RANKING FOR TECHNOLOGY INFLUENCING FACTORS TOWARDS LOCATION BASED SERVICES ADOPTION IN E-GOVERNMENT

*Adi Azlan, Noor Azurati Ahmad, Shamsul Sahibuddin,

Razak Faculty of Technology and Informatics Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Jalan Semarak, 54100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

**Azlena Haron

Institut Tadbiran Awam Negara (INTAN) Jabatan Perkhidmatan Awam Malaysia, Jalan Bukit Kiara. 50480 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

azlan.adi@gmail.com, azurati@utm.my, shamsul@utm.my and azlena.haron@intanbk.intan.my

Article history

Received: 20 Nov 2021

Received in revised form: 30 Nov 2021

Accepted: 11 Dec 2021

Published online: 21 Dec 2021

*Corresponding author azlan.adi@gmail.com

Abstract

E-government is known to have adopted the use of location-based applications. This study identifies the technological factors that influence the adoption of location-based services (LBS) in e-government application from the perspective of public sector in Malaysia. The technological factors were identified through previous work and expert studies to determine important elements for the adoption of LBS in e-government applications. In this research, the fuzzy Delphi method was used to obtain the result. Therefore, 12 experts from e-government and LBS participated in the process. The result of this study was a consensus on 10 important elements of the technological influencing factors of e-government: integrated services; near real-time information; emergency alert; sustainability; compatibility; rapid provision of information; provision of useful information; reliability; ease of use (usability); and privacy. These factors were then ranked using the fuzzy Delphi method as the consensus of the expert study.

Keywords: Location based services, e-government, technological influence, technology adoption, Fuzzy Delphi Method

1. Introduction

LBS can be recognized by the technology that provides mobile users with real-time location information, which is essential for many e-government services. Because it is a critical function for e-government applications, the strategy for implementing LBS includes four elements: People, Processes, Technology, and Data, which are not interdependent (Obi & Iwasaki, 2015). In this study, ten technological influencing factors were identified and ranked using the fuzzy Delphi method (FDM). The result will help the government to improve, innovate and achieve its

strategic goals. Knowing how useful each influencing factor is could help in decision making for e-government.

2. Overview

2.1 E-Government and Location Based Services

E-government is known for using location-based services for almost all of its applications. During the Covid 19 pandemic, the public sector in Malaysia relied on LBS technology accessible through mobile phones and the capabilities of GPS and the Internet to locate critical infected areas and warn people to quarantine them to control the spread of infection.

2.2 Ranking the consensus using FDM

FDM is widely used in many fields such as management, healthcare, physical science and engineering including information systems (Saffie, Shukor, et al., 2016). FDM and the Delphi method (DM) differ by using probability theory instead of mathematical concepts to account for the fuzziness of natural language in decision making (Saffie, Shukor, et al., 2016). DM uses absolute numbers to account for expert judgment. FDM was initiated by Murray et al. to resolve ambiguity in DM (Murray, Pipino, & Gigch, 1985). Ishikawa et al. developed the FDM algorithm using the Max-Min fuzzy Delphi method and improved the new DM by fuzzy integration (Ishikawa et al., 1993). In the improved version, the weighted intuitionistic FDM is proposed to achieve better conclusions (Garai et al., 2013).

2.3 Study Setup

Data collection involved experts study setup by 12 experts (Jones and Twiss, 1978) in e-government and LBS domain were participated in the process. Three category of experts; public sectors developer; vendors; and project management teams were provide in the study protocol. Furthermore, they had at least 10 years of experience related to development in LBS, e-government and competent.

Experts then determine the importance weight of technology influencing factors of 7 variables importance weightage range from "Strongly Least Important", "Highly Least Important", "Least Important", "Fairly Important", "Important", "Highly Important" and "Strongly Important". Scale of fuzzy were determine as Table 1.

| Table 1: Variable and importance weight of criteria | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|
| Variable | Scale Fuzzy | | |
| Strongly Least Important | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Highly Least Important | 0 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Least Important | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Fairly Important | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Important | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| Highly Important | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1 |
| Strongly Important | 0.9 | 1 | 1 |

Average rating with value determined according to formula specified:

= SQRT [1/3*((m1^2)+(m2^2)+(m3^2))

3. Findings

Findings of ten technology influencing factors towards LBS in e-government during experts study were listed in Table 2. 12 Experts had evaluate and weighted the factors.

| Item / Element | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Integrated services | |
| Information almost Real-time | |
| Emergency alert | |
| Sustainability | |
| Compatibility | |
| Provide fast information | |
| Provide useful information | |
| Reliability | |
| Simple to use (ease of use) | |
| Information privacy | |
| internation privacy | |

Table 2: Features Description of Technological Factors

Triangular Fuzzy Number Rules were used to gain the Threshold and Expert group agreement. The Average rating of the items were specified using the Threshold value, d. Value d that <0.2 shown that all experts have reached a consensus agreement and shown that Expert Group agreement percentage as in Table 3. All 10 items received more than 75% consensus agreement. Agreement percentage is reached by counting the percentage of experts reaching the threshold value in the consensus agreement process.

| Table 3: Features Description and Threshold Value, d and Agreement |
|--|
| Percentage. |

| Item / Element | 0 | Triangular Fuzzy Numbers RULES | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | <i>Threshold</i> <i>Value</i> , d | Expert Group Agreement Percentage, % | |
| Integrated services | 0.068 | 100.00% | |
| Information almost Real-time | 0.126 | 91.67% | |
| Emergency alert | 0.119 | 91.67% | |

| Sustainability | 0.119 | 91.67% |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------|
| Compatibility | 0.119 | 91.67% |
| Provide fast information | 0.111 | 91.67% |
| Provide useful information | 0.111 | 91.67% |
| Reliability | 0.111 | 91.67% |
| Simple to use (ease of use) | 0.094 | 91.67% |
| Information privacy | 0.180 | 83.33% |
| | | |

Defuzzification process and evaluation are used to provide the most reliable methods of ranking for this implementation. This process involves complex numbering and alternative method by using mathematical formulas to rank. Fuzzy Score (A) formula is Amax = 1/3* (m1+m2+m3). Table 4 shown the findings of the Fuzzy Score (A).

Table 4: Defuzzification Process Rules

| Dej | Defuzzification Process RULES | | |
|-------|--|---|--|
| m1 | m2 | m3 | Fuzzy Score (A) |
| 0.767 | 0.933 | 1.000 | 0.900 |
| 0.767 | 0.917 | 0.975 | 0.886 |
| 0.750 | 0.908 | 0.975 | 0.878 |
| 0.750 | 0.908 | 0.975 | 0.878 |
| 0.750 | 0.908 | 0.975 | 0.878 |
| 0.733 | 0.900 | 0.975 | 0.869 |
| 0.733 | 0.900 | 0.975 | 0.869 |
| 0.733 | 0.900 | 0.975 | 0.869 |
| 0.700 | 0.883 | 0.975 | 0.853 |
| 0.717 | 0.875 | 0.950 | 0.847 |
| | m1 0.767 0.767 0.750 0.750 0.750 0.750 0.733 0.733 0.733 0.700 | RU. m1 m2 0.767 0.933 0.767 0.917 0.750 0.908 0.750 0.908 0.750 0.908 0.733 0.900 0.733 0.900 0.733 0.900 0.700 0.883 | RULES m1 m2 m3 0.767 0.933 1.000 0.767 0.917 0.975 0.750 0.908 0.975 0.750 0.908 0.975 0.750 0.908 0.975 0.750 0.908 0.975 0.733 0.900 0.975 0.733 0.900 0.975 0.733 0.900 0.975 0.733 0.900 0.975 0.733 0.900 0.975 0.700 0.883 0.975 |

4. Results

The technology influencing factors were accepted by all experts and the weightage were listed according to ranking in Table 5. The three top ranking of most influence items were integrated services, information that almost real-time and emergency alert. These were followed by sustainability; compatibility; fast information; useful information; reliability; simple to use; and information privacy.

| Item / Element | Expert Consensus | Element ACCEPTED | Ranking |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Integrated services | Accepted | 0.900 | 1 |
| Information almost Real-time | Accepted | 0.886 | 2 |
| Emergency alert | Accepted | 0.878 | 3 |
| Sustainability | Accepted | 0.878 | 4 |
| Compatibility | Accepted | 0.878 | 4 |
| Provide fast information | Accepted | 0.869 | 6 |
| Provide useful information | Accepted | 0.869 | 7 |
| Reliability | Accepted | 0.869 | 7 |
| Simple to use (ease of use) | Accepted | 0.853 | 9 |
| Information privacy | Accepted | 0.847 | 10 |

Table 5: Expert Consensus, weight accepted and ranking

5. Conclusion

The findings and results show that the expert study proved that integrated services, near real time information, emergency alert, sustainability, compatibility, fast information, useful information, reliability, ease of use and privacy are the most important technological influencing factors in LBS. This study aims to prove that the fuzzy Delphi method is useful and reliable in reaching a consensus on weighting and ranking the most important items in the study other than just these items in this study only.

6. Acknowledgement

This work has been supported by the grant from UTM and Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) with the project number Q.K130000.3501.05G63.

References

- [1] Obi, T. & Iwasaki, N. 2015. A Decade of World E-Government Rankings. 7th edition. Amsterdam: IOS Press
- [2] Othman, M. H., & Razali, R. (2018). Whole of government critical success factors towards integrated e-government services: A preliminary review. Jurnal Pengurusan (UKM Journal of Management), 53.

- [3] Sensuse, D. I., Purwandari, B., & Rahayu, P. (2018). Defining e-Portofolio Factor for Competency Certification Using Fuzzy Delphi Method. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET, 17(2), 25-33
- [4] Saffie, N. A. M., & Rasmani, K. A. (2016, July). Fuzzy delphi method: Issues and challenges. In 2016 International Conference on Logistics, Informatics and Service Sciences (LISS) (pp. 1-7). IEEE
- [5] Murray, T. J., Pipino, L. L., & Van Gigch, J. P. (1985). A pilot study of fuzzy set modification of Delphi. Human Systems Management, 5(1), 76-80.
- [6] Garai, A. (2013). Weighted intuitionistic fuzzy Delphi method. Journal of Global Research in Computer Science, 4(7), 38-42.
- [7] Mohd Ridhuan, M. J., Saedah, S., Zaharah, H., Nurulrabihah, M. N., & Ahmad, A. S. (2017). Pengenalan asas kaedah fuzzy delphi dalam penyelidikan reka bentuk dan pembangunan.