DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

INSTRUMENT OF SATISFACTION AND LOYALTY ON OUTPATIENT ONLINE REGISTRATION

Put a check mark (√) or a cross (X) on one of the available boxes on each statement with the option:

1. ***SA** if **Strongly Agree***
2. ***A** if **Agree***
3. ***EA** if Enough Agree*
4. ***D** if **Disagree***
5. ***SD** if **Strongly disagree***

No	Statement	Responses				
		SA	**A**	**EA**	**D**	**SD**
Perception of Convenience						
1	The online patient registration system has an *easy-to-use* user interface					
2	I easily find and use the booking feature on the online patient registration system					
3	The service information provided by the patient's online registration system is very clear					
4	The patient's online registration system has a speed according to my cellphone device					
5	The online patient registration system provides me with a system of help and support					
6	The online patient registration system provides effective confirmation and notification					
Perception of Usability						
1	This online registration system provides information precisely and accurately.					
2	I feel that this online registration system is fast and efficient in its use.					
3	I find it easy to access this online registration system.					
4	The use of this online registration system has improved my experience in registering.					
5	This online registration system helps me save time and effort in the registration process.					
6	The use of this online registration system increases the effectiveness of the registration process.					
Attitude						
1	I feel positive about the use of this online registration system.					

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

No	Statement	Responses				
		SA	A	EA	D	SD
2	I have full confidence in the reliability of this online registration system.					
3	I feel confident that my personal data is safe when using this online registration system.					
4	I believe that this online registration system is in accordance with its intended use.					
5	I feel ready to actively adopt and use this online registration system.					
Implementation						
1	I use this system regularly in my work or daily activities.					
2	I feel comfortable using this system whenever I need it.					
3	I tend to look for other alternatives than using this system.					
4	I have a habit of prioritizing the use of this system over other solutions.					
5	I have encountered no obstacles or problems while using this system.					
6	I feel like this system meets my needs and adds value to my work.					
Satisfaction						
1	I feel that the service of this online registration system is reliable and reliable.					
2	I feel that this online registration system service is responsive to my needs and requests.					
3	I feel that this online registration system provides a guarantee for the security of my data and personal information.					
4	I feel that the use of this online registration system is efficient and helps me to save time and effort in the registration process.					
	I am satisfied with the ease and convenience provided by this online registration system.					
	This online registration system has met or exceeded my expectations in the registration process.					
Loyalty						

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

No	Statement	Responses				
		SA	A	EA	D	SD
1	I will reuse this hospital's online registration system for my future registration needs.					
2	I would recommend this online registration system to friends or family in need.					
3	I will continue to take advantage of the outpatient treatment of this hospital					
4	I feel comfortable and believe in the services provided by this hospital.					

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

Convergent Validity

The assessment of the results of the convergence validity test was carried out through the approach of *the outer loading* value and the AVE (*average variance extract*) value. An indicator is declared to meet the requirements for convergent validity if *the outer loading* value > 0.7 and an indicator is declared not to meet the requirements if *the outer loading* value < 0.7. The required AVE score must be more than 0.5. The *outer loading value* of each indicator of all latent variables of this study is presented in the following table.

Table 1. *Latent Variable Outer Loading* Indicator and AVE Values

Latent Variables	Items	Outer Loading	AVE
Perception of . Ease	Pkm1	0,735	0,564
	Pkm2	0,751	
	Pkm3	0,763	
	Pkm4	0,759	
	Pkm5	0,759	
	Pkm6	0,736	
Perception of Uses	Pkg1	0,736	0,587
	Pkg2	0,767	
	Pkg3	0,778	
	Pkg4	0,731	
	Pkg5	0,795	
	Pkg6	0,786	
Attitude	Skp1	0,806	0,595
	Skp2	0,724	
	Skp3	0,793	
	Skp4	0,745	
	Skp5	0,787	
Usage	Imp1	0,742	0,545
	Imp2	0,748	
	Imp3	0,704	
	Imp4	0,736	
	Imp5	0,764	
	Imp6	0,734	
Satisfaction	Kep1	0,768	0,601
	Kep2	0,771	
	Kep3	0,803	
	Kep4	0,825	
	Kep5	0,739	
	Kep6	0,742	
Loyalty	Loy1	0,832	0,68
	Loy2	0,833	
	Loy3	0,822	
	Loy4	0,81	

The table above shows that all latent variable indicators, both the variables of perception of convenience, perception of usability, attitude, use, satisfaction and loyalty, have *an outer loading* value of > 0.7. Therefore, it can be concluded that all indicators for each of these latent variables are declared to meet the convergence validity requirements. In other words, each indicator of all latent

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

variables in this study is able to explain its latent well. Each latent variable has an AVE value of more than 0.5, which indicates the acceptable level of convergent validity of all of those latent variables. This means that all latent variables account for more than 50% of the variance of all indicators.

Discriminant Validity

The assessment of the validity of discrimination is recommended using three approaches, namely the Fornell-Larcker criterion approach, *heterotrait-monotrait* ratio (HTMT), and *cross-loading*.

Table 2. Fornell-Larcker Criterion Values

No	Perception of Ease	Perception of Uses	Attitude	Usage	Satisfaction	Loyalty
Perception of Ease	0,751*					
Of Uses	0,406	0,766*				
Attitude	0,401	0,421	0,772*			
Usage	0,566	0,509	0,572	0,738*		
Satisfaction	0,376	0,277	0,292	0,410	0,775*	
Loyalty	0,385	0,336	0,324	0,398	0,495	0,824*

Information: *The number followed by the asteric sign (*) is the root value of AVE, besides that the number that is not marked is the correlation value between latent variables.*

The table above shows that the root value of the AVE of the latent variable of convenience perception variable is 0.751, usability perception 0.766, attitude 0.772, usage 0.738, satisfaction 0.775 and loyalty 0.824, or greater than all the correlation values between the latent variables. Therefore, all latent variables of the study were declared to meet the requirements for the validity of discrimination. To support this approach, the HTMT ratio approach is used. The following table shows all HTMT values less than 0.85.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

Table 3. HTMT Ratio Matrix of Each Latent Variable

	Perception of Ease	Perception of Uses	Attitude	Usage	Satisfaction
Press. Uses	0,475				
Attitude	0,472	0,488			
Usage	0,663	0,593	0,680		
Satisfaction	0,436	0,308	0,340	0,474	
Loyalty	0,454	0,388	0,384	0,468	0,575

The *cross loading values* of each indicator of all latent variables are presented in the following table.

Table 4. Cross *Loading* Values of Indicators for Each Latent Variable

Indicators	Latent Variables					
	Perception of Ease	Perception of Uses	Attitude	Usage	Satisfaction	Loyalty
Imp1	0,456	0,444	0,417	**0,742**	0,243	0,336
Imp2	0,459	0,389	0,411	**0,748**	0,322	0,267
Imp3	0,342	0,384	0,387	**0,704**	0,265	0,255
Imp4	0,369	0,327	0,348	**0,736**	0,294	0,255
Imp5	0,457	0,360	0,522	**0,764**	0,384	0,378
Imp6	0,404	0,346	0,423	**0,734**	0,291	0,247
Kep1	0,269	0,219	0,223	0,344	**0,768**	0,386
Kep2	0,275	0,174	0,191	0,325	**0,771**	0,343
Kep3	0,328	0,261	0,266	0,343	**0,803**	0,417
Kep4	0,322	0,241	0,302	0,341	**0,825**	0,425
Kep5	0,268	0,183	0,172	0,233	**0,739**	0,348
Kep6	0,280	0,196	0,185	0,306	**0,742**	0,373
Loy1	0,288	0,192	0,292	0,297	0,438	**0,832**
Loy2	0,326	0,392	0,272	0,345	0,429	**0,833**
Loy3	0,292	0,259	0,223	0,329	0,356	**0,822**
Loy4	0,360	0,260	0,278	0,342	0,403	**0,810**
Pkg1	0,355	**0,736**	0,289	0,372	0,194	0,254
Pkg2	0,316	**0,767**	0,364	0,368	0,190	0,313
Pkg3	0,345	**0,778**	0,285	0,407	0,163	0,224
Pkg4	0,306	**0,731**	0,233	0,308	0,130	0,167
Pkg5	0,278	**0,795**	0,280	0,389	0,225	0,267
Pkg6	0,276	**0,786**	0,448	0,463	0,333	0,300
Pkm1	**0,735**	0,248	0,264	0,426	0,281	0,304

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

Indicators	Latent Variables					
	Perception of Ease	**Perception of Uses**	**Attitude**	**Usage**	**Satisfaction**	**Loyalty**
Pkm2	**0,751**	0,314	0,246	0,432	0,234	0,286
Pkm3	**0,763**	0,284	0,275	0,367	0,245	0,267
Pkm4	**0,759**	0,263	0,270	0,384	0,319	0,294
Pkm5	**0,759**	0,322	0,365	0,471	0,285	0,277
Pkm6	**0,736**	0,385	0,370	0,447	0,325	0,302
Skp1	0,359	0,434	**0,806**	0,464	0,289	0,321
Skp2	0,188	0,283	**0,724**	0,404	0,220	0,199
Skp3	0,360	0,287	**0,793**	0,444	0,151	0,203
Skp4	0,334	0,327	**0,745**	0,420	0,255	0,242
Skp5	0,298	0,290	**0,787**	0,469	0,213	0,277

The table above shows that all latent variable indicators, both the variables of perception of convenience, perception of usability, attitude, use, satisfaction and loyalty, have *a cross loading* value in one variable greater than all *the cross loading values of* other variable indicators. Therefore, it can be concluded that all indicators for each of these latent variables are declared to meet the requirements for the validity of discrimination.

Table 5 *Composite Reliability* Values and *Cronbach's Alpha* Latent Variables

No	Latent Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
1	Perception of Convenience	0,846	0,886
2	Perception of Usability	0,860	0,895
3	Attitude	0,830	0,880
4	Usage	0,833	0,878
5	Satisfaction	0,867	0,900
6	Loyalty	0,843	0,895

The table above shows that the latent variables of convenience perception, usability perception, attitude, use, satisfaction and loyalty have *Cronbach's Alpha*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55018/janh.v6i2.251
English Version

> 0.6 and *Composite Reliability* > 0.7, respectively. Therefore, all latent variables of the study were declared to meet the reliability requirements