

Electronic Supplementary Material 2 (ESM 2)

Table ESM 2. Fit indices of alternative research models with a direct effect (M1) and both a direct and an indirect effect (M2) of system trust on behavioral intention

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC	BIC	Adj. BIC
Entire sample (<i>N</i> = 661)								
M1	374.356***	81	.938	.074	.104	15548.118	15790.781	15619.329
M2	252.562***	79	.963	.058	.041	15399.162	15650.813	15473.011
Forced (<i>N</i> = 346)								
M1	279.818***	81	.926	.084	.107	9000.313	9208.021	9036.717
M2	211.812***	79	.950	.070	.048	8925.899	9141.300	8963.652
Voluntary (<i>N</i> = 315)								
M1	162.194***	81	.957	.056	.092	6168.424	6371.063	6199.790
M2	114.974***	79	.981	.038	.040	6113.913	6324.057	6146.440

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual; AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; Adj. BIC = sample-adjusted BIC; M1 = alternative model compared to the research model displayed in Figure 1 with only a direct effect of system trust on behavioral intention; M2 = alternative model compared to the research model displayed in Figure 1 with both a direct and an indirect effect of system trust on behavioral intention. All paths between latent factors were significant (at least $p < .05$) except a) the relation between effort expectancy and behavioral intention in all models (M1 and M2 in the entire sample, among forced, and voluntary users), b) the relation between the competence ICT self-concept and effort expectancy among voluntary users in M2, and c) the direct relation between system trust and behavioral intention among forced and voluntary users in M2, in which both a direct and indirect effect of system trust on behavioral intention was allowed.

*** $p < .001$.