Critique Paper: Why e-government projects fail? An analysis of the Healthcare.gov website Revisited

Nanang Husin

Fakultas Komputer Institut Bisnis Nusantara

Jl. D.I Mayjend Pandjaitan kav 24 by pass, Jaktim INDONESIA

Nanang.h@ibn.ac.id

Abstract—**e-government project failure has been widely discussed in the literature. Many analysis has been done that study the factor and reason, which cover cases in general or specific event. This paper is one of the literature that analysis e-government project failure too which studied on Healthcare.gov case. The paper studied on the cased based literature review analysis combined with data examination of media sources and social media. It has two research question that it try to solve with classification and metadata analysis. By using those combination data, the paper build the model and thus making analysis and conslusion. But the paper did not cleary explain how the model was built, so the result of first research question is questionable. And also the paper did not give strong foundation about the conclusion of the second research question, hence the outcome of the second research question is not clear. Should this paper adhere to this problem, this paper will give a a clear and better result.**

Keywords: A Critique Paper: Why e-government

projects fail? An analysis of the Healthcare.gov

website Revisited

I. INTRODUCTION

NOWADAYS, the use of e-governance is start to bloom. The technology itself was initially discussed during the decade of 1960s, while Internet-enabled egovernment was introduced in the early 1990s (Andersen and Henriksen, 2006; Anthopoulos & Fitsilis, 2014; Garson, 2004; Layne &Lee, 2001; Scholl, 2003) both as a means for governments to utilize information and Communications Technologies (ICT) in order to become more effective and efficient in delivering information and services to the public; more accountable and transparent regarding their internal processes, procurement and auctioning; more open with regard to citizen engagement in decision and policy making, and even more friendly and able to deliver customized and modern public services. Although a lot of it potential, e-governtment project is bound to fail a lot. For instance, Heeks (2001) showed in his study that 35% of public sector ICT projects from around the world can be categorized as failures, 50% as partial failures, and only 15% as successful. World Bank study showed that the majority of public sector ICT applications in least developing countries were either partial or total failures (Neto, Kenny, Janakiram, & Watt, 2005). Hidding and Nicholas (2009) noted that 19% of ICT projects were abandoned without completion and 46% were completed and operational, butwere over budget, late, and/orwithoutmeeting initially

grounded standards. This paper examines the problem of e-government project failures through examining project management failure literature and applies the concepts learned to a case study. In order to accomplish this, the authors aim to answer the following two research questions:

- RQ1:What are the main reasons for egovernment project failures?

In this paper (Leonidas Anthopoulos, Christopher G. Reddick, Irene Giannakidou, & Nikolaos Mavridis, 2015), both a literature review and a representative large-scale public project failure are examined through the launch of the Healthcare.gov website by the federal government in the U.S. In order to analyze this failure, authors used evidence from official sources, mass media accounts, and government document analysis. This research method generated the second research question that this paper aims to answer:

- RQ2: Can social media data analysis, such as Twitter, be used to determine the impact of e-government project failures on public opinion?

The second research method (RQ2) that this paper uses is the analysis of a representative case study (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). The analysis on this paper is to answer the two research questions above

II. CRITIQUE

There are several points in this paper that need to be addressed. The paper's methodology is to conduct several analysis using literatur review and data from social media platforms. The paper first try to build the model of analysis for RQ1 using combination from Ojiako, Guha, and Pinto model (Ojiako, Johansen, & Greenwood, 2008; Guha & Chakrabarti, 2014; Pinto & Mantel, 1990). But the paper doesn't explain how the model was formed. The paper which he cite, does not explain about those timeline separation in his model at all. This is important because this models is the base for the taxonomy tools that he is created on tables 1 and 2 which answer the RQ1 on this paper.

The second is about the Top-failure reasons and factors in e-government project failures which presented on Tables 1 and 2. This paper doesn't give reason why those reasons and factor is the one that the paper choose instead of other reasons and factor. This reasons and factor is the base of taxonomy tools that will answer the RQ1, so unless the paper states why those specific reasons and factor was choosen, the validity for outcome for RQ1 answer is questionable. The same happen on data on tables 4 and 5. This paper doesn't cleary explain why it chooses those selected event out of others that represent the Healthcare.gov case. And even so, there are no links of reputable new of this event. Furthermore, this event underlying the outcome of factor and reasons that answer RQ1, which makes RQ1 conclusion is more unclear and questionable.

The third point is about the result of RQ1. According to GAO reports in 2014 (this paper also cites GAO reports for Healthcare.hov, but the older one, in 2013) , one of the failure reason is regulatory issues that this paper conclude is not, and also finance and operational cost is also one of the failure factor that GAO mention, but this paper is not. Perhaps the difference is caused of unclear method pointed above.

The last point I'd like this paper to address is the selection of twitter as the base to answer RQ2. On this specific case of healthcare.gov failure, the analysis is not sufficient because twitter users of internet users in america at that time (2002) is at 15% (www.poynter.org) which hardly representative of all healthcare.gov user. Analysis for this RQ should be done with other media too.

III. CONCLUSION

Whilst the paper failed to give clear explanation about the model, criteria several critical point that they used on their anaylsis, , they manage to make a quite contribution to try to clear out the cause of egov implementation in case study Healthcare.gov. Even so this paper also introduced how to correlate the impact of of e-gov implementation by using data gathered from social media. Unfortunately, the unclear model construction, no explanation of the choosen criteria, and several other point has made the result of this research unclear and questionable. If the writers could address all the critique point stated before, this paper will be more valid and could be a base for future research, especially for those who try to measure impact of e-gov implementation via social media data.

IV. REFERENCES

[1] TTI Andersen, K. V., & Henriksen, H. Z. (2006). E-government maturity models: Extension of the Layne and Lee model. Government Information Quarterly, 23(2), 236248.

[2] Anthopoulos, L., & Fitsilis, P. (2014). Trends in e-strategic management: How do governments transform their policies? International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age, 1(1), 15-38.

[3] Garson, G. D. (2004). The promise of digital government. In A. Pavlichev, & G. D. Garson (Eds.), Digital government: Principles and best practices. Hershey, USA: IDEA Group Publishing.

[4] Layne, K., & Lee, J. (2001). Developing fully functional e-government: A four stage model. Government Information Quarterly, 18(2), 122-136.

[5] Heeks, R. (2001). Building e-governance for development: A framework for national and donor action. iGovernment Working Paper Series, Paper no. 12

[6] Neto, I., Kenny, C., Janakiram, S., &Watt, C. (2005). Look before you leap: The bumpy road to e-development. In Robert Shware (Ed.), E-Development: From Excitement to Effectiveness. Washington, DC: World Bank.

[7] Hidding, G. J., & Nicholas, J. (2009). Reducing I.T. project management failures: A research proposal. Proceedings of the IEEE 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS 42).

[8] Leonidas Anthopoulos, Christopher G. Reddick, Irene Giannakidou, & Nikolaos Mavridis (2015). Why egoverment projects fail? An analysis of the Healthcare.gov website. Government Information Quarterly. ScienceDirect

[9] Ojiako, U., Johansen, E., & Greenwood, D. (2008). A qualitative re-construction of project measurement criteria. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 108 (3), 405-417.

[10] Guha, J., & Chakrabarti, B. (2014). Making egovernment work: Adopting the network approach. Government Information Quarterly, 31, 327-336

[11] Pinto, J. K., & Mantel, S. J. (1990). The causes of project failure. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 37(4), 269-276.

[12] United States GAO Report to Congressional Requesters. July 2014, http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/665179.pdf

[13] www.poynter.org, http://www.poynter.org/news/mediawire/175757/15- of-americans-now-use-twitter-8-use-it-daily/