Perception of Customers Towards E-Citizen: A Case Of City square Huduma Center Nairobi

Purity Anyango Komer,
Mba & Zachary Mumbo Mosoti, Ph.D.

Abstract : The purpose of this study is to investigate the perception of customers towards e-citizen. The study was guided by the following research objectives; To determine how service quality affect customers perception towards e-citizen, to determine the effect of culture on customers perception towards e-citizen, to determine the effect of privacy and security towards customers perception on e-citizen.The study focused on customers at Huduma Center in City square. Descriptive research was used. The population of the study was 1000 customers. Stratified random sampling and structured questionnaires were used. The target population was customers who use NHIF, NSSF, Driving license renewal, registration of business name, payment of rent and land rates, and pension services. The collected data was then put through a process of cleaning, editing and consolidation to ensure good quality of the data. Both qualitative and quantitative data was analyzed using inferential and descriptive statistics. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the report. Data was coded according to different variables and descriptive statistics such as frequencies, mode, mean percentiles, variances and standard deviations for ease of interpretation. Tabular, figures and chart were used to analysis and interpretation data.Correlation analysis was used to show various variables relate to eachother.The study recommends that since most respondents are between 25-30 years. The government should make e-citizen more interactive such that customers are able to get instant feedback; the site should also be upgraded to be able to handle traffic especially during tax-return handle traffic. In addition, it is also recommended that government should use both English and Kiswahili language. Based on the third objective it was recommend that the government should create more awareness and sensitize citizens on the safety and security of their information on the portal.

Key Words: perception, e-citizen, customers, huduma centre, feedback, quality and service

----

I. INTRODUCTION

The growth of Information Technology has encouraged the Kenyan government to invest and adopt the use of internet and other channels of communication to offer citizens better, cheaper, and faster services (GOK 2008). E-government is increasingly becoming a fundamental tool for enhancing public administration. The central argument is that e- government is not only a tool or platform that enhances delivery of public services but also has the potential to reform the way policies are formulated and implemented, in terms of efficiency, accountability, transparency, and citizens' participation (GOK2008).

According to GOK, (2008), Kenyan e-government will launched in 2004 and its main objectives are to improve service delivery using ICT, make government more transparent, and improve citizen participations in policy making. E-government is also known as digital government, online government or transformational government. It is the delivery of public information and services through the use of ICTs (Heeks, 2002; Norris, 2004; Seed, 2007; Sharma & Gupta, 2003). According to Heeks (2002), e-government is the use of information and communication technologies in improving the activities and services of government. Seifert & Chang (2008) defines e-government as access to government as well as government's access to citizens using current network technologies. E-government is the delivery of government information and services online through the internet or other digital means (Muir & Oppenheim,2002).

The World Bank organization (2004), highlights that with the aid of government corporations of information technology (including, the internet, wide area Networks and cellular computing) has the capacity to transform associations with residents, companies, and different government departments. Those technology have serve a good number of different ends which include delivery of quality government services to residents, interactions with commercial enterprise, citizen empowerment via easy access to records. This resulting advantages can be able to drastically reduce corruption, and at the same time improve transparency, convenience, increase revenues, and value.

World Bank (2004), further defines e-government as the use of information and communication technology to transform government by making it more accessible, effective and accountable. E-government is the process of including all applications of information and communication technologies that will help improve efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability of daily government administration (Mata, 2010).

II. STATEMENT PROBLEM

Customer service is important to any organization or business set up. The quality of that service will either enhance or degrade customer loyalty to the brand and the business. It is true that any organization that proves to be responsive to customer questions, complaints, or other needs can gain a clear competitive advantage. For this reason, it is important to use all resources available to make sure your customers are taken care of. E-service is a government platform to provide its taxpayers with information over the internet.

According to Kelleher & Peppard (2009), the increasing proliferation of the internet and the tremendous growth of e-commerce, organizations, both in the business-to-consumer (B2C) and business-to-business (B2B) sectors, have moved to differentiate themselves through the electronic provision of service and the enhancement of the e-service or web experience. More and more organizations are using technology as a means of interacting and co-creating value with customers, developing and improving customer relationships with the objective of increasing profits. E-government has been believed to bring about benefits such as saving customers money in the form of faster, easier, and more convenient service with better quality. Kenyan government set up e-citizen platform to improve service delivery, however, very little information is available on the user's attitude towards the products and services. The problem of this study is to investigating the perception of customers towards the e-citizen platform

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Service quality involves a comparison of expectations with performance and it can also be used to differentiate between two service providers hence, achieve acompetitive advantage and Sheetal (2000), defines quality as satisfying or exceeding taxpayer's requirement and expectation as a result customers judge the quality of service being provided. Service quality is therefore a measure of how well a delivered service matches customer's expectation (Zeithman & Bitner, 2003). According to Hopeniene (2004), quality is often understood as an attitude, while a

Customer's evaluation of a service and his satisfaction is considered to be the measure of a transaction. E-service quality is as overall consumer evaluations and opinions about the excellence of e-service delivery in the virtual marketplace (Lee & Lin,2005).

According to Ngei (2009), customer's perception towards service quality has been given increased attention in recent years, because of its contribution to business competitiveness, developing satisfied and loyal customer. This makes service quality an important element to understand by companies by knowing how to measure it and making necessary improvement in its dimensions where appropriate especial in areas where gaps between expectation and perception are wide. He adds that perceptions of customers are based solely on what they receive from the serviceencounter.

According to Alanez, Kamil & Bashir (2010), E-service quality can not only provide organization competitive advantages in the online environment, but also involves clients in the product process through customer's feedback, and improve clients' relationships and satisfactions. However, Chutimaskul, Funilkul &Chongsuphajaisiddhi(2008), adds that many e-governments have been developed without paying full attention to the quality of the e-government services and the requirements of citizens.

Douglas & Connor (2003), found that consumer who has developed increased perception of quality tends to become more demanding and less tolerant of assumed shortfalls in service quality and identify the intangible elements (inseparability, heterogeneity and perishability) of a service as the critical determinants of service quality. It is very important to note that, service quality is not only evaluated as the end result but also on how it is delivered during service process and its ultimate effect on customer's perception.

The SERVPERF model will developed by Cronin & Taylor (1992), it is based on customer perception and uses the performance approach method which measures service quality based on customer's overall feeling towards service. This model is good to measure service quality but does not provide information on how customers will prefer service to be in order for service providers to make improvements. Teas (1993), developed the evaluated performance model which measures the gap between perceived performance and the ideal amount of a dimension of service quality, rather than the customer'sexpectation.

Culture is the value, belief, behavior, and material objectives that form people's way of life. According to Dunpy & Herbig (2004), culture is the sum total of a way of life, it includes expected behavior, beliefs, values, language, and living practices shared by members of a society; it is the pattern of values, traits, or behaviors' shared by the people within a region.

According to Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel (1998), culture is a collection of beliefs, values, attitudes, religion, philosophy of time, roles, spatial relations, understanding of the universe and material objects,

knowledge, experience, and belongings gained over generations by the group and the individuals within it. Culture is a "shared patterns ofbehavior" (Davison & Martinsons, 2003, p. 3). Schwartz (2006), identified culture as "the rich complex of meanings, beliefs, practices, symbols, norms, and values common among people in a society" (p.138). Schein (2010), defined culture as a set of basic common assumptions that defines an interpretation of the world; what is an acceptable emotional reaction to what is going on; and what actions are required in response to an event. Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1998), defined culture as the way a group of individuals solve problems.

According to Shahzad, Luqman, Rashid & Shabbir (2012), culture is gained knowledge, explanations, belief, communication, values and behaviors of a large group of people in a given period of time. Hofstede (1991), says national culture is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes members of one group from another (p.5). He argues that people share a collective national character that represents their cultural mental programming, which shapes their values, beliefs, assumptions, expectations, attitudes and behaviors.

According to Shankar (2002), privacy is viewed as customer's expectation that their information will be treated fairly. Online security is the ability if protecting citizens information and protecting their financial transaction from being stolen. A website is perceived to be secure if it is able to protect customer's information from hackers (Hua, 2009). Privacy risk is the loss of citizen's information and the use of this information without their permission (Featherman & Pavlou, 2003). Perceived risk can also be defined as the chances of customers personal information being disclosed (Garbarino & Strahilevitz, 2004). Conklin & White (2006), organizations should constantly monitor security and privacy issues through this they will be able to build citizens trust.

Security and privacy of information is another challenge that affects the implementation of e-government around the world (Layton, 2007). Citizens do not feel safe using websites to transfer their personal information such as name, pictures, date of birth, ID number and credit card information.

Online administration is virtual and differ from traditional ones in the procedure, policy maker's link with e-government transaction phases need to be careful when creating application based and foundation based trust in the citizens (Kim et al., 2005). The business site need to take full responsibility of all trades by assimilating the various roles of the various codependent divisions instead of sending citizen to corresponding sanctioned web interfaces. Karunasena et al. (2011), argues that rate of public trust in e-government is duplicated in citizens' perceptions of the e-services delivered. The government need to ensure that user's privacy and security is free from hackers. This will build customers trust in public agency and encourage customers to use online services.

IV. RESEARCHMETHODOLOGY

Stratified random sampling technique was applied since the population of concern is not homogeneous and can be subdivided into groups or strata to obtain the sample. A reduced number of individuals in a study will help lower error, cost and workload hence making it easier to obtained high quality information (Cooper & Shindler,2006).From the initial population of 1000, a sample of 10% was selected from within each group in proportions that each group bears to the study population this will result into 100 respondents. The study got information from a sample of 100 respondents. This made it easier to get adequate and accurate information necessary for the research. Sample size distribution is shown in the tablebelow.The questionnaire had both open and closed ended questions. The close ended questions provide more planned responses to make possible concrete recommendations. The close ended questions was used to test the rating of various attributes and this helped in reducing the number of related responses in order to obtained more varied responses. The open ended questions provided extra information that might not have been captured in the close ended questions. The questionnaire was carefully designed and pre-tested with a few members of the population for further improvements. This was done in order to enhance its validity and accuracy of data collected for the study. After data collection was completed; data screening, coding, entry and cleaning was done. Strategic package for social sciences program (SPSS) was used to analyzedata.

Data analysis is the process of analysing, cleaning transforming and modeling data collected in a research. Data analysis methods that were used in the study include both qualitative and quantitative techniques (Wagner, Halley & Zaino, 2011). Data was coded according to different variables of the study for ease of data entry and interpretation. Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to help the researcher to describe the data and determine the extent used.

V. RESULTS ANDFINDINGS

From the findings the variable e-citizen service used had a mean of 5.13 and a standard deviation of 1.733 and 29% of the respondents use more than one of the e-citizen services, business license had 20% , iTax 18%, driving license 17%, ID card 9% and visa application at 7%.From the findings the variable frequency of e-citizen use had a mean of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.642 and 61% of the respondents rarely use the service, 32% usethe e-citizen services monthly, while 7% use it weekly, no respondents use the services daily.

From the findings the variable customer service rating had a mean of 1.71 and a standard deviation of 0.686. Good rating has a proportion of 48%, satisfactory ratings was at 41%, average ratings had 10%, while below average had only 1%.

The variable eservices provided as promised was evenly spread with a mean 1.73 and a standard deviation of 0.908. The respondents were asked whether e-citizen provided as promised, 50% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 33% agreed. However, 13% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 2%, those who strongly disagree were also 2%.The variable website appeal was evenly spread with a mean 1.9 and a standard deviation of 0.898. The respondents were asked whether the website was appealing in appearance and visual design, 35% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 47% agreed. However, 11% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 4%, those who strongly disagree were also 3%.

The variable focus on needs was evenly spread with a mean 1.88 and a standard deviation of 0.972. The respondents were asked if e-citizen focus on meeting their needs, 41% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 38% agreed, 14% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 3%, those who strongly disagree were also 3%.

The variable navigation was evenly spread with a mean 1.92 and a standard deviation of 0.829. The respondents were asked if e-citizen website was easy to navigate, 33% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 45% agreed, 18% of the respondents were neutral;A multivariable correlation was done on the various variables that affect service quality towards customer perception. There was a positive correlation between all the variables:service quality promised, website appeal, meeting customer needs, ease of navigation and availability of the information. The strongest positive correlation was between service quality promised and customer needs at 0.687, the p value of 0.00 was statistically significant.

The variable handling problems was evenly spread with a mean 1.99 and a standard deviation of 0.863. The respondents were asked if the website was dependable in handling problems, 53% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 34% agreed, 10% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 2%, those who strongly disagree were also 1%.The variable updated was evenly spread with a mean 1.87 and a standard deviation of 0.906. The respondents were asked if the information on the website was up to date, 41% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 37% agreed, 17% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 4%, those who strongly disagree were also 1%.

The variable access was evenly spread with a mean 1.80 and a standard deviation of 0.964. The respondents were asked if the information on the website easy to access, 47% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 35% agreed, 11% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 5%, those who strongly disagree were 2%. QualityProducts

The variable quality product was evenly spread with a mean 1.96 and a standard deviation of 0.88. The respondents were asked if the technology applied had led to quality products, 30% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 51% agreed, 12% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 5%, those who strongly disagree were 2%.The variable usefulness was evenly spread with a mean 1.75 and a standard deviation of0.77. The respondents were asked if they found e-citizen useful, 41% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 47% agreed, 8% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 4%, no respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable timely delivery was evenly spread with a mean 1.75 and a standard deviation of 0.77. The respondents were asked if e-citizen delivered timely services, 38% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 51% agreed, 6% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 5%, no respondent strongly disagreed.The variable lower travel and queuing was evenly spread with a mean 1.66 and a standard deviation of 0.819. The respondents were asked if e-citizen lowered travel and queuing, 51% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 37% agreed, 7% of the respondents wereneutral; while those who disagree were 5%, no respondent strongly disagreed.The variable easy to interact with was evenly spread with a mean 1.82 and a standard deviation of 0.829. The respondents were asked if it was easy to interact with e-citizen, 38% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 46% agreed, 10% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 6%, no respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable preference of face to face was evenly spread with a mean 2.28 and a standard deviation of 1.278 The respondents were asked if they preferred face to face interaction over online, 34% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 33% agreed, 14% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 10%, 9% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable good idea was evenly spread with a mean 1.67 and a standard deviation of 0.915. The respondents were asked if access to government service is a good idea, 53% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 36% agreed, 6% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 2%, and 3% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable e-citizen to access government services was evenly spread with a mean 1.83 and a standard deviation of 0.869. The respondents were asked if they liked using e- citizen to access government services, 39%

of the respondents stronglyagreed, while. 45% agreed, 9% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 5%, and 2% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable knowledge in rural area was evenly spread with a mean 1.78 and a standard deviation of 1.139. The respondents were asked if people in rural areas had knowledge/ skills of accessing e-citizen, 59% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 20% agreed, 7% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 12%, and 2% respondent strongly disagreed. A multivariable correlation was done on the various variables that affect customer attitude towards Eservice. The variables were; preference of face to face, e-citizen being a good idea, e-citizen liked in accessing government services, knowledge of e-citizen in rural area, and language being a challenge. There was a negative correlation (-0.268) between preference of face to face, and e-citizen being a good idea and the p value was significant at (0.007). The strongest positive correlation was between e-citizen being a good idea, eservice liked in accessing government services at (0.556); the p value of (0.00) was statistically significant as shown in table4.27.

The variable access to resources was evenly spread with a mean 1.65 and a standard deviation of 1.119. The respondents were asked if rural areas have necessary resources to access e-citizen, 67% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 14% agreed, 8% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 7%, and 4% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable geographical location was evenly spread with a mean 2.95 and a standard deviation of 1.279. The respondents were asked if geographical location affectaccessibility to e-citizen, 16% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 23% agreed, 26% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 22%, and 13% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable search engine was evenly spread with a mean 2.01 and a standard deviation of 0.886. The respondents were asked if search engine was user friendly, 29% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 50% agreed, 15% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 4%, and 2% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable compatibility was evenly spread with a mean 1.76 and a standard deviation of 0.903. The respondents were asked if e-citizen was compatible with their lifestyle, 48% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 39% agreed, 6% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 6%, and 1% respondent strongly disagreed.A multivariable correlation was done on the various variables that affect technology in e-citizen. The variables were; access to resources by rural areas, geographical location, and search engine were user friendly, and compatibility of e-citizen to user's lifestyle.

There was a positive correlation (0.495) between search engine being user friendly, and compatibility of e-citizen to user's lifestyle the p-value was significant at (0.000). The variable marketing campaign was evenly spread with a mean 2.28 and a standard deviation of 1.079. The respondents were asked if government conducted marketing campaigns to create awareness, 21% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 49% agreed, 15% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 8%, and 7% respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable workshops was evenly spread with a mean 1.84 and a standard deviation of 0.854. The respondents were asked if government conducted seminars and workshops to create awareness, 36% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 50% agreed, 8% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 4%, and 2% respondent strongly disagreed.

A correlation done on factors of awareness between if government conducted marketing campaigns, and if government conducted seminars and workshops revealed a positive correlation of (0.438) and the p-value (0.000) was statistically significant.The variable trust was evenly spread with a mean 2.09 and a standard deviation of 1.071. The respondents were asked if the e-citizen platform can be trusted, 39% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 36% agreed, 17% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 3%, and 5% respondent strongly disagreed.The variable delivery of information was evenly spread with a mean 2.02 and a standard deviation of 0.812. The respondents were asked if information was safely delivered, 28%of the respondents strongly agreed, while 49% agreed, 18% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 5%, no respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable safety of transaction was evenly spread with a mean 2.11 and a standard deviation of 0.895. The respondents were asked if information transaction was safe, 24% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 54% agreed, 12% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 9%, while 1% of respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable hacking was evenly spread with a mean 2.11 and a standard deviation of 0.895. The respondents were asked if information was safe from hacking, 29% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 46% agreed, 21% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 3%, while 1% of respondent strongly disagreed.

The variable data privacy was evenly spread with a mean 2.20 and a standard deviation of 0.947. The respondents were asked if information was had privacy, 25% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 39% agreed, 26% of the respondents were neutral; while those who disagree were 8%, while 2% of respondent strongly disagreed.

VI. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS ANDRECOMMENDATIONS

According to the findings majority of the respondents 88% agree that eservices provided services as promised and on the other hand, 81% of the respondents also agree that the website was appealing in appearance and visual design, Similar results have been exhibited and according to Hopeniene (2004), quality is often understood as an attitude, while a customer's evaluation of a service and his satisfaction is considered to be the measure of a transaction. E-citizen quality is as overall consumer evaluations and opinions about the excellence of e-citizen delivery in the virtual marketplace (Lee & Lin, 2005).

The findings also revealed that majority of respondents 79% agree that E services focus on meeting their needs. In addition 88% the respondents agree that e-citizen website was easy to navigate. According to Ngei (2009), service quality is an important element to understood by companies by knowing how to measure it and making necessary improvement in its dimensions where appropriate especial in areas where gaps between expectation and perceptions are wide. He adds that perceptions of customers are based solely on what they receive from the serviceencounter.

The finding from this study revealed that 87% of respondents agree that use of the website enabled them accomplish task quickly and 87% also agree that the website was dependable in handling problems. This therefore implies that the website offered quality services to the users. According to Sheetal (2000), service quality involves a comparison of expectations with performance and it can also be used to differentiate between two service providers hence, achieve a competitive advantage and defines quality as satisfying or exceeding taxpayer's requirement and expectation as a result customers judge the quality of service being provided. Service quality is therefore a measure of how well a delivered service matches customer's expectation (Zeithman & Bitner,2003).On analysis of the reliability of the services the findings revealed that majority of the respondents 88% agree that the website use saved time and money; in addition 78% of the respondents also affirmed that the website was up to date. According to the findings by Safwan (2010), reliability shows the ability of the service provider to perform services in a dependable and accurate manner. In addition, it involves doing it right the first time and it is an important service component of customers (Messay,2012).

A multivariable correlation done on the various variables that affect service quality revealed a strongest positive correlation was between service quality promised and customer needs at 0.687, the p value of 0.00 was statistically significant. According to Sakhaei (2014), reliability improvement is an important element in service quality enhancement effort.

According to the findings, respondents affirm that e-citizen made work accomplishment easy 82%, while 88% found e-citizen useful and 89% agree that e-citizen delivered timely services. Selamat (2009), says that a technology which is perceived to be easier to use than another is more likely to be accepted by users whereas the more complex a technology is perceived to be, the slower the rate of adoption. Teo (2001), states that a system which is easy to use often requires less effort on the part of user's and thereby increases the likelihood of adoption and usage of a particular technology, in addition perceived ease of use had a positive influence on consumers' attitude in using the Internet.

According to the findings 82% agree that use of e-citizen has made work accomplishment easy, and 77% agree that the information in the portal was easy to update, and according to Buton-Jones & Hubona (2005), perceive ease of use it the ease of learning and becoming skilful at using pervasive technologies, including technologies and interfaces on online shopping sites, were concluded as valid determinants as to what makes a technology easy to use. This is the degree to which one believes that a particular information technology or system is easy to use system (Venkatesh & Davis,2000).

The findings revealed that majority of respondents 67% prefer face to face interaction over online although it was also revealed that 91% agree that access to government service is a good idea. These findings are similar to those by Shahjahn, (2009), who highlighted that people's attitude towards existing government structures hinders the use of e-citizen. Some sections in the public argue that they require facing the government representatives personally instead of transacting online; this is because they reason that by facing government officials, they can be able to argue their cases well. Vassilakis (2005), highlighted that this behavior is triggered by mistrust of government structures Due to negative attitude or beliefs that people have about the use of online service, some people might still prefer to interact with the government traditionally, via face to faceinteraction

Similar findings were discovered according to Horrigan (2004), majority of citizens, even those with a high speed Internet connection at home, seeking government information and services; prefer to speak to a person directly in their contact with the government. As aresult of these tensions between policy implementation and public perception, e- government exists as an option, but not the preferred option, of most citizens.

The study also revealed that 81% agree that people in rural areas have knowledge and skills of accessing e-citizen, this therefore shows that the platform is universal throughout the country and this is in line with Heeks

(2003), the main reason why people do not use e-citizen in developing countries is the gap that exists between the design and reality of information systems implementation. Due to culture people usually resist change from the use of paper based to the use of e-citizen. The findings revealed that 87% agree that e- citizen was compatible with their lifestyle. Bagchi, Cerveny, Hart & Peterson (2003), argued that ICTs promote more cooperation at work, better quality of life and these values are adopted in nations with low MF index(p.960).

According to the findings 70% agree that government conducted marketing campaigns to create awareness, while 86% agreed that government conducted seminars and workshops this ensures that the citizen are made aware of the service. According to Singh & Sahu, (2008), E-government services are limited by difficulties in searching for and locating the desired information, as well as lack of availability of computers and internet access for many segments of the general population. Jaeger & Thompson, (2004), highlight that problems are increased by a general lack of familiarity with the structure of government and attitudes toward technology among many citizens.

The findings revealed 83% of respondents agreed that English and location posed a challenge to rural customers. According UN (2008), not all citizens currently have equalaccess to computers and Internet. This might be due to a lack of financial resources, necessary skills, or other reasons. In fact, computer literacy is required for people to be able to take advantage of e-government applications. According to Thompson (2009) and World Bank (2002), there is a poor connectivity of internet in Kenya hence is far from realizing universal access given that less than 10% of Karshoda (2009), more than 80% of Kenyans who live in rural areas are having a challenge of internet accessibility and connectivity therefore limiting them from accessing e-citizen. Kamar & Ongo'ndo, (2007) add that most of the website content are also English dominated and can only be understood by minorityelite.

On analysis of the third objective on effects of privacy and security on customers towards e-citizen, the findings reveal that 75% agree that e-citizen while 68% agree that of the can be trusted as it is very secure. In addition, information is safely delivered. This are in line with a research done by Hoffman (1999), one of the reasons why consumers do not like conduction online transactions is because of lack of privacy and potential loss of control over confidential information. Security and privacy of information is another challenge that affects the implementation of e-government around the world (Layton, 2007).

On that note, Citizens do not feel safe using websites to transfer their personal information such as name, pictures, date of birth, ID number and credit card information. Citizens do not feel that the website is secure enough to protect their private information from being accessed by hackers (US-GAOReport,2002).

The findings reveal that 77% agree that information was safely delivered, the findings also revealed that 78 agree that the information transaction was safe, 78% agreed. According to Bélanger et al. (2002), Perceptions of trustworthiness could also prohibit citizens' to use e-government services. Bélanger (2002), trustworthiness is 'theperception

of confidence in the electronic marketer's reliability and integrity'. Carter & Bélanger (2005) argued that trust in the internet and trust in government are significant factors that affect citizens' intention to use e-government servicesWeb portals sometimes have to collect private and personal info to identify users and serve them in a safe way. Privacy and security of the collected data are a main point of concern; citizens need to knowledge and this can only be through the explanations given to them as why the data are required and how the private info will be protected from invasion by any third party (Karunasena et al., 2011).

Karunasena et al., (2011) observe that public trust in e-government is reflected in citizens' and help to build trust in public agency and brings e-satisfaction resulting in enhanced usage of online services. Citizens are concerned with the security and privacy and according to the Hart–Teeter national survey reported by GAO (2001), Americans believe that e-government has the potential to improve the way government operates, but that they have concerns about sharing personal information with the government over the internet. Miyazaki & Fernandez, (2001), add that security and reliability are some concerns that have been identified as one of the most important factors that influence customers risk perceptions towards the use of onlineservices.

The findings also revealed that 75% of the information was safe from hacking; in addition, 64% agree that information had privacy. This coincides with findings by US- GAO Report, (2002), which found out that citizens do not feel safe using websites to transfer their personal information such as name, pictures, date of birth, ID number and credit card information. Citizens do not feel that the website is secure enough to protect their private information from being accessed byhackers.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Since majority of users are between 25-30. The government should make e-citizen more interactive such that customers are able to get instant feedback; the site should also be upgraded to be able to handle traffic especially during tax- return handle traffic. Internet

service has increase in Kenya; government should create an e-citizen app that can enable customers to access the services from anywhere using mobile phone.

The study reveals that many respondents neither agree nor disagree with issues of trust 8%, security 10%, delivery of information 18%, safety of transaction 12%, hacking 21% and data privacy 26%. I there for recommend that the government should create more awareness and sensitize citizens on the safety and security of their information on the portal.

This study only looked at three factors in the study, service quality, culture, privacy and security, it is recommended to do further studies to reveal other factors that affect customer perception towards e-citizen. This will guarantee amplified dependability of the statistics for generalization purpose.

This study only looked at the customers who are using e-citizen services in Nairobi and therefore implies that the result are skewed towards a particular direction by the data from one institution, it is recommended that similar studies be done in other towns so as to increase the statistical prowess of the study.

REFERENCE

[1]. Abhichandani, T., Horan, T. A. (2006). Toward A New Evaluation Model of E Government Satisfaction:Results of Structural Equation Modeling. Claremont, CA: Claremont Universitypress.Agrawal, A. (2007). Assessing Service Quality in e-citizen: Building up on the Quality.Unpublished doctoral dissertation submited to ICTAI University Press.

[2]. Akkaya, P. Wolf, and H. Krcmar, (2012). "Factors Influencing Citizen Adoption of E- Government Services: A cross cultural comparison. (Research in Progress)," in System Science (HICSS), 45th Hawaii International Conference.

[3]. Alanezi, M. K. (2010). A Proposed Instrument Dimensions for Measuring E-government Service Quality. International Journal U- and E-service, Science and Technology, Vol 3, issue 4, pp.1-18

[4]. Alhujran, O. (2009). Determinants of e-government services adoption in developing countries: A field survey and a case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation submited to University of Wollongong.Al-Khouri, A. M. & Bal, J. (2007). Electronic Government in the GCC Countries.International Journal of Social Sciences, Vol 1, issue 2, pp.83-98

[5]. Allard, R., Riel, V., & Jurriëns, P. (2001) Exploring consumer evaluations of e-citizen: a portal site. International Journal of Service Industry Management, Vol 12, issues 4, pp.359-377.

[6]. Armstrong, G., & Kotler, P. (2012). Principles of Marketing, 14th Ed.Upper Saddle River, NJ; PearsonEducation.Aronson, E. (2004). The Social Animal. 9th Ed. NewYork, NY: Worth Publishers.

[7]. Barkhi, R. B. (2008). A model of determinants of purchasing from virtual stores. Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, Vol 18, issue 3, pp.177- 196.

[8]. Belanger, F. & Hiller, J. S. (2006). A framework for E-government: Privacy implications.

[9]. Business Process Management Journal, Vol 1, issue1, pp.48-60

[10]. Bélanger, F. H. (2002). Trustworthiness In Electronic Commerce: The Role Of Privacy, Security, and Site Attributes. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, Vol 11, issue 4, pp.245–270.

[11]. Belanger, F., Hiller, J. S. & Smith, W.J. (2002) Trustworthiness in electronic commerce: the role of privacy, security, and site attributes. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, Vol 1, issue 1, pp.245-270.Bisdee, D. (2007). Consumer Attitudes Review. Journal of Business and Management,Vol 16, issue 9, pp.65-72.

[12]. Bitner, M. (1994). Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction: Consumers Voice, in Service Quality, Thousand Oaks, CA : SagePublication.

[13]. Boyer, H. (2002). E-Services: Operations Strategy – A Case Study And A Method For Analyzing Operational Benefits. Journal of Operations of Operation Management, Vol 20, issue 2,pp.175-188.Branscum, D. (2000), "Guarding on-line privacy". Newsweek, Vol. 135, issue 23, pp.77-8.

[14]. Buton, J. A. (2005). Individual Differences And Usage Behavior: Revisiting A Technology Acceptance Model Assumption. The data base for Advances in Information Systems, Vol 36, issue 2, pp.58-77.

[15]. Chadwick, S. (2001). Communicating trust in e-commerce interactions. Management Communication Quarterly, Vol 14, issue 4, pp.653–658.

[16]. Childers, T. L. (2001). Hedonic And Utilitarian Motivations For Online Retail Shopping Behaviour. Journal of Retailing, Vol 7, issue 4, pp.511-535.

[17]. Christopher, F. (2011). Citizen Interaction and e-government: Evidence For The Managerial, Consultative, & Participatory Models. Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, Vol 5, issue 2, pp.167–184.

[18]. Chutimaskul, W. (2008). The Quality Framework Of E-Government Development, NewYork, NY :ACM Publisher.

[19]. Chuttur, M. Y. (2009). Overview of the technology acceptance model: Origins, developments and future directions. Sproute: Working Papers on Information Systems, Vol 9, issue 37, pp.9-37.

[20]. Collier, J. (2009). Model Misspecification; Contrasting Formative and Reflective Indicators for a Model of E-Service Quality. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, Vol 17, issue 3, pp.283-293.

[21]. Conklin, A. & White, G. B. (2006) E-government and cyber security: the role of cyber security exercises. Proceedings of the 39th annual hicss. Ieee computer society.

[22]. Cooper, D. (2006). Business Research Methods.12th Ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

[23]. Cronin, J. (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Re-Examination And Extension. Journal of Marketing, Vol 56, issue3,pp.55-68.

[24]. Culnan, J. (1993). How did they get my name? An exploratory investigation of consumer attitudes toward secondary information use. MIS Quarterly, Vol 17, 341-62.

[25]. Dabholkar, P. (1996). Consumer Evaluations of New Technology-Based Self-Service Options: An Investigation of Alternative Models of Service Quality.International Journal of Research in Marketing, Vol 13, issue 1, pp.29-51.

[26]. Darison, R. (2003). Cultural Issues and IT Management: Looking Ahead. IEE Transactions on Engineering Management, Vol 50, issue 1, pp.3-7.

[27]. Davis, M. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, Vol 13, issue 3, pp.319-340.

[28]. DeLong, M., R. (1999) Apparel Shopping on the Web. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, Vol 91, issue 3, pp. 65-68.

[29]. Denscombe, M. (2007). The Good Research Guide : For Small-Scale Social Research Projects. 3rd Ed. New York, NY: MacmillanPublishers.

[30]. Denscombe, M. (2010).The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects. 4[th]Ed. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishers.

[31]. Donna, Y. D. (2006). E-Government: Evolving Relationship Of Citizens And Government, Domestics and International Development. Government information quarterly, Vol 23, issue 2, pp.207–235.

[32]. Douglas, L. (2003). Attitudes To The Expectation Gap, Nutrition & Food Science, Vol 33, issue 4,pp.165-172.

[33]. Dourish, P. (1992). Awareness and Coordination in Shared Workspaces, New York, NY: ACM Press.

[34]. Dunphy, S. (1998). Culture And Innovation, Cross Cultural Management,An International Journal, Vol 5, issue 4,pp.13–21.

[35]. Everett, R. M. (1983). Diffusion of Innovation. 3rd Ed.New York, NY: Macmillan Publishers.

[36]. Fang, Z. (2002). E-Government in Digital Era: Concept, Practice, and Development,

[37]. International Journal of the Computer, Vol 10, issue 2, pp.1-22.

[38]. Fassnacht, M. (2006). Quality of electronic services: Conceptualizing and testing a hierarchical model, Journal of Service Research, Vol 9, issue1, pp.19-31.

[39]. Featherman M., S, & Pavlou P, A. (2003). Predicting e-services adoption a perceived risk faces perspective. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, Vol 59, issue 4,pp.51-74

[40]. Field, J. H. (2004). Managing Quality In The Eservice System: Development and Application of a Process Model, Production and Operations Management, Vol 13, issue 4,pp.29-306.

[41]. Fink, A. (2003). How to Sample in Surveys, 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Printers.

[42]. Gefen, D., & Straub, D. (2003). Managing User Trust in B2C. E-service Journal, Vol 2, issue 2, pp.7-24.

[43]. Ghobadian, A. (1994). Service Quality Concepts and Models, The Qualitative Report.

[44]. Vol 8, issue 4, pp.597-606.

[45]. GOK (2004). E-Governmnet Strategy: The strategic frameowrk, Administrative Structure, Training Requirements and Standardization Framework. Nairobi, Kenya: Government Press.

[46]. GOK (2008). National Development and Vision 2030 Millennium Development Goals: Status Report of Kenya. Nairobi, Kenya: Government Press.

[47]. Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. The Qualitaive Report, Vol 8, issue 4, pp.597-606.

[48]. Griffin, E. (2006). A First Look At Communication Theory. 6th Ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

[49]. Ha, H., & Coghill, K. (2006). E-Government in Singapore-A Swot and PestAnalysis.

[50]. Asia-Pacific Social Science Review, Vol 6, issue 2, pp.103-130.

[51]. Hahn, J. & Kauffman, R. (2002). Evaluating Selling Web Site Performance From A Business Value Perspective, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

[52]. Hart,T., & Teeter, R. (2003). The New E-government Equation: Ease, Engagement, Privacy and Protection,Washington, DC: Accenture Council for excellence in government.

[53]. Heeks, R. (2001). Building e-Governance for Development: A Framework for National and Donor Action, Manchester, UK: Institute for Development Policy and Management.

[54]. Heeks, R. (2002). E-government in Africa: Promise and practice. Institute for Development Policy and Management, Vol 13, issue1, pp.1-28.

[55]. Heiner, E., & Gopalkrishnan, I. (2007). E-citizen: Opportunities and Threats. Journal of Value Chain Management, Vol 1, issue1, pp.1-40.
[56]. Hien, N. M. (2014). A study on evaluation of e-government service quality, International Journal of Social Management, Economics and Business, Vol 8, issue 1, pp.1-4.
[57]. Hill, C. (1998). A qualitative assessment of Arab culture and information technology transfer, Journal of Global Information Management, Vol 6, issue 3, pp.29-38.
[58]. Hiller, S. & Cohen, R. (2001). Internet Law and Policy. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
[59]. Hoffman, D. (1991). Building Consumer Trust Online. Communications of the ACM, Vol 42, issue 4, pp.80–85.
[60]. Hoffman, D., & Novak, T. (1999). Information privacy in the marketspace: Implications for the commercial users of anonymity on the web. The infromation Society, Vol 15, issue 2, pp.129-139.
[61]. Hofstede, G. (1996). Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
[62]. Hofstede, G. (2004). Personality & Culture Revisited: Linking Traits & Dimensions of Culture. Cross Cultural Research, Vol 38, issue 1, pp.52-88.
[63]. Hopeniene, R., & Bagdoniene, L. (2004). Services Marketing and Management.Kaunas, LI: Technologija Press.
[64]. Hua, G. (2009). An experimental investigation of online banking adoption in China.
[65]. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, Vol 14, issue 1, pp1-12.
[66]. Huang, E. (2008). Use And Gratification In E-Consumers. Internet Research, Vol 18, issue 4, pp.405- 426.
[67]. Janssen, M., & Lamersdorf, W. (2010). Role Of Cultural Dimensions In Adopting E- Government At Local Government:Government Information Quarterly, Vol 26, issue 2, pp.233-237.
[68]. Javalgi, R. (2004). The export of E-service in the Age of Technology Transformation: Challenges & Implications for International Service Providers. E-service Marketing, Vol 18, issue 7, pp.560-572.
[69]. Jeong, C. (2007). Fundamental of Development Administration.Selangor, MA: Selangor School Press.
[70]. Kaaya, J. (2004). Implementaing E-government Services in East Africa: Assesing Status
[71]. Through Content Analyses of Government Websites.Electronic Journal of E- Government,Vol 2, issue 1, pp.39-54
[72]. Kaliannan, M., & Halimah, A. (2010). Adoption and use of e-governmentservices: A case study on e-procurement in Malaysia, WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics, Vol 7, issue 1, pp.1-10.
[73]. Kamar, N., & Ongo'ndo, M. (2007). Impact of E-Government on Management and Use of Government Information in Kenya, Durban, SA: IFLA general Conference and Council.
[74]. Kamel, M. (2014). Measuring Social Factors in the Hashemetis Kingdom of Jordan,International Journal of Digital Society, Vol 1, issue 2, pp.123-124
[75]. Kelleher, C., & Peppard, J. (2009). The Web Experience – Trends in E-Service. Cranfield, UK: Cranfield School of Management.
[76]. Kibera, F. (1998). Fundamental of Marketing: An African Perspective. Nairobi, KE: Kenya Literature Bureau.
[77]. Kim, D. J., Song, Y., & Rao, H. (2005). A Multidimensional Trust Formation Model in B-to-C E-Commerce: A Conceptual Framework and Content Analyses Of Academia/Practitioner Perspectives, Decision support systems, Vol 40, issue 2, pp. 143-165.
[78]. Kothari, C. (2004). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. Delhi, IN: New AgeInternational.
[79]. Kottemann, J. E., & Boyer-Wright, K. (2010). Socioeconomic Foundations Enabling E- Business and E-Government. Information Technology for Development, Vol 16, issue 1, pp.4-15.
[80]. Kotter, J. P. (1996). Leading Change. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
[81]. Kumar, V., Mukerji, B., Butt, I., & Persaud, A. (2007). Factors For Successful E- Government Adoption: A Conceptual Framework. The electronic journal of e- Government, Vol 5, issue1, pp.63-76.
[82]. Lau, E. (2003). Challenges for e-government development.In proceedings of the 5th global forum on reinventing government conference, Mexico City, Washington, DC: Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.
[83]. Layne, K., & Lee, J. (2001) Developing Fully Functional E-government: A four-stage model. Government information quarterly, Vol 18, issue 2, pp.122-136.
[84]. Layton, T. (2007). Information Security: Design, Implementation, Measurement, and Compliance. Boca Raton, FL: Aurbach Publications. Lee D. H., & Chircu. A.M (2005), "E-government: key success factors for value discovery and realisation", Electronic government, Vol. 2, issue 1, pp.11-25.
[85]. Lee, G., &. Ling, H. (2005). Customer perceptions of e-service quality in online shopping. International. Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, Vol 33, issue 2,pp.161-176.
[86]. Lewis, B. (1993). Service Quality Measurement. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, Vol 11, issue 4,pp.4-12.
[87]. Littlejohn, S. (2005). Theories Of Human Communication. 8th Ed.: Belmont, CA: Thomson wadworth.

[88]. Lopez, C. (2009). Barriers to Electronic Government Use as Perceived by Citizens at the Municipal Level in Mexico.

[89]. Madu, C. (2002). Dimensions of Equality. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, Vol 19, issue 3, pp.246-259.

[90]. Majeed, M. (2014). National Culture and E-government Service Adoption. Tunisia Case.International Journal of Business Economic Strategy, Vol 1, issue 1, pp.1-5.

[91]. Mata, F. (2010). Information Technology & Sustained Competitive Advantage. A Resource Based Analysis. MIS Quarterly, Vol 29, issue 4, pp. 487-505.

[92]. Mathieson, K. (1991). Predicting User Intention: Comparing Technology Acceptance Model and The Theory of Planned Behavior. Journal of information science, Vol 2, issue 3, pp.173 – 191.

[93]. Matiangi, F. (2014). Information & Communications Technology (ICT) Sector Policy Guidelines. Nairobi, KE: Government press.

[94]. Mauricio, S., & Featherman, A. (2010). Reducing Online Privacy Risk to Facilitate E- Service Adoption: The Influence of Perceived Ease of Use and Corporate Credibility. Journal of Services Marketing, Vol 24, issue 3, pp.219–229.

[95]. Mbulwa, C. (2006). Framework for Quality Assessment of E-Government Services Delivery in Kenya, Nairobi, KE: Strathmore University

[96]. McClure, D. (2001). Electronic Government: Challenges Must Be Addressed With Effective Leadership and Management. Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office Address.

[97]. Messay, S. (2012). Banking Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty in Ethiopian Banking Sector. Journal of Business Administration and Management Sciences Research, Vol 1, issue 1, pp.1-9.

[98]. Miles, M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Source Book. 2nd Ed.

[99]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

[100]. Miyazaki, A. (2001). Consumer perceptions of privacy and security risks for online shopping. Journal of Consumer Affairs, Vol 35, issue 1, pp.27–44.

[101]. Morgeson, V., & Mithas, S. (2009). Does E-Government Measure Up to E-Business? Comparing End User Perceptions of U.S. Federal Government and E-Business, Public Administration Review, Vol 69, issue 4, pp.740-752.

[102]. Mudass, K. T. (2013). The Effect of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction and the Moderating Role of Word of Mouth. African Journal of Business Management, Vol 7, issue 18, pp.1751-1756.

[103]. Mugada, N. (2008). E-Government for Development, Department Of Management Science, Nairobi, KE: University of Nairobi.

[104]. Mugenda, A. & Mugenda, O. (1999). Research Methods: Quantitative and qualitative Approaches, Nairobi, KE: African Centre for Technology Studies

[105]. Mugenda, A. & Mugenda, O. (2003). Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative Approaches, Nairobi, KE: African Centre for Technology Studies.

[106]. Muir, A., & Oppenheim, C. (2002). National Information Policy Developments Worldwide In Electronic Government. Journal of Information Science, Vol 28, issue 3, pp.173-186.

[107]. Mutula, S. (2008). Comparison of Sub-Saharan Africa's e-government status with the developed and transitional nations. Infromation Management & Computer Security, Vol 16, issue 3, pp.235-250.

[108]. Ndou, V. (2004). E-government for Developing Countries: Opportunities and Challenges. The Electronic Journal on Information Systems in Developing Countries, Vol 18, issue 1, pp.1-24.

[109]. Negi, R. (2009). Determining Customer Satisfaction Through Perceived Service Quality: A Study of Ethiopian Mobile Users. International Journal of Mobile Marketing, Vol 4, issue 1, pp.31-38.

[110]. Noort, G. V., P. Kerkhof, and B. M. Fennis, (2007). "The Persuasiveness of Online Safety Cues: The Impact of Prevention Focus Compatibility of Web Content on Consumers' Risk Perceptions, Attitudes, and Intentions", Journal of Interactive Marketing, Vol. 22, issue 4, pp.58-72,

[111]. Norris, P. (2004). Deepening Democracy via E-Governance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

[112]. O'Keefe, D. (2002). Persuasion: Theory and research. 2ndEd. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage:

[113]. Oliveria, T. (2011). Information Technology Adoption Models at Firm Level.Journal of Infromation System Evaluation, Vol 14, issue1, pp.132.

[114]. Ooh, L. K. (2009). Factors Influencing Intention to Use e-Government Services among Citizens in Malaysia. International Journal of Information Management, Vol 29, issue 6, pp 458-475.

[115]. Osborne D., & Gaebler T. (1992). Reinventing Government: How the Enterprise Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. Boston, MA: Addison Wesley.

[116]. Paul Herbig, S. D. (1998). Culture and innovation, Cross Cultural Management. An International Journal, Vol 5, issue 4, pp.13-21.

[117]. Paul, P. (2001), "Mixed signals", American Demographics, Vol. 23, issue1, pp. 44-9.

[118]. Pavlou, P. (2003). Consumer acceptance of electronic commerce: integrating trust and risk with the

technology acceptance model. International Journal of Electric Commerce, Vol 7, issue 3, pp.101-134.

[119]. Pitt, L., & Kavan, B. (1995). Service quality: A measure of information systems effectiveness. MIS Quartely, Vol 19, issue 2, pp. 173-188.

[120]. Raman, K. S. (1992). The GDSS Research Project. In R. P. Bostrom, R. T. Watson & S. T. Kinney (Eds.), Computer Augmented Teamwork: A Guided Tour. NewYork, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

[121]. Reynolds, J. (2000). The Complete E-Commerce Book: Design, Build and Maintain a Successful Web-Based Business. 2nd ed. New York, NY: CMP Books.

[122]. Rust, R., & Kannan, P. (2002). E-Service: New Directions in Theory andPractice.

[123]. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

[124]. Safwan, A. (2010). Determinants of Consumer Retention in Telecommunication Industry: Case of Saudi Arabia,. International Journal of Business and Management, Vol 5, issue 5, pp.104-120.

[125]. Samovar, P. (1998). Communication between cultures. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.Santos, J. (2003). E-service quality. A model of Virtual Service Dimension, Managing Service Quality. An International Journal, Vol 13, issue 3, pp.121-131.

[126]. Sawang, S. (2014).It's not only what i think but what they think! The Modern Effect of Social Norms. Computers &Education, Vol 76, issue 1, pp.182-189.

[127]. Schein, E. (2010). Organizational Culture & Leadership. 4th Ed. Sanfransisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

[128]. Schwartz, S. (2006). A Theory Of Cultural Value Orientations: Explication and applications. Comparative Sociology, Vol 5, issue 3, pp.137-182.

[129]. Scupola, A., Henten, A., & Nicolajsen, H. (2009). E-citizen: Characteristics, Scope and Conceptual Strengths. International Journal of E-citizen and Mobile Applications, Vol 1, issue 3, pp.1–16.

[130]. Selamat, Z. J. (2009). Technology acceptance in Malaysian banking industry. European . Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, Vol1, issue17, pp.143-155.

[131]. Shahin, A. (2005). SERVQUAL and Model Ofservice Quailty Gaps: A Framework For Determining and Prioritizing Critical Factors in Delivering Quality Services.Isfahan, IR: Department of Management University of Isfahan.

[132]. Shahzad, F. (2012). Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Performance: An Overview Interdisciplinary. Journal of Contemporary Research Business, Vol 3, issue 9, pp.975-985.

[133]. Shankar, G. L. Urban, & F. Sultan (2002), "Online Trust: a Stakeholder Perspective, Concepts, Implications, and Future Directions" Journal of Strategic Information Systems, vol. 11. Issue pp.325-344

[134]. Shareef, M. (2009). Theory of Planned Behavior and Reasoned Action in Predicting Technology Adoption Behavior, Hershey, PA:IGI Global Publications.

[135]. Shareef, M. (2011). E-Government Adoption Model (GAM): Differing Service Maturity Levels, Government Information Quarterly, Vol 28, issue1, pp.17-35.

[136]. Sharma, S., & Gupta, J. (2003). Building Blocks Of An E-Government: A Framework,

[137]. Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations, Vol 1, issue 4, pp.34-48.

[138]. Smith, S. & Jamieson, R. (2006) Determining key factors in e-government information system security. Information Systems Management, Vol 23, issue 2, pp.23-32.

[139]. Sofiane, S. (2007). E-Inclusion As A Further Stage Of E-Government? Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, Vol 1, issue1, pp.44-58.

[140]. Soteriou, A. (1997). Efficiency, Profitability And Quality Of Banking Services.

[141]. International Journal of Bank Marketing, Vol 18, issue 5, pp.97-128.

[142]. Strader, T. (1997). Characteristics Of Electronic Markets.Decision Support systems, Vol 21, issue 3, pp.185-198..

[143]. Suh, B., & Han, I. (2003). The Impact of Customer Trust and Perception of Security Control on. International Journal of Electric Commerce, Vol 7, issue 3, pp.135- 161.

[144]. Sulaiman, A., Crowder, M., & Wills, B. (2013). An Exploratory study of proposed factors to Adopt e-government Services Saudi Arabia as a case study. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, Vol. 4, issue 11, pp.57 - 64

[145]. Sulaiman, A., Crowder, M, & Wills, B. (2013). Identified Factors Affecting the Citizen's Intention to Adopt E-government in Saudi Arabia. World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, Vol 80, issue 7, pp.904

[146]. Teo, T. (2001). Demographic and motivation variables associated with Internet usage activities. Internet Research, Vol 11, issue 2, pp.125-137.

[147]. Thompson, Bill. 2002. The problem with e-Government. BBC News, 7 June 2002

[148]. Tiwana, A., & Balasubramaniam, R. (2001). E-services, problems, opportunities, and digital Sites: A Critical Review of Extant Knowledge, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol 30, issue 4, pp. 362-375

[149]. Trompenaars, F. (1998). Riding The Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Global

Business. New York.NY: McGraw-Hill.

[150]. United Nations. (2008). Un-government survey 2008: From E-government to Connected Govenmamce. New York, NY: United Nations.

[151]. Vassilakis, C., Lepoura, G., & Georgiadis, P. (2005). Barriers To Electronic Service Development. E-service Journal, Vol 4, issue 1, pp.41-63.

[152]. Venkatesh, V. (2000).A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies. Management Science, Vol 46, issue 2, pp.186- 204.

[153]. Warkentin, M., Gefen, D., Pavlou, P.., Rose, G..: Encouraging Citizen Adoption of e- Government by Building Trust. Electronic Markets, Vol 12, issue 3, pp157–162

[154]. Welch, E. W. (2005). Linking Citizen Satisfaction with E-Government and Trust in Government. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Vol 15, issue 3,pp.371-391.

[155]. Welch, E., Wimmer, A., Scholl, H., Janssen, M., & Traunmüller, R. (2009). Electronic Government: 8th International Conference, E-gov. Proceedings. Berlin:Springer.

[156]. Wimmer, A., Scholl, H., Janssen, M., & Traunmüller, R. (Eds.). (2009). Electronic Government: 8th International Conference, E-gov. Proceedings. Berlin:Springer.

[157]. Wolfinbarger, M. (2003). ETAILQ: Dimensionalizing, Measuring, and Predicting.

[158]. Journal of retailing, Vol 79, issue 3, pp.183 - 198.

[159]. World Bank. (2004). A definition of e-government, Retrieved. June 2016. Retrieved from http:// www.WorldBank.org/publicsectore/egov/definition.htm

[160]. Yang, Z., & Jun, M. (2002) Consumer Perception of E-service Quality: From Internet Purchaser and Non-purchaser Perspectives. Journal of Business Strategies, Vol 19, issue 1, pp.19-41

[161]. Yang, Z. (2004). Online Service Quality Dimensions and Their Relationships With Satisfaction: A Content Analysis Of Customer Reviews of Securities Brokerage Services. International Journal of Service Industry Management, vol 15, issue 3, pp.3023-2617.

[162]. Yang, Z. (2005). Development and Validation of An Instrument To Measure User Perceived Service Quality of Information Presenting Web Portal, Information & Management, Vol 42, issue 1, pp.575‑89.

[163]. Yi, M. (2006). Understanding Information Technology Acceptance By Individual Professionals: Toward An Integrative View. Information Management, Vol 43, issue 3, pp.350-363.

[164]. Yoo, B., & Nareen, D. (2001). Developing a Scale to Measure the Percived Quality of Internet Shopping Site (SITEQUAL). Quarterly Journal of Electonic Commerce,Vol 2, issue 1, pp.31-47.

[165]. Yuslihasri, I. (2011). Factors That Influence Customers Buying Intention On Shopping Online.International Journal of Marketing Studies, Vol 3, issue1, pp.128-143.

[166]. Zeithaml, V. (1996). Customer expectations of services: Services Marketing. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

[167]. Zeithaml, V. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for understanding e‑service quality: implications for future research and managerial practice,Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.

[168]. Zeithaml, V. P. (2002). Service Quality Delivery Through Web Sites: A Critical Review of Extant Knowledge.Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol 30, issue 4, pp. 362‑75.

[169]. Zoo, B. (2001). Developing A Scale To Measure Perceived Quality Of An Internet Shopping Site (SITEQUAL), Quarterly Journal of Electronic Commerce, Vol 2, issue1, pp.31‑46.