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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

Two datasets were obtained to develop an understanding of factors characterizing the eLearning experience of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan. Both datasets were collected via electronic questionnaires. The secondary school teachers’ dataset was collected toward the end of the second semester of the 2019/2020 academic year, and the university undergraduate students’ dataset was collected during the summer semester of the same year. Six hundred and sixty-six participants responded to the secondary school teachers’ questionnaire, and one thousand participants responded to the university undergraduate students’ questionnaire. A structural equation modelling approach was utilized to analyze the data. Future research might extend the two data models by collecting data about other factors and examine their impact on the eLearning experience of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan and other countries. Moreover, the datasets can be compared with other data from different developing and developed countries.
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Specifications Table

| Subject                      | Education                  |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Specific subject area        | Educational technology     |
| Type of data                 | Table                      |
| How data were acquired       | Surveys: two electronic questionnaires were put out seeking responses from secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan about their eLearning experience |
| Data format                  | Raw                        |
| Parameters for data collection | Two datasets were obtained to get an understanding of factors characterizing the eLearning experience of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan. The secondary school teachers’ dataset was collected toward the end of the second semester of the 2019/2020 academic year, and the university undergraduate students’ dataset was collected during the summer semester of the same year. For secondary school teachers, a questionnaire was distributed targeting teachers who teach from eighth grade to twelfth grade, those teachers used Microsoft Teams to deliver instruction as mandated by the Jordanian Ministry of Education during COVID-19 lockdown in Jordan. For university undergraduate students, a questionnaire was put out seeking responses from university undergraduate students during that summer semester, where the Jordanian Ministry of Higher Education mandated that all courses for undergraduate students to be taught online to prevent the diffusion of COVID-19 disease |
| Description of data collection | Hosted on Google forms, both datasets were collected via two different electronic questionnaires. The invitation letters to participate, in the questionnaires, were distributed via social networks of secondary school teachers and public and private university undergraduate students in Jordan. Six hundred and sixty-six participants responded to the school teachers’ questionnaire, and one thousand responded to the university undergraduate students’ questionnaire |
| Data source location         | Secondary schools and public and private universities in Jordan |
| Data accessibility           | Both datasets are with the article |

Value of the Data

- The datasets are important because they capture data about factors characterizing the eLearning experience of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan, which is useful in formulating an eLearning strategy in Jordan and other countries.
- Online course developers, university instructors, school teachers, administrators, educational policy makers, and learning management system vendors can utilize the datasets in support of their decision-making processes.
- Future research might extend the two data models by collecting data about other factors and examine their impact on the eLearning experience of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan and other countries. Moreover, the datasets can be compared with other data from different developing and developed countries.

1. Data Description

The data for secondary school teachers, (Appendix A), was collected toward the end of the second semester of the 2019/2020 schools academic year in Jordan. Such that, a questionnaire (Appendix B) was distributed targeting secondary school teachers – teachers who teach from eighth grade to twelfth grade. Those teachers used Microsoft Teams to deliver instruction as mandated by the Jordanian Ministry of Education, during COVID-19 lockdown in Jordan. The
Table 1.
Demographic characteristics of secondary school teacher participants.

| Gender     | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Male       | 236       | 35.4%      |
| Female     | 430       | 64.6%      |
| Total      | 666       | 100%       |
| Age        |           |            |
| 20–29      | 70        | 10.5%      |
| 30–39      | 196       | 29.4%      |
| 40–49      | 322       | 48.3%      |
| 50–59      | 76        | 11.5%      |
| 60–70      | 2         | 0.3%       |
| Total      | 666       | 100%       |
| Education  |           |            |
| Community college | 34  | 5%         |
| Bachelor   | 403       | 61%        |
| Postgraduate diploma | 121 | 18%      |
| Master     | 77        | 11.5%      |
| Doctorate  | 31        | 4.5%       |
| Total      | 666       | 100%       |

Table 2.
Demographic characteristics of university undergraduate student participants.

| Gender     | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Male       | 490       | 49%        |
| Female     | 510       | 51%        |
| Total      | 1000      | 100%       |
| Age        |           |            |
| 18–20      | 391       | 39.1%      |
| 21–23      | 456       | 45.6%      |
| 24–26      | 96        | 9.6%       |
| 27–29      | 57        | 5.7%       |
| Total      | 1000      | 100%       |
| Academic level |    |            |
| First year | 230       | 23%        |
| Second year| 218       | 21.8%      |
| Third year | 253       | 25.3%      |
| Fourth year| 234       | 23.4%      |
| Fifth year | 47        | 4.7%       |
| Sixth year | 18        | 1.8%       |
| Total      | 1000      | 100%       |

A questionnaire was hosted on a Google form. The invitation to participate in the electronic questionnaire was distributed via social networks of secondary school teachers in Jordan. Six hundred and sixty-six teachers filled-in the questionnaire. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of secondary school teacher participants.

The data for university undergraduate students, (Appendix C), was collected during the summer semester of 2019/2020 academic year in Jordan. Hosted on a Google form, a questionnaire (Appendix D) was put out seeking responses from public and private university undergraduate students in Jordan about their eLearning experience. The invitation letter to participate in the electronic questionnaire was sent via social networks of public and private university undergraduate students in Jordan. One thousand responses to the questionnaire were obtained. Table 2 presents the demographic characteristics of university undergraduate student participants.
Table 3.
Constructs for the first and second datasets.

| Construct                  | Number of items | Resource | Teachers’ dataset | Students’ dataset |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|-------------------|------------------|
| Perceived ease of use      | 4               | [1]      | ✓                 | ✓                |
| Perceived usefulness       | 4               | [1]      | ✓                 | ✓                |
| Intention to continuous use| 2               | [1]      | ✓                 | ✓                |
| Attitude toward use        | 4               | [2]      | ✓                 | ✓                |
| Subjective norms           | 2               | [2]      | ✓                 |               |
| Facilitating conditions    | 5               | [3]      | ✓                 |               |
| Computer self-efficacy     | 10              | [4]      | ✓                 |               |
| Computer anxiety           | 4               | [5]      | ✓                 |               |
| User satisfaction          | 4               | [6]      | ✓                 | ✓                |
| Complexity                 | 4               | [7]      | ✓                 |               |
| Outcome expectations       | 7               | [8]      | ✓                 |               |
| Compatibility              | 3               | [9]      | ✓                 |               |
| Technical support          | 3               | [10]     | ✓                 |               |
| Learning community         | 3               | [11]     | ✓                 |               |
| Learning content           | 4               | [11]     | ✓                 |               |
| Learning personalization   | 4               | [11]     | ✓                 |               |

For both datasets, all constructs were operationalized using validated items from prior research. Table 3 presents the constructs for both datasets, their associated number of items, and the resources they were obtained from.

To establish convergent validity for each measurement model, four criteria were assessed: (1) standardized Factor Loading (FL) for each item which must be greater than 0.5, (2) composite reliability (CR) for each construct which must be greater than 0.7, (3) Cronbach’s alpha for each construct which must be greater than 0.7, and (4) the average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct which must be above 0.5 [12]. With respect to secondary school teachers’ measurement model, the absolute value of FL for the fifth item measuring the facilitating conditions construct (FC5), which is reverse coded, was below the specified threshold. As such, the item was removed from the model. By examining Table 4, it can be concluded that convergent validity of secondary school teachers’ measurement model has been established after removing FC5. Also, by examining Table 5, it can be concluded that convergent validity of university undergraduate students’ measurement model has been established as well.

The discriminant validity for each model was assessed by the heterotrait–monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations as it is the most rigorous approach for achieving that goal [13]. The criterion in this approach is that the HTMT for each pair of constructs must be below 0.9 [13]. As presented in Tables 6 and 7, in both models, the HTMT for each pair of constructs is below 0.9. As such, the discriminant validity for each measurement model has been established.

To confirm the goodness-of-fit for each model, five criteria were used: (1) Comparative Fit Index (CFI) [14], (2) Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) [15], (3) Relative Non-Centrality Index (RNI) [15], (4) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) [16], and (5) Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) [17]. Each model met the thresholds of all criteria as shown in Table 8.

Structural equation modeling approach, in R language version 4.0.1, was applied to analyze the data for each model. Appendix E and Appendix F have the R code for analyzing secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students’ datasets, respectively. Table 9 presents the analysis results of the university undergraduate students’ structural model, and Table 10 presents the analysis results of the secondary school teachers’ structural model.
Table 4. Secondary school teachers’ measurement model assessment.

| Construct                  | Item | Cronbach’s α Before item removal | CR   | AVE   | FL   | Cronbach’s α After item removal | CR   | AVE   | FL   |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|-------|------|---------------------------------|------|-------|------|
|                             |      |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Perceived ease of use      | PE1  | 0.89                             | 0.89 | 0.68  | 0.81 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | PE2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | PE3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | PE4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Perceived usefulness       | PU1  | 0.94                             | 0.94 | 0.80  | 0.86 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | PU2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | PU3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | PU4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| User satisfaction          | US1  | 0.95                             | 0.93 | 0.82  | 0.89 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | US2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | US3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | US4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Subjective norms           | SN1  | 0.87                             | 0.87 | 0.77  | 0.85 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | SN2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Attitude toward use        | AT1  | 0.92                             | 0.86 | 0.70  | 0.79 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | AT2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | AT3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | AT4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Intention to continuous use| IC1  | 0.93                             | 0.93 | 0.87  | 0.93 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | IC2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Computer self-efficacy     | CS1  | 0.94                             | 0.93 | 0.62  | 0.60 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS5  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS6  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS7  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS8  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS9  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CS10 |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Outcome expectations       | OE1  | 0.91                             | 0.87 | 0.57  | 0.85 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | OE2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | OE3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | OE4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | OE5  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | OE6  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | OE7  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Computer anxiety           | CA1  | 0.88                             | 0.88 | 0.65  | 0.75 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CA2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CA3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CA4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Complexity                 | CX1  | 0.84                             | 0.85 | 0.58  | 0.72 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CX2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CX3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CX4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Compatibility              | CT1  | 0.91                             | 0.91 | 0.78  | 0.85 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CT2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | CT3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |

| Construct                  | Item | Cronbach’s α Before item removal | CR   | AVE   | FL   | Cronbach’s α After item removal | CR   | AVE   | FL   |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|-------|------|---------------------------------|------|-------|------|
| Technical support          | TS1  | 0.80                             | 0.82 | 0.61  | 0.57 |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | TS2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | TS3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
| Facilitating conditions    | FC1  | 0.75                             | 0.82 | 0.55  | 0.83 |                                 | 0.87 | 0.88  | 0.65 |
|                            | FC2  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | FC3  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | FC4  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |
|                            | FC5  |                                   |      |       |      |                                 |      |       |      |

* Item removed.
### Table 5.
University undergraduate students’ measurement model assessment.

| Constructs                  | Items | Cronbach’s α | CR  | AVE  | FL  |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-----|------|-----|
| Perceived ease of use       | PE1   | 0.88         | 0.88| 0.66 | 0.80|
|                             | PE2   |              |     |      |     |
|                             | PE3   |              |     |      | 0.82|
|                             | PE4   |              |     |      |     |
| Perceived usefulness        | PU1   | 0.93         | 0.93| 0.77 | 0.87|
|                             | PU2   |              |     |      |     |
|                             | PU3   |              |     | 0.87 | 0.89|
|                             | PU4   |              |     |      |     |
| Subjective norms            | SN1   | 0.85         | 0.85| 0.74 | 0.83|
|                             | SN2   |              |     |      |     |
| Intention to continuous use | IC1   | 0.91         | 0.91| 0.83 | 0.91|
|                             | IC2   |              |     |      |     |
| Learning community          | LM1   | 0.87         | 0.88| 0.65 | 0.74|
|                             | LM2   |              |     |      | 0.71|
|                             | LM3   |              |     |      | 0.85|
|                             | LM4   |              |     |      |     |
| Learning content            | LN1   | 0.87         | 0.87| 0.70 | 0.78|
|                             | LN2   |              |     |      | 0.89|
|                             | LN3   |              |     |      | 0.83|
| Learning personalization    | LP1   | 0.89         | 0.89| 0.67 | 0.81|
|                             | LP2   |              |     |      |     |
|                             | LP3   |              |     |      | 0.80|
|                             | LP4   |              |     |      | 0.84|
| User satisfaction           | US1   | 0.95         | 0.95| 0.83 | 0.90|
|                             | US2   |              |     |      |     |
|                             | US3   |              |     |      | 0.91|
|                             | US4   |              |     |      | 0.92|

### Table 6.
HTMT matrix for secondary school teachers’ measurement model.

| Construct | PE   | PU   | US   | SN   | AT   | IC   | CS   | OE   | CA   | CX   | CT   | TS   | FC   |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PE        | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| PU        | 0.72 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| US        | 0.68 | 0.70 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| SN        | 0.54 | 0.71 | 0.61 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| AT        | 0.65 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.60 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| IC        | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.61 | 0.82 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| CS        | 0.58 | 0.68 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.71 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| OE        | 0.56 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.69 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |
| CA        | 0.32 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.18 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |
| CX        | 0.49 | 0.34 | 0.40 | 0.25 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.31 | 0.60 | 1.00 |      |      |      |
| CT        | 0.60 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.68 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.63 | 0.88 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 1.00 |      |      |
| TS        | 0.57 | 0.61 | 0.71 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.61 | 0.56 | 0.69 | 0.16 | 0.29 | 0.69 | 1.00 |      |
| FC        | 0.82 | 0.66 | 0.77 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.63 | 0.32 | 0.44 | 0.68 | 0.74 | 1.00 |

Note. PE: Perceived ease of use, PU: Perceived usefulness, US: User satisfaction, SN: Subjective norms, AT: Attitude toward use, IC: Intention to continuous use, CS: Computer self-efficacy, OE: Outcome expectations, CA: Computer anxiety, CX: Complexity, CT: Compatibility, TS: Technical support, FC: Facilitating conditions.

### 2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

Two datasets were obtained to get an understanding of factors characterizing the eLearning experience of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students in Jordan. The first dataset is concerned with secondary school teachers, and the second dataset is concerned with university undergraduate students. The first and second datasets were collected via two different questionnaires. Since the language of all prospected respondents is Arabic, both
Table 7.
HTMT matrix for university undergraduate students' model.

| Constructs | PE   | PU   | SN   | IC   | LM   | LN   | LP   | US   |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PE         | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| PU         | 0.74 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| SN         | 0.69 | 0.74 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |
| IC         | 0.72 | 0.85 | 0.70 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |
| LM         | 0.74 | 0.71 | 0.65 | 0.71 | 1.00 |      |      |      |
| LN         | 0.71 | 0.68 | 0.60 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 1.00 |      |      |
| LP         | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 0.72 | 0.80 | 1.00 |
| US         | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.65 | 0.83 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.80 | 1.00 |

Note. PE: Perceived ease of use, PU: Perceived usefulness, SN: Subjective norms, IC: Intention to continuous use, LM: Learning community, LN: Learning content, LP: Learning personalization, US: User satisfaction.

Table 8.
Fit indices of secondary school teachers and university undergraduate students' structural models.

| Fit indices | Teachers' model | Students' model | Criteria |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| CFI         | 0.928           | 0.959           | >0.9     |
| TLI         | 0.921           | 0.953           | >0.9     |
| RNI         | 0.928           | 0.959           | >0.9     |
| RMSEA       | 0.052           | 0.058           | <.08     |
| SRMR        | 0.074           | 0.037           | <.08     |

Table 9.
University undergraduate students' structural model analysis results.

| Path                              | Coefficient | z-value | \( P(>|z|) \) | Decision |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------------|----------|
| Subjective norms→ Perceived usefulness | 0.340       | 7.966   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Learning content→ Perceived usefulness | −0.046     | −0.747  | 0.455         | Insignificant |
| Learning community→ Perceived usefulness | 0.072       | 1.262   | 0.207         | Insignificant |
| Learning personalization→ Perceived usefulness | 0.499       | 7.596   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Perceived ease of use→ Perceived usefulness | 0.189       | 4.168   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Subjective norms→ Perceived ease of use | 0.296       | 7.161   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Learning community→ Perceived ease of use | 0.174       | 2.951   | 0.003         | Significant |
| Learning content→ Perceived ease of use | 0.133       | 2.099   | 0.036         | Significant |
| Learning personalization→ Perceived ease of use | 0.341       | 5.303   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Subjective norms→ Intention to continuous use | 0.114       | 2.490   | 0.013         | Significant |
| Perceived usefulness→ Intention to continuous use | 0.517       | 10.609  | 0.000         | Significant |
| Perceived ease of use→ Intention to continuous use | 0.072       | 1.588   | 0.112         | Insignificant |
| User satisfaction→ Intention to continuous use | 0.365       | 8.982   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Subjective norms→ User satisfaction | 0.006       | 0.123   | 0.902         | Insignificant |
| Perceived usefulness→ User satisfaction | 0.588       | 13.647  | 0.000         | Significant |
| Perceived ease of use→ User satisfaction | 0.423       | 9.676   | 0.000         | Significant |

questionnaires were translated into their native Arabic language. Attitude toward use in the first dataset, and user satisfaction in both datasets were operationalized using a 5-point semantic differential scale from 1 to 5, with higher numbers reflecting more positive evaluations. The rest of the constructs, in both datasets, were operationalized using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"). Structural equation modeling approach, in R language version 4.0.1, was applied to analyze the data for each model.
Table 10. Secondary school teachers' structural model analysis results.

| Path                                      | Coefficient | z-value | \( P(>|z|) \) | Decision |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------------|----------|
| Subjective norms → Perceived usefulness   | 0.367       | 8.943   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Computer self-efficacy → Perceived usefulness | 0.231     | 4.639   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Technical support → Perceived usefulness  | 0.161       | 3.391   | 0.001         | Significant |
| Complexity → Perceived usefulness        | -0.019      | -0.545  | 0.585         | Insignificant |
| Perceived ease of use → Perceived usefulness | 0.375    | 9.458   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Subjective norms → Perceived ease of use  | 0.085       | 1.407   | 0.159         | Insignificant |
| Computer self-efficacy → Perceived ease of use | 0.344   | 5.302   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Technical support → Perceived ease of use | 0.599       | 4.441   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Complexity → Perceived ease of use        | -0.342      | -7.360  | 0.000         | Significant |
| Perceived usefulness → User satisfaction  | -0.075      | -1.057  | 0.291         | Insignificant |
| Perceived ease of use → User satisfaction | 0.100      | 1.674   | 0.094         | Insignificant |
| Facilitating conditions → User satisfaction | 0.361    | 6.218   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Compatibility → User satisfaction         | 0.355       | 4.956   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Outcome expectations → User satisfaction  | 0.341       | 3.967   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Computer anxiety → User satisfaction      | -0.003      | -0.104  | 0.917         | Insignificant |
| Subjective norms → User satisfaction      | 0.001       | 0.020   | 0.984         | Insignificant |
| Perceived usefulness → Attitude toward use | -0.064     | -0.616  | 0.538         | Insignificant |
| Perceived ease of use → Attitude toward use | 0.337    | 3.831   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Facilitating conditions → Attitude toward use | -0.010   | -0.122  | 0.903         | Insignificant |
| Compatibility → Attitude toward use       | 0.079       | 0.773   | 0.439         | Insignificant |
| Outcome expectations → Attitude toward use | 0.746      | 5.860   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Computer anxiety → Attitude toward use    | -0.180      | -4.399  | 0.000         | Significant |
| Subjective norms → Attitude toward use    | 0.152       | 2.041   | 0.041         | Significant |
| Perceived usefulness → Intention to continuous use | 0.223   | 4.018   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Perceived ease of use → Intention to continuous use | -0.032   | -0.653  | 0.513         | Insignificant |
| Attitude toward use → Intention to continuous use | 0.477    | 11.589  | 0.000         | Significant |
| User satisfaction → Intention to continuous use | 0.274    | 6.703   | 0.000         | Significant |
| Subjective norms → Intention to continuous use | 0.009   | 0.178   | 0.859         | Insignificant |
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