

IMPORTANCE OF ERP SELECTION CRITERIA IN SLOVAK COMPANIES

František SUDZINA

ABSTRACT

The questionnaire research focused on selected criteria, which influence the enterprise resource planning (ERP) system selection process in Slovak companies. Examined are criteria, which are both ERP system (reduced cycle times, enhanced decision making, improved service levels/quality, incorporation of business best practices, business process improvement, integrated and better quality of information, e-business enablement, increased organizational flexibility, increased customer satisfaction, improved innovation capabilities, enabler for desired business processes) and ERP vendor-specific (organizational fit of system, software costs, functionality of the system, system flexibility, systems reliability, advanced technology, operating system independency, system interoperability, internationality of software, system usability, vendor reputation, vendor support, market position of vendor, availability of an industry focused solution, short implementation time, enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc., connectivity). The article estimates importance and differences of factors in relation to company size, information strategy, and representation of IT department on the board level.

KEYWORDS: ERP systems, selection process, empirical research

JEL classification: D81, L15

INTRODUCTION

The enterprise resource planning (ERP) system is an integrated set of programs that provides support for core business processes, such as production, input and output logistics, finance and accounting, sales and marketing, and human resources. An ERP system helps different parts of an organization to share data, information and, hopefully, also knowledge, to reduce costs, and to improve management of business processes (Aladwani, 2001). Wier et al. (2007) argue that ERP systems aim to integrate business processes and ICT into a synchronized suite of procedures, applications and metrics which goes over firms' boundaries.

ERP systems per se received a lot of attention in the last years; there are many ERP systems research instances and quite a lot of reviews, e.g. Esteves and Pastor (2001), Shehab, Sharp, Supramaniam, and Spedding (2004) and Botta-Genoulaz, Millet and Grabot (2005). Regarding the latter, it does not mention ERP selection issue at all. But although evaluation of information systems investments as such is rather old; researchers, such as Frielink (1961) and Joslin (1968), began working on evaluation of information systems already in 1960s, according to Keil, Tiwana (2006), very little had been written about packaged software selection criteria in academic journals. They conducted a literature search of both academic papers and practitioner articles. They looked into leading information systems and computer science journals that had specifically studied the criteria that managers use in evaluating packaged enterprise software systems. They used the ABI-

INFORM database and searched for strings "enterprise systems" or "ERP systems"; and "selection criteria". In our opinion, "systems" in "ERP systems" and "criteria" in "selection criteria" might be too restrictive. As for the latter, criteria might be described e.g. as attributes, factors, and (independent) variables.

They focused their preliminary search on peer-reviewed academic articles in information systems, such as Information Systems Journal, MIS Quarterly, Journal of Management Information Systems, Information Systems Research, European Journal of Information Systems, Management Science, Decision Sciences, Communications of ACM, and Decision Support Systems, and in computer science, such as IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, IEEE Software, IEEE Computer, ACM Transactions on Information Systems. They claim that they found only three scholarly publications on the subject (Chau, 1995; Montazemi, Cameron, Gupta, 1996; Bernroider, Koch, 2001). There were more practitioner oriented articles on the subject. Keil, Tiwana (2006) synthesized criteria found in these articles into seven: (1) cost, (2) reliability, (3) functionality, (4) ease of use, (5) ease of customization, (6) ease of implementation and (7) vendor reputation.

The next section describes data and methodology. Results of a questionnaire survey conducted in Slovak companies are presented in the second section. Conclusions are offered in the last section.

1. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire survey is based on criteria identified by Bernroider, Koch (2001). Y2K readiness and EURO currency conversion were left out because they were not relevant anymore. Criteria used in the research are reduced cycle times, enhanced decision making, improved service levels/quality, incorporation of business best practices, business process improvement, integrated and better quality of information, e-business enablement, increased organizational flexibility, increased customer satisfaction, improved innovation capabilities, enabler for desired business processes, organizational fit of system, software costs (licenses, maintenance, etc.), functionality of the system, system flexibility, systems reliability, advanced technology, operating system independency, system interoperability, internationality of software, system usability, vendor reputation, vendor support, market position of vendor, availability of an industry focused solution, short implementation time, enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc., connectivity (intra/extranet, mobile comp., ...). These dependent variables are measured on Likert scale 1-5, where 1 is of very little importance and 5 is of very high importance.

Independent variables are company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy. The questionnaire research was conducted in Slovakia and Slovenia. Analyzed are small and mid-sized enterprises, where companies from 10 to 49 employees are considered to be small enterprises and companies from 50 to 249 employees are considered to be mid-sized enterprises. Information strategy stands for formal information strategy and representation of the IT department on the board level means that there is a CIO or alike director for IT.

All analyses (tables 1-29) are ANOVAs, a multivariate approach is used and results are commented on confidence level $\alpha = 0,05$. In order to figure out, between what instances of an independent variable there are significant differences, Tukey-Kramer multiple-comparison test is used. Tables 30 is based on Tukey-Kramer multiple-comparison test as well.

2. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

This section offers statistical tests of relationships between ERP selection criteria and independent variables. The first 28 subsections analyze individual criteria and the last subsection analyzes relationship between all the criteria.

Reduced cycle times

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of reduced cycle times is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Reduced cycle times

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	1,048077	0,5240385	0,44	0,647645
Information strategy	1	0,1218752	0,1218752	0,10	0,750743
CIO	1	0,1717485	0,1717485	0,14	0,706133
S	95	114,0768	1,200808		
Total (Adjusted)	99	115,31			
Total	100				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of reduced cycle times.

Enhanced decision making

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of enhanced decision making is presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Enhanced decision making

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,3131827	0,1565913	0,19	0,831069
Information strategy	1	0,006019101	0,006019101	0,01	0,932900
CIO	1	3,441483	3,441483	4,07	0,046321*
S	96	81,08288	0,8446134		
Total (Adjusted)	100	85,32674			
Total	101				

* Term significant at alpha = 0,05

Importance of enhanced decision making depends on representation of the IT department on the board level (it is 3,90 on average in companies with CIOs and 4,30 in companies without CIOs).

Improved service levels/quality

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of improved service levels/quality is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Improved service levels/quality

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	5,226357	2,613179	3,14	0,047881*
Information strategy	1	2,680794	2,680794	3,22	0,075975
CIO	1	0,2722282	0,2722282	0,33	0,568919
S	97	80,82175	0,8332139		
Total (Adjusted)	101	87,37255			
Total	102				

* Term significant at alpha = 0,05

Importance of improved service levels/quality depends on company size (it is 4,22 on average in small, 4,28 in mid-sized, and 3,78 in large companies; Tukey-Kramer multiple-comparison test could not identify between what groups there is a significant difference because the groups' dispersion is significantly different).

Incorporation of business best practices

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of incorporation of business best practices is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Incorporation of business best practices

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,5092367	0,2546183	0,33	0,718125
Information strategy	1	1,38432	1,38432	1,81	0,182157
CIO	1	0,2825135	0,2825135	0,37	0,545186
S	94	72,02975	0,766274		
Total (Adjusted)	98	74,68687			
Total	99				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of incorporation of business best practices.

Business process improvement

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of business process improvement is presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Business process improvement

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,4886514	0,2443257	0,36	0,695455
Information strategy	1	0,972464	0,972464	1,45	0,231322
CIO	1	0,004238837	0,004238837	0,01	0,936777
S	96	64,3374	0,6701813		
Total (Adjusted)	100	66,23763			
Total	101				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of business process improvement.

Integrated and better quality of information

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of integrated and better quality of information is presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Integrated and better quality of information

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	1,540509	0,7702544	0,97	0,380982
Information strategy	1	0,9129096	0,9129096	1,15	0,285128
CIO	1	0,01430206	0,01430206	0,02	0,893269
S	99	78,25295	0,7904339		
Total (Adjusted)	103	80,61539			
Total	104				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of integrated and better quality of information.

E-business enablement

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of e-business enablement is presented in Table 7.

Table 7 E-business enablement

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	2,915619	1,457809	0,96	0,387540
Information strategy	1	1,275553	1,275553	0,84	0,362358
CIO	1	0,7026677	0,7026677	0,46	0,498582
S	96	146,1833	1,522743		
Total (Adjusted)	100	150,7525			
Total	101				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of e-business enablement.

Increased organizational flexibility

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of increased organizational flexibility is presented in Table 8.

Table 8 Increased organizational flexibility

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	2,449571	1,224786	1,05	0,352878
Information strategy	1	1,846603	1,846603	1,59	0,210702
CIO	1	0,7114817	0,7114817	0,61	0,436090
S	99	115,187	1,163505		
Total (Adjusted)	103	118,9135			
Total	104				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of increased organizational flexibility.

Increased customer satisfaction

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of increased customer satisfaction is presented in Table 9.

Table 9 Increased customer satisfaction

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	4,832196	2,416098	1,99	0,142409
Information strategy	1	1,708072	1,708072	1,41	0,238644
CIO	1	0,4207793	0,4207793	0,35	0,557579
S	98	119,0832	1,215135		
Total (Adjusted)	102	124,7573			
Total	103				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of increased customer satisfaction.

Improved innovation capabilities

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of improved innovation capabilities is presented in Table 10.

Table 10 Improved innovation capabilities

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	2,844743	1,422371	1,32	0,272970
Information strategy	1	1,24475	1,24475	1,15	0,285883
CIO	1	0,4,287378	0,04,287378	0,04	0,842560
S	98	105,9415	1,081035		
Total (Adjusted)	102	109,5534			
Total	103				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of improved innovation capabilities.

Enabler for desired business processes

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of enabler for desired business processes is presented in Table 11.

Table 11 Enabler for desired business processes

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,3250352	0,1625176	0,20	0,822077
Information strategy	1	2,465506	2,465506	2,98	0,087544
CIO	1	0,01404031	0,01404031	0,02	0,896651
S	98	81,1292	0,827849		
Total (Adjusted)	102	84,38835			
Total	103				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of enabler for desired business processes.

Organizational fit of system

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of organizational fit of system is presented in Table 12.

Table 12 Organizational fit of system

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,5341807	0,2670904	0,41	0,667753
Information strategy	1	0,4855552	0,4855552	0,74	0,392671
CIO	1	0,198948	0,198948	0,30	0,583856
S	97	63,8874	0,658633		
Total (Adjusted)	101	65,14706			
Total	102				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of organizational fit of system.

Software costs

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of software costs (licenses, maintenance, etc.) is presented in Table 13.

Table 13 Software costs

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,3777477	0,1888738	0,25	0,776138
Information strategy	1	1,133527	1,133527	1,52	0,219861
CIO	1	0,6067672	0,6067672	0,82	0,368511
S	97	72,1039	0,7433392		
Total (Adjusted)	101	73,81373			
Total	102				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of software costs.

Functionality of the system

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of functionality of the system is presented in Table 14.

Table 14 Functionality of the system

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	1,17058	0,5852901	1,06	0,349802
Information strategy	1	1,813628	1,813628	3,29	0,072781
CIO	1	0,2430879	0,2430879	0,44	0,508208
S	97	53,46647	0,5512007		
Total (Adjusted)	101	57,5			
Total	102				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of functionality of the system.

System flexibility

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of system flexibility is presented in Table 15.

Table 15 System flexibility

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	2,438301	1,21915	2,05	0,134091
Information strategy	1	1,757794	1,757794	2,96	0,088653
CIO	1	0,1989246	0,1989246	0,33	0,564230
S	97	57,64614	0,5942901		
Total (Adjusted)	101	61,81372			
Total	102				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of system flexibility.

Systems reliability

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of systems reliability is presented in Table 16.

Table 16 Systems reliability

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	0,3134132	0,1567066	0,28	0,758215
Information strategy	1	1,310346	1,310346	2,32	0,130887
CIO	1	0,656505	0,656505	1,16	0,283542
S	97	54,76105	0,5645469		
Total (Adjusted)	101	56,66667			
Total	102				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of systems reliability.

Advanced technology

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of advanced technology is presented in Table 17.

Table 17 Advanced technology

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	1,469648	0,7348241	1,19	0,308375
Information strategy	1	0,4964358	0,4964358	0,80	0,371965
CIO	1	0,001144133	0,001144133	0,00	0,965741
S	96	59,23146	0,6169943		
Total (Adjusted)	100	60,9901			
Total	101				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of advanced technology.

Operating system independency

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of operating system independency is presented in Table 18.

Table 18 Operating system independency

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	9,323317	4,661658	5,32	0,006440*
Information strategy	1	0,6121021	0,6121021	0,70	0,405350
CIO	1	1,12149	1,12149	1,28	0,260743
S	96	84,1207	0,8762573		
Total (Adjusted)	100	94,63367			
Total	101				

* Term significant at alpha = 0,05

Importance of operating system independency depends on company size (there is significant difference between small (3,59) and large (2,87) companies).

System interoperability

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of system interoperability is presented in Table 19.

Table 19 System interoperability

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	0,002451053	0,001225527	0,00	0,998111
Information strategy	1	1,278987	1,278987	1,97	0,163510
CIO	1	0,3397143	0,3397143	0,52	0,470930
S	90	58,32464	0,6480516		
Total (Adjusted)	94	60,88421			
Total	95				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of system interoperability.

Internationality of software

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of internationality of software is presented in Table 20.

Table 20 Internationality of software

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-level
Company size	2	4,500337	2,250168	1,46	0,236883
Information strategy	1	0,5696	0,5696	0,37	0,544358
CIO	1	1,222529	1,222529	0,79	0,374996
S	94	144,6279	1,538594		
Total (Adjusted)	98	152,0808			
Total	99				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of internationality of software.

System usability

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of system usability is presented in Table 21.

Table 21 System usability

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,01395102	0,006,975512	0,01	0,989257
Information strategy	1	0,9909164	0,9909164	1,53	0,218493
CIO	1	0,04411555	0,04411555	0,07	0,794372
S	95	61,34784	0,6457667		
Total (Adjusted)	99	62,75			
Total	100				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of system usability.

Vendor reputation

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of vendor reputation is presented in Table 22.

Table 22 Vendor reputation

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	2,574452	1,287226	1,80	0,171681
Information strategy	1	4,102216	4,102216	5,72	0,018731*
CIO	1	0,9257779	0,9257779	1,29	0,258700
S	95	68,11819	0,7170337		
Total (Adjusted)	99	81,04			
Total	100				

* Term significant at alpha = 0,05

Importance of vendor reputation depends on information strategy (it is 3,78 on average in companies with information strategy and 3,33 in companies without information strategy).

Vendor support

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of vendor support is presented in Table 23.

Table 23 Vendor support

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,2409089	0,1204544	0,18	0,837301
Information strategy	1	2,616829	2,616829	3,86	0,052254
CIO	1	0,004413047	0,004413047	0,01	0,935825
S	94	63,64384	0,6770622		
Total (Adjusted)	98	67,63636			
Total	99				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of vendor support.

Market position of vendor

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of market position of vendor is presented in Table 24.

Table 24 Market position of vendor

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,6818987	0,3409494	0,28	0,755006
Information strategy	1	3,212849	3,212849	2,66	0,106528
CIO	1	0,5645148	0,5645148	0,47	0,496201
S	93	112,4885	1,209553		
Total (Adjusted)	97	118,7041			
Total	98				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of market position of vendor.

Availability of an industry focused solution

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of availability of an industry focused solution is presented in Table 25.

Table 25 Availability of an industry focused solution

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	1,295305	0,6476526	0,78	0,462985
Information strategy	1	0,7676474	0,7676474	0,92	0,339865
CIO	1	0,6446531	0,6446531	0,77	0,381589
S	95	79,25307	0,8342429		
Total (Adjusted)	99	81,31			
Total	100				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of availability of an industry focused solution.

Short implementation time

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of short implementation time is presented in Table 26.

Table 26 Short implementation time

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	0,981087	0,4905435	0,61	0,543167
Information strategy	1	1,514814	1,514814	1,90	0,171662
CIO	1	0,291695	0,291695	0,37	0,547034
S	95	75,86432	0,7985718		
Total (Adjusted)	99	78,75			
Total	100				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of short implementation time.

Enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc.

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc. is presented in Table 27.

Table 27 Enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc.

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	4,595718	2,297859	2,13	0,124899
Information strategy	1	5,914393	5,914393	5,48	0,021445*
CIO	1	0,0693885	0,0693885	0,06	0,800415
S	90	97,13468	1,079274		
Total (Adjusted)	94	105,6211			
Total	95				

* Term significant at alpha = 0,05

Importance of enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc. depends on information strategy (it is 3,33 on average in companies with information strategy and 2,75 in companies without information strategy).

Connectivity

The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO) and information strategy on importance of connectivity (intra/extranet, mobile comp., ...) is presented in Table 28.

Table 28 Connectivity

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	4,28867	2,144335	1,64	0,199641
Information strategy	1	0,3499818	0,3499818	0,27	0,606186
CIO	1	0,07938886	0,07938886	0,06	0,805940
S	93	121,6385	1,307941		
Total (Adjusted)	97	126			
Total	98				

There is no significant relationship between the independent variables and importance of connectivity.

Intercriteria comparison

Although there is a high correlation between selection criteria (standardized Cronbachs alpha = 0,915 981), there are significant differences between the selection criteria. The analysis of the impact of company size, representation of the IT department on the board level (CIO), information strategy and criterion on criteria evaluation is presented in Table 29.

Table 29 Intercriteria comparison

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P-value
Company size	2	8,576741	4,288371	4,85	0,007903*
Information strategy	1	34,8454	34,8454	39,40	0,000000*
CIO	1	0,002840976	0,002840976	0,00	0,954806
D: criterion	27	628,6926	23,28491	26,33	0,000000*
S	2785	2463,055	0,8844003		
Total (Adjusted)	2816	3132,211			
Total	2817				

* Term significant at alpha = 0,05

Importance of selection criteria depends on company size (there is a significant difference between small (3,89 on average) and large (3,75 on average) companies), information strategy (it is 3,94 on average in companies with information strategy and 3,69 in companies without information strategy) and criterion, which is presented in Table 30 in detail.

Table 30: Comparison of selection criteria

		2.93	3.05	3.14	3.16	3.19	3.31	3.35	3.52	3.56	3.63	3.70	3.71	3.73	3.74	3.86	3.98	4.03	4.06	4.09	4.11	4.21	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.43	4.48	4.65
E-business enablement	2,93																												
Enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc.	3,05																												
Market position of vendor	3,14																												
Internationality of software	3,16																												
Operating system independency	3,19																												
System interoperability	3,31																												
Reduced cycle times	3,35																												
Improved innovation capabilities	3,52	>																											
Connectivity (intra/extranet, mobile comp., ...)	3,56	>	>																										
Vendor reputation	3,63	>	>																										
Increased organizational flexibility	3,70	>	>	>	>	>																							
Enabler for desired business processes	3,71	>	>	>	>	>																							
Incorporation of business best practices	3,73	>	>	>	>	>																							
Short implementation time	3,74	>	>	>	>	>																							
Availability of industry focused solution	3,86	>	>	>	>	>	>																						
Advanced technology	3,98	>	>	>	>	>	>																						
Increased customer satisfaction	4,03	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																					
Improved service levels/quality	4,06	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																				
Software costs (licenses, maintenance, etc.)	4,09	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																				
Enhanced decision making	4,11	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																				
System flexibility	4,21	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																			
Vendor support	4,26	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																		
Business process improvement	4,26	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																	
System usability	4,34	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																	
Integrated and better quality of information	4,37	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>																
Organizational fit of system	4,43	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>															
Functionality of the system	4,48	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>														
Systems reliability	4,65	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>													

CONCLUSION

Top eight ERP selections criteria for Slovak companies are systems reliability, functionality of the system, organizational fit of system, integrated and better quality of information, system usability, business process improvement, vendor support, system flexibility. There is no significant difference between systems reliability and the remaining seven criteria. The price (software costs), which might be intuitively expected to rank high because of economic reasons, is the 10th most important. So, there is a significant difference between system reliability and price. But all the other criteria, which are significantly different from price, are of lower importance.

To sum up, there is a significant relationship between company size and importance of operating system independency depends on company size and of improved service levels/quality; between information strategy and importance of vendor reputation and of enabling technology for CRM, SCM, etc.; and between representation of the IT department on the board level and importance of enhanced decision making.

There is a certain percentage of companies, which justify their information system expenditures on the basis of what could called "acts of faith" (Andresen, 2001). So, it is possible that even ERP systems not performing well in these criteria may stay on the market.

REFERENCES

1. ALADWANI, A. M.: Change management strategies for successful ERP implementation. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol. 7, 2001, No. 3, pp. 266-275. ISSN 1463-7154
2. ANDRESEN, J.L.: *A Framework for Selecting an IT Evaluation Method-in the Context of Construction*, Technical University of Denmark, BYG-DTU, 2001. ISBN 8778770696
3. BERNROIDER, E., KOCH, S.: ERP selection process in midsize and large organizations. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol. 7, 2001, No. 3, pp. 251-257. ISSN 1463-7154
4. BOTTA-GENOULAZ, V., MILLET, P. A., GRABOT, B.: A survey on the recent research literature on ERP systems. *Computers in Industry*, Vol. 56, 2005, No. 6, pp. 510-522. ISSN 0166-3615
5. CHAU, P.Y.K.: Factors used in the selection of packaged software in small businesses: views of owners and managers. *Information and Management*, Vol. 29, 1995, No. 2, pp. 71-78. ISSN 0378-7206
6. ESTEVES, J., PASTOR, J.: Enterprise Resource Planning Systems Research: An Annotated Bibliography. *Communications of AIS*, Vol. 7, 2001, No. 8, pp. 1-51. ISSN 1529-3181
7. FRIELINK, A.B.: *Auditing automatic data processing*. Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1961.
8. JONES, R.A.: Spotlight on Midlevel ERP Software. *Journal of Accountancy*, Vol. 193, 2002, No. 5, pp. 24-47. ISSN 0021-8448
9. JOSLIN, E.O.: *Computer selection*. London, Addison-Wesley, 1968.
10. KEIL, M., TIWANA, A.: Relative importance of evaluation criteria for enterprise systems: a conjoint study. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 16, 2006, No. 3, pp. 237-262. ISSN 1350-1917
11. MONTAZEMI, A.R., CAMERON, D.A., GUPTA, K.M.: An empirical study of factors affecting software package selection. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 13, 1996, No. 1, pp. 89-105. ISSN 0742-1222

12. SHEHAB, E. M., SHARP, M. W., SUPRAMANIAM, L., SPEDDING, T. A.: Enterprise resource planning: An integrative review. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol. 10, 2004, No. 4, pp. 359-386. ISSN 1463-7154
13. WIER, B., HUNTON, J. AND HASSABELNABY, H. R.: Enterprise resource planning systems and non-financial performance incentives: The joint impact on corporate performance. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, Vol.8, 2007, No. 3, pp. 165-190. ISSN 1467-0895

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Ing. Mgr. Mgr. František Sudzina, PhD.
Assistant Professor
Center for Applied ICT
Copenhagen Business School
Howitzvej 60
2000 Frederiksberg
Denmark
Tel.: +45 38152449
E-mail: fs.caict@cbs.dk