

Proceeding Paper

Key Determinants of Continuance Usage Intention: An Empirical Study of Mobile Food Delivery Apps among Malaysians[†]

Emily H. T. Yapp^{1,*}  and Saraniya Kataraiian²

¹ Labuan Faculty of International Finance, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Labuan International Campus, Labuan 87000, Malaysia

² Accenture Technology Solution Sdn. Bhd. Sunway, Kuala Lumpur 47500, Malaysia

* Correspondence: emilyyht@ums.edu.my

† Presented at the International Academic Symposium of Social Science 2022, Kota Bharu, Malaysia, 3 July 2022.

Abstract: Mobile food delivery apps have been widely used, especially among Malaysians during the COVID-19 pandemic. When the government allowed restaurants to reopen, mobile food delivery apps slightly declined as Malaysians rushed to dine in restaurants. What determinants Malaysian users to continue to use mobile food delivery apps services after the COVID-19 pandemic remain unknown. Underlying the Extended Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT2) determinants, this study introduces two other relevant determinants: convenience and time saving. Partial least squares structural equation modeling techniques using SmartPLS were used to analyse the data.

Keywords: mobile food delivery apps; UTAUT2; COVID-19 pandemic



Citation: Yapp, E.H.T.; Kataraiian, S. Key Determinants of Continuance Usage Intention: An Empirical Study of Mobile Food Delivery Apps among Malaysians. *Proceedings* **2022**, *82*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2022082015>

Academic Editor: Mohamad Rahimi Mohamad Rosman

Published: 8 September 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

From 2018 to 2025, the Malaysian online meal delivery industry is expected to grow at 18.6% [1]. Mobile food delivery apps allow users to order their food fast and conveniently with real-time access, and users may either takeaway or obtain their food at their doorstep [2]. Users may need only a smartphone to download and visit restaurants, no physical contact is required to view menus and make orders and payments [3]. According to Ariel [4], food-related apps were users' second most frequently installed application. By using mobile food delivery apps, users may plan their meals from a broad variety of outlets more simply and reliably at times and locations that are convenient for them. These apps often provide more thorough, updated, and reliable information regarding food places and the meals they serve. Since Malaysia banned dine-in on March 16, 2019 as part of a government Movement Control Order, food delivery has become a lifeline for restaurateurs. Mobile food delivery apps have progressively increased as people want to purchase meals in a contactless way by utilising food delivery apps. However, as the Malaysian government allows restaurants and cafés to reopen, will the usage of mobile food delivery apps decrease? It is questionable if Malaysians would continue actively to utilise mobile food delivery apps as before. As a result, this research focuses on identifying the factors that may influence users' continued use of mobile food delivery apps through the lens of the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology 2 (UTAUT2) by Venkatesh et al. [5]. In addition, this research also offers two more crucial factors to the model which is time saving and convenience.

2. Literature and Hypothesis

Table 1 provides a selected study on food delivery apps that used the UTAUT theory over the past 3 years. Although researchers have mainly used the UTAUT theory as

their underlining theory, researchers such as Zhao and Bacao [6] have also merged the task–technology fit model and expectancy confirmation theory into the UTAUT theory. These researchers have mainly focused on multi-dimensional attributes of food delivery apps and concentrated on users’ attitude and/or their behaviour. Although UTAU is the underlying theory, not every researcher retained the original independent variables [6,7] but also added new variables into their study [7–9]. In addition, given the importance of identifying what are the important aspects when evaluating food delivery apps, researchers such as Ray et al. [10]; Zhao and Bacao [6], and Fakfare [11] have urged for more research to be performed.

Table 1. Studies on food delivery apps using UTAUT theory.

Authors	Variables
Alalwan [8]	Performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influences, facilitating conditions, hedonic motivation, price value, habit, online review, continued intention, online rating online tracking, and satisfaction
Gunden et al. [7]	Performance expectancy, congruity with self-image, habit, impulse buying tendency, mindfulness, and intention
Tam, Santos, and Oliveira [9]	Social influence, performance expectancy, effort expectancy, perceived fear, facilitating conditions, and continuous intention
Zhao and Bacao [6]	Performance expectancy, effort expectance, social influence, trust, perceived task–technology fit, confirmation, satisfaction, continuance intention
Surya, Sukresna, and Mardiyano [12]	Performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition, behavioural intention
Agarwal and Sahu [13]	Delivery Experience, time saving orientation, societal pressure, search for restaurants, listing, performance expectancy, effort expectancy, facilitating conditions, price saving orientation, hedonic motivations, habit, e-satisfaction, usage intention, and repeat use intention bandwagon effect

2.1. Performance Expectancy

Performance expectation was defined by Venkatesh et al. [5] as “how much the use of technology in specific activities will benefit consumers”. Individuals utilising mobile food delivery apps would help them accomplish a certain job [14]. According to Marinkovic, Dordevic, and Kalinic [15] performance expectation is equivalent to perceived usefulness. As a result, if the user considers mobile food delivery apps beneficial, they are more likely to continue to utilise the mobile food delivery services. Consequently, performance expectation is a major element in mobile food delivery apps continued use intention [5,6]. Hence, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H1. Performance expectancy will positively influence the continuous usage intention of the mobile food delivery apps.

2.2. Effort Expectancy

Effort expectancy is “the extent of ease connected with the use of a system” [13]. Based on the literature, one of the most significant reasons customers use mobile food delivery apps is the expectation of effort [14] and not to mention particularly relevant in food delivery apps [16]. In meal delivery applications, users order their food without assistance from restaurant or café workers. Thus, a customer’s propensity to continue using mobile food delivery apps may be influenced by their perception of mobile food delivery apps simplicity and ease of use especially after they have adopted the apps for quite some time [15]. Therefore, effort expectations are anticipated to substantially impact customers’ continued use intentions of mobile food delivery applications. The following hypothesis was formulated:

H2. The effort expectancy will positively influence the continuous usage intention of mobile food delivery applications.

2.3. Social Influence

One of the important factors in determining whether or not a user will continue to use an application is the opinions of their friends and family members [14]. For new technology, products, and services, social influence has been shown to affect customers' behaviour [16] positively. Customers are more likely to consult their social network to learn more about mobile food delivery apps or to obtain social support for their choice to continue using them. In addition, social influence may impact how individuals think and act [17]. These applications continue to be used by customers if customers receive societal acceptance. However, consumers' willingness to continue to use mobile food delivery apps decreases if they do not obtain social validation from their friends and family members. As a result, it was hypothesised that:

H3. The social influence will positively influence the continuous usage intention of mobile food delivery applications.

2.4. Facilitating Condition

Facilitating conditions are the customers' perceptions of available resources and support to perform the behaviour [5]. They also refer to consumers' perception of the system's access to instruction, guidance, and assistance [17]. As a result, if users are satisfied with the apps facilitating conditions, users are less likely to choose a new service and more likely to reuse food delivery applications. It may also be proposed that if consumers consider a sufficient degree of technological, operational, infrastructural, and human support by utilising food delivery applications, and more comfortable experience using them [18]. Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H4. The facilitating conditions will positively influence the continuous usage intention of mobile food delivery applications.

2.5. Hedonic Motivation

Hedonic motivation relates to multisensory, fantasy, and emotive aspects when using the products or services [5]. It is connected to users' desire, entertainment, and pleasure after the experiences of using the products or services and, in this case, the mobile food delivery apps [19]. From a mobile food delivery app perspective, ordering food through an application enables consumers to enjoy their favourite food without going out of the house or workplace. As consumers find pleasure after using the food delivery application, this encourages them to continue using it. Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H5. The hedonic motivation will positively influence the continuous usage intention of mobile food delivery applications.

2.6. Price Value

Price value exerts a favourable impact on intention to use as the advantage of technology use is considered more than currency benefits. The findings showed that the concept of price is essential in attracting consumers and that certain quality value has a beneficial impact on intentions to reuse mobile food delivery apps [20]. Mobile food delivery apps can save the expense of buying food from restaurants. Not to mention mobile food delivery apps collaborate with the restaurants by giving more promotions such as promotions as well as other attractive incentives for users if they use food delivery apps instead of visiting restaurants. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H6. The price value will positively influence the continuous usage intention of mobile food delivery applications.

2.7. Habit

Habit has been a crucial factor in the potential adoption of technologies. Research on habitual intentions has shown that the habit is a strong indicator of technology usage to facilitate behavioural improvements. Customer's inclination to act spontaneously as a result of their collected learning experience can be defined as habit [21]. In addition, the influence of habit influences consumers' continuous usage intention, especially when consumers are familiar with the food delivery apps [22]. This relationship has also been confirmed by research such as Hsu et al. [23]; and Zanetta et al. [24]. Thus, the following hypothesis proposes that:

H7. Habit will positively influence the continuous usage intention of mobile food delivery applications.

2.8. Time Saving

Society is busy with daily routines and experiencing time constraints. As a result, products or services that can provide them time saving are chosen. In the mobile food delivery apps context, time saving is a perceived advantage to consumers [25]. Using the food delivery, users do not need to drive to the restaurant or café for food. Furthermore, time savings may boost a user's feeling of self-control, which has been shown to increase the likelihood of continuing to use food delivery apps [26]. Thus, the following hypothesis proposes that:

H8. Time saving will positively influence the continuous usage intention in mobile food delivery applications.

2.9. Convenience

In previous research on routes and mobile applications, Ozturk et al. [27], Xu, Hung, and Li [26] and Shah, Yan, and Qayyum [2] discovered that users' continuing intention was substantially influenced by convenience. Convenience is known as perceived advantage associated with mobile apps [26]. In the mobile food delivery apps context, the application allows users to access the application anytime and anywhere if they want to order food. Not to mention, the food is then be delivered to their doorsteps. Due to these reasons, it encourages the user to reuse the application from time to time. As such, convenience positively influences continuance usage intention, as presented in the following hypothesis.

H9. Convenience will positively influence continuance usage intention in mobile food delivery applications.

3. Research Method

This study concentrated exclusively on Malaysians. In this study, a non-probability sampling method, specifically purposive sampling, was used. To be eligible for this study, respondents had to be Malaysian and have use mobile food delivery applications. The measurement items for performance expectancy, effort efficacy, social influence, facilities conditions, hedonic motivation, price value, and habit were adopted from Alalwan [8]. Time saving and convenience were adopted from Yeo, Goh, and Rezaei [25]. The questionnaire was constructed using Google Forms and was distributed online on Whatsapp and Facebook. The G-Power software [28] suggested a sample size of 114 respondents (minimum). In total 301 respondents who participated in the research. Descriptive statistics for a demographic profile were analysed using SPSS 26 package and Partial least square analysis was analysed using SmartPLS version 3.3.9 [29].

4. Result

4.1. Respondents' Profile

In total, there were 301 respondents, 165 are female, and 136 are male. A total of 53.5% are between 18 and 23 years of age, 35.5% between 24 and 39 years of age, 7.3% between 40

and 55 years of age, and 3.7% between 56 years of age and above. Malay (42.5%) comprise the majority of the respondents followed by the Indian (34.9%), Chinese (19.6%), and other ethnicities (3%).

4.2. Common Method Bias

The data for this research came from a single source (an experienced user), it is crucial to determine if common method bias has occurred [30]. To overcome this challenge, MacKenzie and Podsakoff [31] and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff [32] suggested procedural control and statistical control strategies. Both procedural and statistical control were used since using a single control technique would not eliminate the possible influence of common method bias. For procedural control, a cover letter describing the foundation of the study was included in the surveys. A marker variable titled cognitive rigidity [33] was included as part of the questionnaire as statistical control. Cognitive rigidity is the cognitive process underpinning an individual’s inclination to resist or avoid making changes; nonetheless, this measure has no theoretical relationship with the other factors in this research. The approach of a partially out marker variable [33] was applied. The R2 changes are negligible (0.041). This suggests that methodological common method bias was not present in this research.

4.3. Measurement Model

Construct validity of the measuring model was evaluated using convergent and discriminant validity. Refer to the table below (Table 2), except for CIN4, HBT1, PVE4, FCO4, and PEY3, all indicator loadings were more than 0.50 [34]. For each latent variable, the average variance extracted (AVE) values were more than 0.50 [35]; and the composite reliability scores were greater than 0.70 [34]. These data demonstrate the achievement of convergent validity.

Table 2. Measurement model.

Construct	Items	Loadings	CR	AVE
Continuance Intention	CIN1	0.786	0.754	0.507
	CIN2	0.622		
	CIN3	0.719		
Convenience	CON1	0.779	0.819	0.602
	CON2	0.737		
	CON3	0.809		
Effort Expectancy	EEY1	0.676	0.811	0.519
	EEY2	0.697		
	EEY3	0.722		
	EEY4	0.782		
Facilitating Conditions	FCO1	0.762	0.766	0.522
	FCO2	0.698		
	FCO3	0.705		
Habit	HBT2	0.754	0.768	0.525
	HBT3	0.685		
	HBT4	0.734		
Hedonic Motivation	HMN1	0.749	0.780	0.542

Table 2. *Cont.*

Construct	Items	Loadings	CR	AVE
	HMN2	0.746		
	HMN3	0.714		
Performance Expectancy	PEY1	0.759	0.796	0.567
	PEY2	0.800		
	PEY4	0.696		
Price Value	PVE1	0.714	0.784	0.548
	PVE2	0.722		
	PVE3	0.783		
Social Influence	SIF1	0.714	0.758	0.511
	SIF2	0.698		
	SI3	0.732		
Time Saving	TS1	0.773	0.851	0.588
	TS2	0.793		
	TS3	0.717		
	TS4	0.781		

Note: CON: convenience; EEY: effort expectancy; FCO: facilitating conditions; HBT: habit; HMN: hedonic motivation; PEY: performance expectancy; PVE: price value; SIF: social influence; TSG: time saving; CIN: continuance intention.

To ascertain the discriminant validity of the measurement model, the Fornell–Larcker Criterion was used. Table 3 demonstrates that each indication has a higher load on its constructs but a lower load on others. This implies that discriminant validity has been established.

Table 3. Discriminant validity.

	CIN	CON	EEY	FCO	HBT	HMN	PEY	PVE	SIF	TSG
CIN	0.712									
CON	0.528	0.776								
EEY	0.474	0.460	0.720							
FCO	0.471	0.464	0.562	0.722						
HBT	0.522	0.394	0.417	0.493	0.725					
HMN	0.492	0.437	0.482	0.480	0.518	0.736				
PEY	0.447	0.392	0.671	0.503	0.472	0.412	0.753			
PVE	0.513	0.440	0.487	0.482	0.558	0.463	0.400	0.740		
SIF	0.476	0.400	0.436	0.450	0.502	0.427	0.445	0.421	0.715	
TSG	0.554	0.732	0.542	0.506	0.441	0.450	0.491	0.414	0.416	0.767

Note: CON: convenience; EEY: effort expectancy; FCO: facilitating conditions; HBT: habit; HMN: hedonic motivation; PEY: performance expectancy; PVE: price value; SIF: social influence; TSG: time saving; CIN: continuance intention. The black background show that CIN and CON do not have value and so on for other variables.

4.4. Structural Model

Following the evaluation of the measurement model, the investigation moved on to the evaluation of the structural model. A bootstrapping approach with 5000 samples was utilised to generate the path coefficients and accompanying t-values. Table 4 reveals that all variables’ variance inflation factor (VIF) ratings were less than 5 [35]. To be considered sufficient, the R2 must be greater than the value of 0.02. The model explained 48.1% of the variation in continuance intention ($R^2 = 0.481$) in this study. The model used in this study

has strong explanatory power since the R is rather significant. Social influence ($\beta = 0.119$; $t = 1.995$); hedonic motivation ($\beta = 0.111$; $t = 1.983$); price value ($\beta = 0.153$; $t = 2.619$); habit ($\beta = 0.140$; $t = 2.27$); time saving ($\beta = 0.177$; $t = 2.662$) and convenience ($\beta = 0.135$; $t = 1.968$) are the factors that are significant and have positive influence on users' continuance intention towards food delivery apps except for performance expectancy ($\beta = 0.045$; $t = 0.671$); effort expectancy ($\beta = 0.032$; $t = 0.476$), and facilities conditions ($\beta = 0.028$; $t = 0.426$). Except for effort expectancy, facilities conditions, and performance expectancy, none of the variables crossed the '0' line at the lower and upper confidence levels. Furthermore, it is critical to determine if the exogenous constructions of convenience, habit, hedonic motivation, price value, social influence, and time saving have a significant influence on the endogenous constructs. Cohen's [36] criteria for effect sizes (f^2) were used to measure this, with 0.02 being a small impact, 0.15 representing an average effect, and 0.35 representing a large effect. According to this research, habit ($f^2 = 0.020$), price value ($f^2 = 0.026$) and time saving ($f^2 = 0.023$) have little effect. The Q^2 value for continuous intention (0.222) was more than 0, indicating that the model has sufficient predictive relevance.

Table 4. Structural model.

	Std. Beta	Std. Error	T-Value	p Values	Decision	LL	UL	f ²	VIF	R ²	Q ²
H1: PEY->CIN	0.045	0.067	0.671	0.251	Not supported	-0.071	0.15	0.002	2.068	0.481	0.222
H2: EEY->CIN	0.032	0.067	0.476	0.317	Not supported	-0.078	0.144	0.001	2.354		
H3: SIF->CIN	0.119	0.06	1.995	0.023	Supported	0.031	0.222	0.017	1.568		
H4: FCO->CIN	0.028	0.067	0.426	0.335	Not supported	-0.075	0.138	0.001	1.849		
H5: HMN->CIN	0.111	0.056	1.983	0.024	Supported	0.025	0.21	0.014	1.676		
H6: PVE->CIN	0.153	0.058	2.619	0.005	Supported	0.054	0.247	0.026	1.759		
H7: HBT->CIN	0.140	0.062	2.27	0.012	Supported	0.027	0.232	0.020	1.932		
H8: TSG->CIN	0.177	0.066	2.662	0.004	Supported	0.066	0.281	0.023	2.577		
H9: CON->CIN	0.135	0.068	1.968	0.025	Supported	0.023	0.248	0.015	2.325		

Note: CON: convenience; EEY: effort expectancy; FCO: facilitating conditions; HBT: habit; HMN: hedonic motivation; PEY: performance expectancy; PVE: price value; SIF: social influence; TSG: time saving; CIN: continuance intention.

5. Discussion

Data analysis results demonstrated that convenience, habit, hedonic motivation, price value, social influence, and time saving are the factors that are a positive influence on users' continuance intention towards food delivery applications. As a result, users' continued intention of using food delivery apps are based on their convenience, habit, hedonic motivation, price value, social influence, and time saving. However, users' continuous usage intention is not influenced by users' effort expectancy, facilities conditions, and performance expectancy. The results for facilities conditions and performance expectancy are consistent with Lee, Sung, and Jeon [16]. Thus, the result for effort expectancy is inconsistent with Lee, Sung, and Jeon [16]. The research respondents are mainly 18–39 years of age, which are the generations familiar with the technology and mobile applications. As a result, they do not need much effort expectancy and facilities conditions when they use the food delivery applications. As for performance expectancy, respondents do not perceive that mobile food delivery apps are helpful post-pandemic because users do not rely only on food delivery apps for food as dine-in is allowed.

6. Conclusions

This study contributes both to theoretical and practical research. From a theoretical perspective, this study added two additional determinants: time saving and convenience, into the UTAUT2 model. Furthermore, by adding these two determinants, it is also confirmed that both time saving and convenience contribute to continued usage intention. In addition, this study also contributes to mobile food delivery and the framework given in this model can be used as a foundation for future research on mobile food delivery apps.

From a practical perspective, organisations that offer mobile food delivery apps services need to understand the importance of convenience, habit, hedonic motivation, price value, social influence, and time saving to users, especially if they want to encourage users to continue to use mobile food delivery app services. The focus of this project is constrained in certain aspects: data were solely obtained among Malaysians; therefore, the findings' generalizability is constrained. As a result, this study may not be appropriate for other countries. Secondly, most of the respondents in this study are between 18 and 39 years of age, favouring the younger generation, particularly Millennials. Therefore, future research needs to focus on or consider older generations and identify their determinant of continuance usage of mobile food delivery applications.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, supervision, writing—review and editing, E.H.T.Y.; Writing—original draft, investigation, S.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: Paper presented during a panel—organized by Faculty of Information Management, Universiti Teknologi Mara, Kelantan Branch, Malaysia—in the context of the International Academic Symposium of Social Science 2022 conference, organized and hosted by Universiti Teknologi Mara, Kelantan Branch, during the IASSC 2022.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Adroit Market Research. Available online: <https://www.adroitmarketresearch.com/industry-reports/malaysia-online-food-delivery-market> (accessed on 2 February 2022).
- Shah, A.; Yan, X.; Quayyum, A. Adoption of mobile food ordering apps for O2O food delivery services during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Br. Food J.* **2021**, *28*, ahead-of-print. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Okumus, B.; Ali, F.; Bilgihan, A.; Ozturk, A. Psychological factors influencing customers acceptance of smartphone diet apps when ordering food at restaurants. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2018**, *72*, 67–77. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Ariel, M. App Stores Growth Accelerates in 2014. Available online: <https://www.developernation.net/blog/app-stores-growth-accelerates-2014> (accessed on 2 February 2022).
- Venkatesh, V.; Thong, J.Y.; Xu, X. Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Q.* **2012**, *36*, 157–178. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Zhao, Y.; Bacao, F. What factors determining customer continuingly using food delivery apps during 2019 novel coronavirus pandemic period? *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2020**, *92*, 102683. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Gunden, N.; Morosan, C.; DeFranco, A. Consumers' intentions to use online food delivery systems in the USA. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* **2020**, *32*, 1325–1345. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Alalwan, A. Mobile food ordering apps: An empirical study of the factors affecting customer e-satisfaction and continued intention to reuse. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* **2020**, *50*, 28–44. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Tam, C.; Santos, D.; Oliveira, T. Exploring the influential factors of continuance intention to use mobile apps: Extending the expectation confirmation model. *Inf. Syst. Front.* **2020**, *22*, 243–257. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Ray, A.; Dhir, A.; Bala, P.; Kaur, P. Why do people use food delivery apps (FDA)? A use of gratification theory perspective. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2019**, *51*, 221–230. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fakfare, P. Influence of service Attributes of food delivery application on customers satisfaction and their behavioural responses: The IPMA. *Int. J. Gastron. Food Sci.* **2021**, *25*, 100392. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Surya, A.; Sukresna, I.; Mardiyona, A. Factors affecting intention to use food order-delivery feature of ride-hailing applications: The UTAUT approach. *Int. J. Bus. Soc.* **2021**, *22*, 1363–1383. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Agarwal, V.; Sahu, R. Predicting repeat usage intention towards O2O food delivery: Extending UTAUT2 with user gratifications and bandwagoning. *J. Foodserv. Bus. Res.* **2022**, *25*, 434–474. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Venkatesh, V.; Morris, G.B.; Davis, F.D. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Q.* **2013**, *27*, 425–478. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Marinković, V.; Đorđević, A.; Kalinić, Z. The moderating effects of gender on customer satisfaction and continuance intention in mobile commerce: A UTAUT-based perspective. *Technol. Anal. Strateg. Manag.* **2019**, *32*, 306–318. [[CrossRef](#)]

16. Lee, S.W.; Sung, H.J.; Jeon, H.M. Determinants of continuous intention on food delivery apps: Extending UTAUT2 with information Quality. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 3141. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Chao, C.M. Factors Determining the Behavioral Intention to Use Mobile Learning: An Application and Extension of the UTAUT Model. *Front. Psychol.* **2019**, *10*, 1652. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Al-Saedi, K.; Al-Emran, M.; Ramayah, T.; Abusham, E. Developing a general extended UTAUT model for M-payment adoption. *Technol. Soc.* **2020**, *6*, 101293. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Akdim, K.; Casalo, L.V.; Flavian, C. The role of utilitarian and hedonic aspects in the continuance intention to use social mobile apps. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2022**, *66*, 102888. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Dodds, W.B.; Monroe, K.B.; Grewal, D. Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers. *J. Mark. Res.* **1991**, *28*, 307–319.
21. Limayem, M.; Hirt, S.G.; Cheung, M.K. How Habit Limits the Predictive Power of Intention: The Case of Information Systems Continuance. *MIS Q.* **2007**, *31*, 705–737. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Nascimento, B.; Oliveira, T.; Tam, C. Wearable technology: What explains continuance intention in smartwatches? *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2018**, *43*, 157–169. [[CrossRef](#)]
23. Hsu, M.-H.; Chang, C.M.; Chuang, L.W. Understanding the determinants of online repeat purchase intention and moderating role of habit: The case of online group-buying in Taiwan. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* **2015**, *35*, 45–56. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Zanetta, L.D.A.; Hakim, M.P.; Gastaldi, G.B.; Seabra, L.M.A.J.; Rolim, P.M.; Nascimento, L.G.P.; Medeiros, C.O.; Cunha, D.T.D. The use of food delivery apps during the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil: The role of solidarity, perceived risk, and regional aspects. *Food Res. Int.* **2021**, *149*, 110671. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
25. Yeo, V.; Goh, S.K.; Rezaei, S. Consumer experiences, attitude and behavioral intention toward online food delivery (OFD) services. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2017**, *35*, 150–162. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Xu, F.; Huang, S.; Li, S. Time, money, or convenience: What determines Chinese consumers' continuance usage intention and behavior of using tourism mobile apps? *Int. J. Cult. Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2019**, *13*, 299–322. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. Ozturk, A.B.; Nusair, K.; Okumus, F.; Hua, N. The role of utilitarian and hedonic values on users' continued usage intention in a mobile hotel booking environment. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2016**, *57*, 106–115. [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Faul, F.; Erdfelder, E.; Buchner, A.; Lang, A.G. Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behav. Res. Methods* **2009**, *41*, 1149–1160. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Ringle, C.M.; Smith, W.R.; Becker, J. *SmartPLS 3*; SmartPLS GmbH: Boennigstedt, Germany, January 2015.
30. Tehseen, S.; Ramayah, T.; Sajilan, S. Testing and Controlling for Common Method Variance: A Review of Available Methods. *J. Manag. Sci.* **2017**, *4*, 142–168. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. MacKenzie, S.B.; Podsakoff, P.M. Common Method Bias: Nature, Causes, and Procedural Remedies. *J. Retail.* **2012**, *88*, 556–562. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Podsakoff, P.M.; MacKenzie, S.B.; Lee, J.-Y.; Podsakoff, N.P. Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2003**, *88*, 879–903. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Oreg, S. Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2003**, *88*, 680–693. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Byrne, B.M. *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Apps and Programming*, 3rd ed.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2016.
35. Hair, J.; Hult, G.T.; Ringle, C.; Sarstedt, M. *A Primer On Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 2nd ed.; SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2017.
36. Cohen, J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Science*, 2nd ed.; Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ, USA, 1988.