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Abstract. The Presidential Instruction No. 3 of 2003 on National Policy and Strategy for e-Government Development, has posed its own set of challenges, particularly for local governments in terms of providing responsive, effective, and efficient public services that lead to electronic public service innovations. The application of "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" is a type of public service innovation based on the electronic output of Surakarta City’s Population Office and Civil Registry. The goal of this study was to use the Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA) to assess the elements of public acceptability in the application “Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman,” with data from 100 respondents. This was a quantitative study which used associative research and surveying approaches. Data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares (PLS). The results showed that there were five aspects or variables that influenced the acceptability of the application "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman” by the user community, including expectations of effort, facilitating conditions, perceived risk, attitude, and behavioral intentions. The public acceptability of users of “Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman” was unaffected by performance expectancy and social influence.
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1. Introduction

The issue of good governance is growing in the reform era and is increasingly opening up democratic space for community involvement in governance. In this globalization, which is accompanied by technological and information development, has influenced and brought enormous demands for the government as a service provider to be more open, effective, and efficient in carrying out government obligations, as well as to provide convenience to access information, especially government information [1].

To answer the demands of society in the creation of good governance in the era of globalization, electronic government (e-government) services have emerged. E-government is defined as the application of information and communication technology (ICT) to the administration of government [2], support service actives in the public...
sector by increasing efficiency and effectiveness in their implementation. Meanwhile in Indonesia, e-government has been included in the Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 3 of 2003 concerning the National Policy and Strategy for the Development of e-Government. This Presidential Instruction calls for the establishment of a government that is clean, transparent, and capable of effectively responding to change demands, in which each Governor and Regent/Mayor takes the necessary steps for the implementation of national e-government development in accordance with their respective duties, functions, and authorities.

The Presidential Instruction has created its own set of obstacles, particularly for local governments in terms of providing responsive, effective, and efficient public services. Local governments’ challenges in providing responsive, effective, and efficient services spawned electronic public service innovations. Surakarta is one of the cities that uses technology to provide services to its citizens. It is proven that the City of Surakarta is able to become one of the most innovative cities in Indonesia which received the title of Innovative Local Government throughout 2017, with the 2017 Innovative Government Award (IGA) from the Ministry of Home Affairs for innovations made in providing public services.[3]

One form of service provided by government officials to the community is service in the population sector [4]. Services in the field of population have been under the authority of the Department of Population and Civil Registration (Dispendukcapil). Dispendukcapil is an implementing element of regional autonomy that has duties in the field of population administration. Population services at the Surakarta City Dispendukcapil, including the issuance of a NIK (Family Identification Number), issuance of population documents and residence certificates, registration of moving and arriving residents, recording and issuance of civil registration certificates, and others.

In its implementation, the Dispendukcapil of Surakarta City also provides service innovations in the population sector on an electronic basis. One of them is a service that appears in the form of an application with the name "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman". The "Dukcapil dalam genggaman" application can be downloaded or downloaded for free through the Google Play Store application. The Dukcapil dalam genggaman application has various features in it, such as filing for population administration services which include services for managing e-KTP, KK, KIA, birth certificates to moving in. This application was created with the aim of increasing public awareness, as well as providing convenience for the people of Surakarta City in managing adminduk. The Surakarta City Dispendukcapil also hopes that people do not need to queue and can realize an effective and efficient service because the presence of this application. However, in
its adoption, this application also encountered several obstacles, such as the typical culture of the people of Surakarta City who like to gather and socialize, tend to choose to provide face-to-face services. This can be seen from the number of people queuing to carry out administrative management at the Surakarta City Civil Registration Office. In addition, if we look in the comments column of the "Dukcapil dalam genggaman" application on the Google Play Store.

Viewing the contents of the comments column on the Google Play Store application is a simple step to gather information related to the public's response to the adoption of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application itself. The higher the good comments given by the user community, the better the quality of existing services. On the other hand, if bad comments dominate, it indicates public dissatisfaction with the existing services. To measure the level of community satisfaction in the application "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" this can be done by knowing the level of public acceptance of the application.

The goal of this research is to analyze the factors that influence the acceptance of the user community on the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application in Surakarta City by using the Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA) theory. UMEGA has seven variables with five main variables, namely performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, and perceived risk, then attitude variable as a mediating variable, and finally the user's behavioral intention (behavioral intention) as a variable that is influenced [5]. This research is expected to be a recommendation for the Dispendukcapil of Surakarta City to develop strategic steps to upgrade the services quality, especially in the application of "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" so that it can continue to be accepted by the service user community.

1.1. Electronic Government

E-government, according to [6], is a government-led application of information and communication technology, where the government promises effectiveness and efficiency in the field of government and the establishment of relationships with the community. This is in line with what was expressed[7], e-government, on the other hand, is more about using information and communication technology to improve government efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, and accountability. [8]classifying e-government into four types, namely (1) G2G (Government to Government); (2) G2B (Government to Business); (3) G2C (Government to Citizens); and (4) G2E (Government to Employees). In Indonesia, the policy on e-government structuring itself has been
regulated in Presidential Instruction No. 3/2003 on e-government Development Policies and Strategies.

1.2. Public Service

In Chapter One, Article One, Paragraph One of Law No. 25 of 2009 Concerning Public Services, it is stated that public services are activities or series of activities carried out in the context of meeting service needs in accordance with statutory regulations for every citizen and resident of goods, services, and/or administrative services provided by public service providers. According to the Minister for State Apparatus Empowerment's Decree 63 of 2004 concerning General Guidelines for the Implementation of Public Services, public services are all service activities carried out by public service providers in order to meet the needs of service recipients as well as the implementation of statutory regulations.

1.3. Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE)

In terms of policy, the government of Indonesia governs e-government through Presidential Regulation (Perpres) Number 95 of 2018 on the Electronic-Based Government System. The Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) is a government agency that provides services to SPBE users through the use of information and communication technologies. It is indicated in this Presidential Regulation, to improve the quality of government administration and public services, SPBE acceleration is carried out in central and local government organizations. Acceleration can be done by building SPBE applications, where SPBE applications are divided into two, namely general applications and special applications. General applications are SPBE applications that are the same, standard, and are used for sharing by central agencies and/or local governments.

1.4. Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA)

The Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA) is the development of the UTAUT model which is considered to have not provided an explanation that the existing variables are in accordance with the e-government context. In[5]have analyzed the variables of various previous acceptance models, such as TRA, TAM, SCT, TPB, DPTB, IDT, TAM2, DOI, and UTAUT which are suitable for e-government, it is also explained that this UMEGA model is suitable to be used to analyze e-user acceptance.
government. The UMEGA model has seven variables with five main variables, namely performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, and perceived risk. attitude variable as a mediating variable, and finally the user’s behavioral intention as the variable that is affected.

The following is an explanation of the variables in the Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA):

![Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA)](Source: Dwivedi, 2017)

**1.5. Performance Expectancy**

The degree to which a person believes that adopting the system would help him achieve higher performance is referred to as performance expectancy. The variables in this concept are a combination of variables from several previous studies, including perceptions of the perceived usefulness of TAM/TAM2, the relative advantage of DOI and IDT, and outcome expectations from SCT. [9].

**1.6. Effort Expectancy**

Effort expectancy is the degree to which people believe that using new technology is simple and straightforward. This variable will be made up of three existing variables from previous research: perceived ease of use from TAM/TAM2, complexity from MPCU, and ease of use from IDT [9].
1.7. Social Influence

The amount to which a person believes that other people persuade him to use the system is referred to as social influence. Social influence is formed by several variables from previous studies such as subjective norms of TRA, TAM2, TPB, and DTPB, status (image), and social factors where social influence is always related to one of the constituent variable is subjective norm[9].

1.8. Facilitating Conditions

Facilitating conditions are defined as the level of person's confidence in the existence of infrastructure and the organization as a supporter of system users. This description encompasses the notion of the preceding model variables, notably TPB and DTPB's perceived behavioral control, MPCU's facilitating conditions, and IDT's compatibility [9].

1.9. Perceived Risk

Perceived Risk is a condition that describes the user's perception that the level of risk rather than trust will also result in the level of user interest in using a system. [9]. Perceived risk stand up for attitude and environmental insecurity. Attitude insecurity, such as due to unfriendly internet, while environmental insecurity happened because internet-based technology's nature[10]. [11] revealed that the subjective expectation of suffering a loss in pursuit of a desirable objective is known as perceived risk.

1.10. Attitude

Attitude variables have been used in various studies, such as TRA, TAM, TPB, and DTPB. This variable is used to quantify the effect on attitude intention to use a system. Attitude is defined as the level of a person who has both positive and negative evaluations (behavioral assessments) that are still questionable[12]. Meanwhile, according to[13], attitude is a mediator variable that guide to the whole intention of system.
1.11. Behavioral Intention

The existence of behavioral interest (behavioral intention) is the basis for using a system. [14] defines behavioral interest as the behavior of service users who are willing to recommend to others because the service they receive is satisfactory. While in [15] Behavioral interest is a consumer’s attitude who has a propensity to use the sustainable function of services, is a behavior or attitude that has a desire to use services continuously.

In this study, the proposed framework uses the UMEGA acceptance model. The following describes the framework of thinking in this research.
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**Figure 2:** Thinking Framework.

H1: Performance expectancy has a positive and significant effect on the attitude of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application (attitude).

H2: Effort expectancy has a positive and significant effect on the attitude of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application (attitude).

H3: Social influence has a positive and significant effect on the attitudes of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application (attitude).

H4: The condition of the facility (facilitating conditions) has a positive and significant effect on the attitude of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application (attitude).

H5: The condition of the facility (facilitating conditions) has a positive and significant effect on the expectation of the ease of application of "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" (effort expectancy).
H6: Perceived risk has a negative and significant effect on the attitude of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application (attitude).

H7: The user’s attitude has significant effect on the interest of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application (behavioral intention).

2. Methods

This is study use associative research and survey method using quantitative approach. Quantitative approach is the act of discovering knowledge by using data in the form of numbers as a tool to discover information about the context of what people looking for. [16]. Meanwhile associative research [17], is a research that attempts to establish relationship between two or more variables.

This research was conducted in Surakarta City, where Surakarta City was able to become one of the most innovative cities in Indonesia which received the title of Innovative Local Government throughout 2017, with the 2017 Innovative Government Award (IGA). Dukcapil dalam genggaman" in Surakarta City. Where the population of this study is infinite (not limited) with an unknown population, the number of samples to be taken in this study will refer to the theory proposed by[18], using the following formula:

\[ n = \left( \frac{Z_{\alpha/2}}{e} \right)^2 \]

Information:
- \( n \) = Number of samples
- \( \sigma \) = Population standard deviation
- \( Z_{\alpha/2} \) = Table value Z
- \( e \) = error rate

The standard deviation of the population in this study is 0.25 or 25% and the confidence level is 95%, so that the error level (\( \alpha \)) is not more than 0.05 or 5% and the \( Z_{0.05/2} \) of 1.96. So it can be seen that the sample used in this study amounted to 96.04 samples or rounded up to 97 samples.

The techniques of data collection in this study using a survey (questionnaire) in purposive, this technique is the most efficient technique used with a population that tends to be large. While the measurement scale that will be used is the Likert scale. Where in this study, the distribution of questionnaires was carried out by visiting the
Data analysis in this study is using Partial Least Square (PLS), a multivariate statistical technique that performs for comparing multiple dependent variables and multiple independent variables. This technique is an alternative method of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) model.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Data Description

Researchers have analyzed questionnaires from 100 respondents obtained through direct or online distribution. The results of the analysis of the factors of public acceptance of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application using the Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA) shown below.

![Figure 3: Display of Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman Application. (Source: Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman Application)](image)

3.1.1. The Validity and Reliability Test

Convergent validity and discriminant validity are the two steps of the validity test. The value on the outside loadings in convergent validity may be noticed. If the value on the outer loadings shows a number > 0.70 with the measured variable, then the reflection size is said to be high. The indicator with outer loadings below 0.70 must be removed so that the evaluation of the outer model can continue. After re-estimate, the value of
outer loadings is above 0.70. In terms of convergent validity, apart from looking at the outer loadings, it can also be seen through the Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

At the discriminant validity stage, the value of the reflective indicator seen based on the cross-loading value. The indicator is said to meet discriminant validity if the cross-loading value of all indicators is more than 0.70, the indicator is considered to have discriminant validity. Examining the value of Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is another way to check the validity of variables. [19]. Discriminant validity may also be verified using the Fornell-Lacker criteria, which states that each variable's Square Root value on the AVE must be greater than that of other variables. [20].

The reliability test using two criteria, first is Composite Reliability and the second is Cronbach Alpha. The variable can decided to be reliable if the Composite Reliability and Cronbach Alpha value is > 0.70, this indicates that each variable has good reliability.

| Variable          | Indicator | Outer Loading | AVE  | Fornell Lacker | Composite Reliability | Cronbach's Alpha | Information |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------|------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Performance Expectancy | PE1       | 0.811         | 0.472| 0.687          | 0.870                  | 0.833            | Yes         |
|                   | PE2       | 0.811         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | PE3       | 0.672         |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
|                   | PE4       | 0.367         |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
|                   | PE5       | 0.896         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | PE6       | 0.736         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | PE7       | 0.580         |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
|                   | PE8       | 0.438         |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
| Effort Expectancy | EE1       | 0.755         | 0.438| 0.662          | 0.782                  | 0.748            | Yes         |
|                   | EE2       | 0.790         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | EE3       | 0.399         |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
|                   | EE4       | 0.419         |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
|                   | EE5       | 0.813         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
| Social Influence | SI1       | 0.824         | 0.502| 0.709          | 0.830                  | 0.736            | Yes         |
|                   | SI2       | 0.733         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | SI3       | (-0.364)      |      |                |                        |                  | No          |
|                   | SI4       | 0.804         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | SI5       | 0.721         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | SI6       | 0.721         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
|                   | SI7       | 0.693         |      |                |                        |                  | Yes         |
### 3.1.2. Evaluation Inner Model

The evaluation of the inner model has three criteria, where in [19], all three can be explained as follows: (1) Looking at the value on R Square ($R^2$), where the results of $R^2$ with values of 0.67, 0.33, and 0.19 identify that the model is good, moderate, and weak, (2) looking at the value on F Square ($f^2$), where the results of $f^2$ with values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 can be interpreted that the variable has a weak, medium, and large influence, and (3) look at the value on the relevance of predictions ($Q^2$), if the value of $Q^2$ is above zero, then the model has predictive relevance, whereas if the value of $Q^2$ is below zero, the model does not have predictive relevance.

**Table 1: Table continued.**

| Variable                  | Indicator | Outer Loading | AVE  | Fornell Lacker | Composite Reliability | Cronbach’s Alpha | Information |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|
| **Facilitating Conditions** | FC1       | 0.782          | 0.434| 0.659          | 0.803                | 0.710            | Yes         |
|                           | FC2       | 0.788          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
|                           | FC3       | 0.165          |      |                |                      |                  | No          |
|                           | FC4       | 0.760          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
|                           | FC5       | 0.514          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
|                           | FC6       | 0.708          |      |                |                      |                  | Yes         |
| **Perceived Risk**        | PR1       | 0.713          | 0.508| 0.713          | 0.786                | 0.596            | Yes         |
|                           | PR2       | 0.268          |      |                |                      |                  | No          |
|                           | PR3       | 0.835          |      |                |                      |                  | Yes         |
|                           | PR4       | 0.869          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
| **Attitude**              | AT1       | 0.812          | 0.728| 0.853          | 0.889                | 0.811            | Yes         |
|                           | AT2       | 0.924          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
|                           | AT3       | 0.819          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
| **Behavioral Intentions** | BI1       | 0.747          | 0.640| 0.800          | 0.876                | 0.810            | Yes         |
|                           | BI2       | 0.870          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
|                           | BI3       | 0.851          |      |                |                      |                  |             |
|                           | BI4       | 0.723          |      |                |                      |                  |             |

Source: data processed 2020

**Table 2: Summary of Inner Model Evaluation Output**

|       | $f^2$  | $R^2$  | $Q$   |
|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| AT    |        | 0.351  | 0.539 | 0.389 |
| BI    | 0.387  |        | 0.423 | 0.297 |
| EE    |        | 0.068  | 0.054 | 0.037 |

Source: data processed 2020
4. Discussion

In this study, the SEM method used as a data analysis tool and looks at the estimated value of the path coefficient with the aim of knowing the effects arising from exogenous variables on endogenous variables, some of which pass through the mediating variable.

Based on the hypothesis testing that has been done, it is known that the proposed first hypothesis (H1) is rejected, meaning that performance expectancy (PE) does not have a positive and significant effect on attitude (AT). This is evident from the results of the path coefficient output, the PE t statistics value for AT is less than the t table value (1.96), which is 0.986 and p values are more than 0.05, which is 0.325. Thus, it can be concluded that performance expectancy does not have a positive and significant effect on the attitude of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application.

In the third hypothesis (H3) that is proposed is rejected, it means that social influence (SI) does not have a positive and significant influence on attitude (AT). This evident come from the results of the output path coefficient, the SI t statistics value for AT is less than the t table value (1.96), which is 0.616 and p values are more than 0.05, which is 0.538. Thus, it can be concluded that social influence does not have a positive and significant influence on the user's attitude of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application.

In the fourth hypothesis (H4) that is proposed is accepted, it means that facilitating conditions (FC) have a positive and significant influence on behavioral intention (BI). This is evident from the results of the output path coefficient, the t statistics value of FC against BI is more than the t table value (1.96), which is 3.934 and p values are less than 0.05, which is 0.000. The coefficient value of the FC variable is 0.333, which means that there is a positive effect of 33% caused by the variable on the BI variable. Thus, it can be concluded that the facilitating conditions has a positive and significant influence on behavioral intention of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application.
The fifth hypothesis (H5) proposed is accepted, meaning that facilitating conditions (FC) have a positive and significant effect on effort expectancy (EE). This is evident from the results of the output path coefficient, the t statistic value of FC to EE which is more than the t table value (1.96), which is 2.232 and the p value is less than 0.05, which is 0.026. The coefficient value of the FC variable is 0.253, which means that there is a positive influence of 25% caused by the variable on the EE variable. Thus, it can be concluded that the facilitating conditions have a significant and positive impact on the effort expectancy of users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application.

In the sixth hypothesis (H6) that is proposed is accepted, it means that perceived risk (PR) has a negative and significant effect on attitude (AT). This is evident from the results of the output path coefficient, the t statistics value of PR to AT is more than the t table value (1.96), which is 2.221 and p values are less than 0.05, which is 0.027. The coefficient value of the PR variable is -0.184, which means that there is a positive effect of 18% caused by the variable on the AT variable. Thus, it can be concluded that the perceived risk has a negative and significant influence on the attitude of the users of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggangan" application.

In the seventh hypothesis (H7) that is proposed is accepted, it means that attitude (AT) has a positive and significant influence on behavioral intention (BI). This is evident from the results of the output path coefficient, the t statistics value of AT against BI which is more than the t table value (1.96), which is 3.492 and p values are less than 0.05, which is 0.001. The coefficient value of the AT variable is 0.486, which means that there is a positive influence of 48% caused by the variable on the BI variable. Thus, it can be concluded that the user's attitude has a positive and significant influence on behavioral intention "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application.

5. Conclusion

This study was conducted to analyzing what influencing the acceptance of user community on the “Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman” application in Surakarta City by using the Unified Model of Electronic Government Adoption (UMEGA) theory. The results and conclusions of the data processing show that there are five factors or variables that affect the acceptance of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application by the user community, such as expectations of convenience, facility conditions, perceived risk, user attitudes, and user behavior interests. Meanwhile, the community's approval of the "Dukcapil Dalam Genggaman" application was unaffected by two additional elements or variables, viz performance expectations and social pressures.
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