	.003
Scalar (s)	34.99**	18	s-m	.984	-.004
Adjusted research model ^a					
Configural (c)	341.53***	171		.962	
Metric (m)	390.76***	186	m-c	.955	-.007

Note. $N_{forced} = 346$; $N_{voluntary} = 315$; CFI = comparative fit index; $\Delta CFI \geq |.01|$ indicates lack of invariance between the two compared nested models; c = configural (equal pattern); m = metric (equal pattern and factor loading); s = scalar (equal pattern, factor loading, and item-intercepts).

^a No direct path between effort expectancy and behavioral intention specified.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.