



Exploring Role of Technology Performance Expectancy, Application Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk and Perceived Cost On Digital Behavioral Intention of GoFood Users

Hendy Tannady^{1✉}, Cynthia Sari Dewi², Gilbert³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Multimedia Nusantara

hendy.tannady@umn.ac.id

Abstract

In the current era of globalization, organizational culture cannot be separated from Human Resources, which is one of the main elements that occupies an important and strategic position in improving company quality. By using these Human Resources in the current era of globalization and increasingly sophisticated technology, it makes it easier for people to access any activity via technology. The online delivery service feature is useful for buying food that consumers want without having to waste time queuing and traveling. In fact, consumers often experience problems when ordering food via online delivery orders. However, providers of online delivery features are still able to convince consumers to stay and continue to use these features. In this research the author used a quantitative approach. The quantitative approach is the measurement of objective quantitative and statistical data through scientific calculations derived from samples of people or residents who are asked to answer a number of questions on a survey to determine the frequency and percentage of their responses. In this quantitative theory, research will be predetermined, analyzing statistical data and interpreting statistical data. The population in this study was 100 random online or remote application users of the GoFood application. The research method used is the explanatory survey research method. Data collection used is a questionnaire or self-administered questionnaire. The research results prove that using this online application can make it easier and create a culture among people to order online. Of course, the nature of new culture or traditions can influence people's behavior in carrying out transactions every day, especially in terms of food products that every Indonesian citizen needs every day.

Keywords: Ordering Food Online, Food Delivery App, GoFood.

JIDT is licensed under a Creative Commons 4.0 International License.



1. Introduction

In Indonesia, there are online wholesale services that collaborate with many restaurants or grocery stores so that their wholesale stores can continue to serve consumer needs. These services are "GoFood" and "GrabFood", both services or features that are popular among consumers [1]. Although there are also private restaurants that have delivery services. Indonesian consumers feel satisfied because the online delivery feature is facilitated and there is no need to bother buying food outside by having to drive a private vehicle, because the service continues to be open to consumers [2]. The online delivery service feature is useful for buying food that consumers want without having to waste time queuing and traveling. In fact, consumers often experience problems when ordering food via online delivery orders. However, providers of online delivery features are still able to convince consumers to stay and continue to use these features [3]. Many consumers have used this online delivery feature, many things can be proven by the good reputation of online food delivery services that Gojek has with its Gofood and Grab with its Grabfood [4].

Because these two services can survive and can control marketing targets on an Indonesian national scale. This service can attract the attention of consumers, because there are habits of consumers who are hedonistic or you could say that they often buy goods or food according to consumer needs in their daily activities [5]. Therefore, service quality is at a level that is expected to answer customer desires. Online food delivery is a means of connecting consumers with companies as well as online culinary businesses that connect restaurants with consumers [6]. Consumers can immediately view the menu, order and make payments via digital applications. It has been proven that 74.4% of internet users in Indonesia use food delivery applications (databoks.katadata.co.id, 2021). Online food delivery services can be accessed via the application and consumers can easily fulfill their daily needs. Companies that provide online-based services in Indonesia are GoFood and Grabfood. Data shows

that the gross transaction value of Grab food delivery (GrabFood) is the highest in Southeast Asia [7]. The figure reaches Rp. 109.4 trillion in 2021, a jump of 28.8% from the previous year. Meanwhile Gojek (GoFood) is IDR. 28.8 trillion. Companies need the right strategy and quickly try to market the goods or services they sell, because nowadays the competition in the business world is increasingly fierce [8]. In the era of globalization, companies must be able to design and act correctly at an early stage in a world full of buying and selling, which is characterized by high dynamics and uncertainty. In the era of digitalization, companies must continue to innovate so that consumers/audiences become more familiar with them and do not reject them. One phenomenon that is currently trending and widely used is online food delivery services [9].

Behavioral Intention is related to the experiences experienced by consumers. The development of this increasingly modern era has many factors that can cause many changes in the behavior of modern society in all daily activities. People's behavioral intention is a very important aspect, where it greatly influences consumers' behavioral intention in making repurchase decisions and can even retell their experiences to other people [10]. Therefore, companies must be able to understand what consumers need so that their expectations are in line with expectations. This is a factor that will lead to consumer behavioral intention regarding previous experiences [11]. Consumer behavior is the experience consumers experience using, to evaluate products, be it goods or services, based on the criteria they use, including their feelings, motivations and behavior [12]. There are many factors that can influence consumer interest in buying or using a product or service such as performance expectancy, effort expectancy, Perceived Risk and Perceived Cost [13]. Performance expectancy is a benchmark for performance, both individual and group, that using a collaboration system can increase work effectiveness and efficiency and lead to operational success results. This has been validated repeatedly in studies of the factors that determine the acceptance and use of new products and technologies [14]. Performance Expectation is generally used to measure the extent to which consumers believe a system such as new mobile technology will bring benefits to their daily lives [15].

The influence of performance expectations on behavioral intentions can also be observed in the context of mobile payments [16]. Mobile payment systems offer consumers a convenient payment method without location or time restrictions. The influence of performance expectations on behavioral intentions can also be observed in the context of mobile payment systems [17]. Mobile payment systems offer consumers a convenient payment method without location or time restrictions [18]. Hence, it has become prevalent in recent years. Because it provides many benefits to users, it has a higher potential to become an important factor for adoption. Apart from that, the research conducted revealed that there is a significant relationship between performance expectancy and behavioral intention [19]. Effort expectancy is defined as the level of system usability. This is a key factor that shows how easy a technology or system is to use. On the other hand, effort expectancy shows the ease of a system to learn, understand and use so that someone will be skilled at using the system [20]. Effort expectancy is each individual's effort to implement a system that can help them complete their work. Effort expectancy refers to how efficient a person thinks in using a system [21]. The results of the research show that effort expectancy has an influence on behavioral intention to use mobile banking services. Consumers have expectations about a brand and the consequences of the purchase. The risk felt by consumers regarding online purchases is because consumers cannot directly examine the product or compare quality [22].

Perceived risk is the nature and level of risk that consumers feel when considering certain purchasing decisions [23]. It is important to consider perceived risk because this perception can be an important factor influencing consumer behavior [24]. The term "Perceived Cost" is like the costs that consumers may incur in the future in connection with the introduction of new technology, such as initial costs, subscription costs, and communication costs [25][26]. These costs include the financial burden on consumers who buy smartphones to use smartphone services [27]. The costs can be monetary or non-monetary as it also requires time and effort to consider the analysis and benchmarking process before introducing new technologies such as mobile payment services and establishing good relationships with new service providers [28][29]. Cost does influence behavioral intention in adopting mobile payments because people will always think wisely in every decision in their life [30]. Conduct research based on cost benefit theory to investigate consumers' intentions to continue adopting mobile payments. It defines cost benefit as an individual's preference to achieve maximum benefits with the least costs incurred for their decisions. When he makes a decision, the consumer always considers unavoidable costs and compares the value or benefits a person would receive before technology adoption.

2. Research Methods

In this research the author used a quantitative approach. The quantitative approach is the measurement of objective quantitative and statistical data through scientific calculations derived from samples of people or residents who are asked to answer a number of questions on a survey to determine the frequency and percentage of their responses. In this quantitative theory, research will be predetermined, analyzing statistical data and interpreting statistical data. Researchers who use a quantitative approach will test a theory by detailing specific hypotheses, then collecting data to support or refute these hypotheses. The approach that will be taken in this

research is a quantitative analysis approach based on statistical information. A research approach that answers research problems requires careful measurement of the variables of the object under study to produce conclusions that can be generalized regardless of the context of time, place and situation. The type of research used in this research is quantitative research. Quantitative research methods are a type of research whose specifications are systematic, planned and clearly structured from the start until the creation of the research design. The method used in this research is an explanatory survey method. An explanatory survey is a research method carried out on large or small populations, but the data studied is data from samples taken from that population, so that relative events, distributions and relationships between variables are found. Explanatory research is research that provides explanations and reasons in the form of cause and effect relationships. A research that attempts to explain the causal relationship between variables through hypothesis testing is called hypothesis testing research or explanatory research. So it can be concluded that the explanatory survey method is research that explains the relationship between variables through hypothesis testing.

3. Results and Discussion

The total number of respondents who filled out a questionnaire that had been distributed by researchers was 100 respondents, consisting of 84 people or 84% of male respondents, and 16 people or 16% of female respondents. From the data results, researchers can conclude that the dominant gender of the respondents who filled out the questionnaire was male. n 68% of respondents aged 23-28 years and other respondents aged 17-22 years amounted to 13%, and aged 29-34 years amounted to 19%. Researchers concluded that the respondents who filled out the questionnaire were predominantly aged 23-26 years. The results of respondents based on their last education show that more respondents filled out the questionnaire with their last education, namely S1 or Bachelor's degree, amounting to 83%, with their last education being SMA/SMK amounting to 36%. And 1% of the respondents had a secondary school education, from the results of the survey the researchers could conclude that the respondents who filled out the questionnaire were predominantly S1. The indicator in PE1 produces an average value of 4.49, which falls into the Strongly Agree category. With the results of the majority of respondents being on a 4-5 Likert scale, 95 respondents stated that they strongly agreed with the PE1 indicator category. It can be concluded that online food ordering is easy to use and can be accessed anywhere and at any time. The value of the PE2 Indicator has an average value of 4.41, with the dominant respondent results being on a 4-5 Likert scale with 94 respondents stating that they Strongly Agree with the PE2 Indicator. This can be concluded that respondents can order food or Order Food Delivery (OFD) easily without affecting the respondent's activities. The value of the PE3 indicator has an average value of 4.49, with the dominant respondent results being on a 4-5 Likert scale with 94 respondents stating that they strongly agree with the PE3 indicator. This can be concluded that respondents can be accessed either in an emergency or not in an emergency. The value of the PE4 indicator has an average value of 4.5, with the dominant respondents being on a 4-5 Likert scale with 93 respondents stating that they Strongly Agree with the PE4 indicator. It can be concluded that respondents agree that the application is easy to access and the features are easy to learn. The EE1 indicator obtained an average value of 4.49 which could be said to be in the Strongly Agree category.

The results of the dominant respondents being on a 4-5 Likert scale were 92 respondents. This shows that the respondent strongly agrees with carrying out the procedure for using GoFood, because it is easy to follow. Indicator EE2 obtained an average value of 4.01 which is included in the Agree category. With the results of respondents who were predominantly on a 4-5 Likert scale, there were 92 respondents. It can be concluded that respondents agree that GoFood can be accessed without having to open a savings account at a bank. Indicator EE3 obtained an average value of 3.98 which is included in the Agree category. The results of the dominant respondents were on a 4-5 Likert scale of 95 respondents. It can be concluded that respondents agree that the GoFood application service can be mastered quickly. Indicator EE4 obtained an average value of 3.94 which is included in the Agree category. The results of the dominant respondents were on a 4-5 Likert scale of 95 respondents. It can be concluded that respondents agree that the GoFood application service is easy to access and its features are easy to use. Indicator PC1 obtained an average value of 3.96 which is included in the Neutral category. The results of the dominant respondents were on a 2-4 Likert scale of 91 respondents. This can be concluded that the respondents agree that miscalculations can occur which can lose money from respondents or users. Indicator PC2 obtained an average value of 2.95 which is included in the Neutral category. The results of the dominant respondents were on a 2-4 Likert scale of 87 respondents. It can be concluded that respondents feel neutral that there could be delays in food delivery when ordering from the GoFood application.

The results of the multiple regression test show that Constants α is 1819, indicating that if Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost are constant, then the level of Behavioral Intention is 0.549. The Performance Expectancy (PE) regression coefficient is 0.520. This can be interpreted as if the Performance Expectancy variable increases by one unit, the level of Behavioral Intention will increase by 0.520 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The Effort Expectancy (EE) regression coefficient is 0.220. This can be interpreted if the Effort Expectancy variable increases by one unit,

the level of Behavioral Intention will increase by 0.220 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The Perceived Risk (PR) regression coefficient is - 0.443. This can be interpreted as if the Perceived Risk variable increases one unit then the level of Behavioral Intention will decrease by -0.443 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The Perceived Cost (PC) regression coefficient is 0.252. This can be interpreted if the Perceived Cost variable increases by one unit, the level of Behavioral Intention will increase by 0.252 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The coefficient of determination (Adjusted R²) is 0.337 or 33%. This can be interpreted to mean that the independent variables (Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost) contained in this study can only explain the factors that influence Behavioral Intention by 0.363 or 36%, while the remaining 64% is explained by variables others outside the model. The significance value in Figure 4.9 above shows a figure of 0.000 or less than 0.05, and from the F-calculated value of 13.561, the regression equation obtained in this research is suitable for use, because the F-calculated value is significantly greater than 0.000. or more than number 4. Therefore, it is used to test the regression coefficient hypothesis simultaneously. Based on the summary table of significance test results, the F test hypothesis is accepted. So, it can be stated that the variables Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost together significantly influence Behavioral Intention. the results of the t-calculated value of each independent variable, namely, Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost. From the Performance Expectancy variable, the value is 5.096, the Effort Expectancy variable is 2.019, the Perceived Risk variable is -3.707, the Perceived Cost variable is 2.618. and after that look for the results of the t-count.

The next step is to use the degree of freedom (df) which has a significant value of 5%, then from this degree of freedom system there is a formula that must be followed, namely ($df = n - 2$). So it can be concluded from the respondents that $df = (100-2)$ so that the df obtained is 98, then from determining the t value from the t-table used for this research it is 1.98447, with a significance level > 0.05 . The result of the t-calculated test value is 2.356, then compared with the significance value of the Performance Expectancy (PE) variable of 0.000 or less than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the Performance Expectancy (PE) variable has a significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H1 is accepted. The result of the t-test value is 5.096. Therefore, compared to the significance value of the Effort Expectancy (EE) variable of 0.46 or smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that the Effort Expectancy (EE) variable has no significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H2 is rejected. The result of the t-test is 2.019. Therefore, if we compare the significance value of the Perceived Risk (PR) variable of 0.000 or less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the Perceived Risk (PR) variable has a significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H3 is accepted. The result of the t-test value is -3.707. Therefore, compared to the significance value of the Perceived Cost (PC) variable of 0.10 or greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the Perceived Cost (PC) variable has no significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H4 is rejected.

4. Conclusion

The results of the multiple regression test show that Constants α is 1819, indicating that if Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost are constant, then the level of Behavioral Intention is 0.549. The Performance Expectancy (PE) regression coefficient is 0.520. This can be interpreted as if the Performance Expectancy variable increases by one unit, the level of Behavioral Intention will increase by 0.520 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The Effort Expectancy (EE) regression coefficient is 0.220. This can be interpreted if the Effort Expectancy variable increases by one unit, the level of Behavioral Intention will increase by 0.220 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The Perceived Risk (PR) regression coefficient is - 0.443. This can be interpreted as if the Perceived Risk variable increases one unit then the level of Behavioral Intention will decrease by -0.443 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The Perceived Cost (PC) regression coefficient is 0.252. This can be interpreted if the Perceived Cost variable increases by one unit, the level of Behavioral Intention will increase by 0.252 with the assumption that EE, PR, PC are constant or have a value of zero (0). The coefficient of determination (Adjusted R²) is 0.337 or 33%. This can be interpreted to mean that the independent variables (Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost) contained in this study can only explain the factors that influence Behavioral Intention by 0.363 or 36%, while the remaining 64% is explained by variables others outside the model. The significance value in Figure 4.9 above shows a figure of 0.000 or less than 0.05, and from the F-calculated value of 13,561, the regression equation obtained in this research is suitable for use, because the F-calculated value is significantly greater than 0.000. or more than number 4. Therefore, it is used to test the regression coefficient hypothesis simultaneously. Based on the summary table of significance test results, the F test hypothesis is accepted. So, it can be stated that the variables Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost together significantly influence Behavioral Intention. the results of the t-calculated value of each independent variable, namely, Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Perceived Risk, Perceived Cost. From the Performance Expectancy

variable, the value is 5,096, the Effort Expectancy variable is 2,019, the Perceived Risk variable is -3,707, the Perceived Cost variable is 2,618. and after that look for the results of the t-count.

The next step is to use the degree of freedom (df) which has a significant value of 5%, then from this degree of freedom system there is a formula that must be followed, namely ($df = n - 2$). So it can be concluded from the respondents that $df = (100-2)$ so that the df obtained is 98, then from determining the t value from the t-table used for this research it is 1.98447, with a significance level > 0.05 . The result of the t-calculated test value is 2.356, then compared with the significance value of the Performance Expectancy (PE) variable of 0.000 or less than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the Performance Expectancy (PE) variable has a significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H1 is accepted. The result of the t-test value is 5.096. Therefore, compared to the significance value of the Effort Expectancy (EE) variable of 0.46 or smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that the Effort Expectancy (EE) variable has no significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H2 is rejected. The result of the t-test is 2.019. Therefore, if we compare the significance value of the Perceived Risk (PR) variable of 0.000 or less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the Perceived Risk (PR) variable has a significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H3 is accepted. The result of the t-test value is -3.707. Therefore, compared to the significance value of the Perceived Cost (PC) variable of 0.10 or greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the Perceived Cost (PC) variable has no significant effect on Behavioral Intention, or H4 is rejected.

References

- [1] Wibowo, T. S., Suhendi, D., Suwandana, I. M. A., Nurdiani, T. W., & Lubis, F. M. (2023). The Role Of Transformational Leadership And Organizational Culture In Increasing Employee Commitment. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 7(2).
- [2] Rony, Z. T., Lubis, F. M., & Rizkyta, A. (2019). Job shadowing as one of the effective activities in the promotion process creates quality managers. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(2), 388-396.
- [3] Rony, Z. T. (2019). An effective promotion strategy for managers in Era Disruption. *Asia Proceedings of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 57-59.
- [4] Lubis, F. M. (2019). DIGITAL LEADERSHIP IN MANAGING WORK MOTIVATION OF MILLENIAL EMPLOYEES:(STUDY CASE: OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY IN INDONESIA). *Asia Proceedings of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 108-110.
- [5] Lubis, F., Rony, Z., & Santoso, B. (2020, March). Digital leadership in managing employee work motivation (case study: oil and gas industry in Indonesia). In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social Sciences, ICSSS 2019, 5-6 November 2019, Jakarta, Indonesia*.
- [6] Aryanto, T., Tukinah, U., Hartarini, Y. M., & Lubis, F. M. (2020). Connection of Stress and Job Satisfaction to Successful Organizational Stress Management: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science*, 7(11).
- [7] Lubis, Z., Zarlis, M., & Aulia, M. R. (2023). Performance Analysis of Oil Palm Companies Based on Barcode System through Fit Viability Approach: Long Work as A Moderator Variable. *Aptisi Transactions on Technopreneurship (ATT)*, 5(1), 40-52.
- [8] Junaidi, J., Lubis, Z., Effendi, I., Aulia, M. R., Utami, M. P., & Supriatna, D. (2023). Strategy Enhancement Performance MSMEs Through PTPN III Partnership Program. *Devotion Journal of Community Service*, 4(2), 438-445.
- [9] Aulia, M. R., Saragi, C. P., & Simbolon, R. (2021). The Effect of Entrepreneurial Characteristics on Entrepreneurial Competence and Entrepreneurial Competence on Business Performance of Micro and Small-Scale Coffee Shops in Bogor. *BASKARA: Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 4(1), 37-48.
- [10] Aulia, M. R. (2020). Pengaruh kompetensi kewirausahaan terhadap kinerja usaha kedai kopi skala mikro dan kecil pada masa pandemi Covid-19 di Kota Medan. *Jurnal Agriust*, 38-44.
- [11] Aulia, M. R. (2020). Pengaruh Kompetensi Kewirausahaan Terhadap Kinerja Usaha Kedai Kopi Skala Mikro Dan Kecil Di Kota Medan. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Krisnadwipayana*, 8(3), 100-113.
- [12] Fitri, S., Wardana, Y. F. W., Mustafa, F., Sari, E. N., & Arief, I. (2023). Analysis of The Influence of Online Purchase Decisions, Digital Perceive Value of Quality and Digital Viral Marketing on Consumer Satisfaction of Skincare Products. *Jurnal Informasi dan Teknologi*, 148-152.
- [13] Sari, E. N. (2021). Pengaruh Store Atmosphere Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Kopi Pada Kong Djie Café Pekanbaru. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 1(2), 73-80.
- [14] Sudirman, W. F. R., Sari, E. N., Reza, S., Syaipudin, M., & Hidayat, H. (2023). Apakah fintech lending berpengaruh terhadap kinerja bank syariah di indonesia?. *MONEY: JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL AND ISLAMIC BANKING*, 1(2), 81-90.
- [15] Sari, E. N., Farhas, R. J., Zulmi, S., & Zakky, M. A. (2021). Analisis Keputusan Konsumen Dalam Pembelian Smartphone (Studi Kasus Pada Mahasiswa Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai). *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 1(2), 688-695.
- [16] Rabialdy, F., & Sari, E. N. (2022). Peran Program Pelatihan Terhadap Kinerja UKM Di Kota Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Pajak*, 2(2), 8-12.
- [17] Ricardianto, P., Ikhsan, R., Setiawati, R., & Gugat, R. (2020). How to improve ship crew's work effectiveness through the leadership style, work life balance and employee engagement in Indonesia national shipping. *Management Science Letters*, 10(2), 399-410.

- [18] Hartatik, H., Kwintiana, B., Nengsih, T. A., Baradja, A., Harto, B., Sudipa, I. G. I., ... & Gugat, R. M. D. (2023). *DATA SCIENCE FOR BUSINESS: Pengantar & Penerapan Berbagai Sektor*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- [19] Suhardjono, S., Cakranegara, P. A., Sari, A. R., Gugat, R. M. D., & Mayasari, N. (2022). Analysis of Internet Utilization for the Community in Terms of Rural and Urban Conditions in the Province of Indonesia. *Jurnal Mantik*, 6(3), 2954-2961.
- [20] Suraharta, I. M., Djajasina, N. D., Wicaksono, M. B. A., Akbar, R. A., Priono, N. J., Yusuf, M. A., & Gugat, R. M. D. (2022). Electric vehicle policy: the main pillar of Indonesia's future energy security. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 4(4), 142-156.
- [21] Bakhar, M., Harto, B., Gugat, R. M. D., Hendrayani, E., Setiawan, Z., Surianto, D. F., ... & Tampubolon, L. P. D. (2023). *PERKEMBANGAN STARTUP DI INDONESIA (Perkembangan Startup di Indonesia dalam berbagai bidang)*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- [22] Nugroho, S. P., Soeprapto, A., & Sirait, A. (2022). Strategic Management Accounting Techniques for Strategic Costing in Village-Owned Enterprises. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 7(6), e0810-e0810.
- [23] Pujiastuti, E. E., Soeprapto, A., Susanta, S., Utomo, H. S., & Maharani Putri, A. (2022). The role of perceived value in understanding tourist experience and post experience at heritage destinations. *Jurnal Siasat Bisnis*, 36-56.
- [24] Sriyono, S., Pujiastuti, E. E., Pulung, N., & Soeprapto, A. (2021). The Acceleration Village Owned Enterprises towards a Social Enterprise in the Village Using a Strategic Management Approach. *Design Engineering*, 8, 13640-13659.
- [25] Pujiastuti, E. E., Maharani Putri, A., & Soeprapto, A. (2021). Pengaruh Memorable Tourist Experience (Mte) Terhadap Affective Commitment dan Behaviors Storytelling. *Journal of Tourism and Creativity*, 5(1), 1-13.
- [26] Otiva, C. S., Israkwaty, Nuryanto, U. W., Eldo, H., & Tahir, A. (2024). Application of Holt-Winter Exponential Smoothing Method to Design a Drug Inventory Prediction Application in Private Health Units. *Jurnal Informasi Dan Teknologi*, 6(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.60083/jidt.v6i1.464>
- [27] Sudirjo, F., Ratna Tungga Dewa, D. M., Indra Kesuma, L., Suryaningsih, L., & Yuniarti Utami, E. (2024). Application of The User Centered Design Method To Evaluate The Relationship Between User Experience, User Interface and Customer Satisfaction on Banking Mobile Application. *Jurnal Informasi Dan Teknologi*, 6(1), 7-13. <https://doi.org/10.60083/jidt.v6i1.465>
- [28] Pujiastuti, E. E., Sriyono, S., Soeprapto, A., & Nugroho, S. P. (2020, October). Visiting peaceful Maghilewa: culture and nature as the potentials of community-based tourism. In *Proceeding of LPPM UPN "VETERAN" YOGYAKARTA CONFERENCE SERIES 2020-POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 107-115).
- [29] Mahdalela, R., Ainun, N., & Roslina, R. (2022, December). An Analysis of Students' Mathematical Communicative Skills in Solving Sets Problems at SMP Negeri 1 Darul Hikma Aceh Jaya. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 70-81).
- [30] Suryawati, I., Rahmani, R., & Ainun, N. (2022, November). Students' Mathematical Communication Ability through Blended Learning Model for Elementary School Students in Banda Aceh. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 53-57).