A Selection Method for COTS Systems

Hedman, Jonas

Document Version
Final published version

Publication date:
2010

License
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Hedman, J. (2010). *A Selection Method for COTS Systems*. Center for Applied ICT (CAICT), CBS. CAICT Communications No. 2010/1

CAICT COMMUNICATIONS 2010/1

A SELECTION METHOD FOR COTS SYSTEMS

Jonas Hedman

6 January 2010

ISBN 978-87-92524-07-2

Copenhagen Business School
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

Center for Applied ICT (CAICT)
Copenhagen Business School - Howitzvej 60 - 2000 Frederiksberg
URL http://www.cbs.dk/caict

Abstract

Historically, organizations developed their information systems in-house. Today, a large portion of information systems development is based on acquisition of pre-made information systems, so called commercially off the shelf (COTS) systems. This approach of developing information systems requires new skills and methods supporting the process of evaluating and selecting information systems. This paper presents a method for selecting COTS systems. The method includes the following phases: problem framing, requirements and appraisal, and selection of systems. The idea and distinguishing feature behind the method is that improved understanding of organizational' ends' or goals should govern the selection of a COTS system. This can also be expressed as a match or fit between 'ends' (e.g. improved organizational effectiveness) and 'means' (e.g. implementing COTS systems). This way of approaching the selection of COTS systems as viewing COTS systems as a 'mean' to reach organizational 'ends' is different from the mainstream view of information systems development, which view information systems development as a problem solving process, and the underlying ontological view in other COTS selection methods, which focus on selection of functionality not reaching organizational ends.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the beginning of software and information systems (IS) development in-house development was the only option. There were no information systems (IS) to be bought off the shelf. However, since that time in-house development has become relatively less common. Today, organizations select and implement Commercially Off The Shelf (COTS) systems for many reasons, including technical (replacement of old and outdated IS) (O'Callaghan 1998); integration of disparate IS (Markus 2000); business, such as changes of production mode (make-to-order versus make-to-stoke) (Welti 1999); organizational (new organizational structure) (Taylor 1998), strategic reasons, such as to gain competitive advantage (Davenport 2000, Shang & Seddon 2000), and due to difficulties with in-house development.

The above mentioned reasons for selecting COTS systems are based on economic and/or administrative rationality (cf. Fayol 1949, Simon 1976, Taylor 1911, Weber et al. 1946). However, there are other rationalities governing the selection of COTS systems, including institutional and individual rationalities. For instance, an organization might select a COTS system if their competitors are perceived as gaining competitive advantage through that COTS system or if a COTS system has become de facto standard in an industry (Davenport 2000, Parr & Shanks 2000). These types of environmental pressure are referred to as institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, Meyer & Rowan 1977, Scott 2001). Individuals on the other hand, such as senior managers, might also select or argue for a certain system based on other rationalities than economic and administrative. For instance, such as favoring a brother-in-law who works for a vendor, power struggle within a firm, owning shares in a vendor firm, and previous employments, i.e. the death sins (cf. the motivation behind Scientific Management (Taylor 1911) and Weber's key characteristics of a bureaucracy (Weber et al. 1946)). Afterwards, the selection are often justified through economic or administrative rationalities (Sjöstrand 1997), e.g. managers might use statements like "It is a strategic solution" to justify the selection (Davenport 2000) or create a business case that shows positive benefits.

From a traditional rational perspective, organizations and its members should behave systematically and rationally and identify the problems they want to solve, which formulates as a requirements specification. If not they behave dysfunctional. The specification is the starting point of an ex ante evaluation and selection of solution. In a perfect world, the solution ought to match the requirements, i.e. there is a fit between solution and requirements. However, the solution to the identified problems seldom has a 100% fit. So either the problem domain or the solution domain has to be changed or modified. Changes of the problem domain, e.g. in the organization or business, refers to change management, continuous improvement or business process reengineering. Changes in COTS system, i.e. the solution domain, are labeled as configuration and customization.

Behavior that is governed by institutional or individual rationalities is difficult if not impossible to anticipate and control in most cases and therefore difficult to be supported through formalized methods. Therefore, from a method engineering perspective it has to be assumed that managers behave at least in a bounded rationalistic (Simon 1976) or incremental (Lindblom 1959) manner. Thus, a critical management task becomes understanding, assessing, and evaluating COTS systems for 'rational' and systematic behaving managers who try to select and implement COTS system, in the most appropriate way. However, there are few methods supporting the process of selecting COTS systems and the few that exists are inappropriate for the selection of complex IS (Beach et al. 2000). This constitutes our design setting or beginning of our method development. The angle of this paper is to support the selection of system by improving the understanding of what 'ends' or goals are desired and what 'means' a COTS system supports.

The paper is organized as follows: Initially, a review of literature on selection of COTS systems. The subsequent section discuses how to develop methods and the underlying design theory. In the forth section the method is presented. The paper is then concluded with a discussion and conclusion.

2. RESEARCH ON SELECTION OF COTS SYSTEMS

In this section we review some of the research on selection of COTS systems. The main contribution in this area is related to ERP system. The academic research on COTS systems selection has mostly been concerned with critical success factors and organizational issues (Bernroider & Koch 2001, Brown et al. 2000, Hedman & Borell 2002, Shakir 2000, Shakir & Hossain 2002, Stafyla & Stefanou 2000, Stefanou 2000, Swanson & Dans 2000, Taudes et al. 2000). For instance, Bernroider & Koch (2001) present a study that show how firm size and the structure of the team affects the selection of ERP systems in 138 Austrian organizations. Shakir (2000) studied decision styles during the evaluation, selection, and implementation of ERP systems in New Zealand, based on Hoy and Tarter's six decision-making models (Hoy & Tarter 1995). Murphy & Simon (2002) studied the use of cost benefit analysis (CBA), e.g. NPV (Net Present Value), IRR (Internal Rate of Return), and payback time, in a large manufacturing firm. This study also included intangible measures, such as user satisfaction, to provide a broader picture of benefit analysis. Finally, Taudes et al. (2000) applied option-pricing models in a replacement decision between SAP R/2 and SAP R/3 platforms.

There are also some specific COTS selection methods in the literature. For instance, SHERPA (Systematic Help for ERP Acquisitions) (Illa et al. 2000) includes five phases (Decision to acquire, Search systems, Get more information, Demonstration of systems, and Final decision). To gather user requirements SHERPA uses natural language and formal language for modeling the application domain. Komiya et al. (2000) on the other hand describes a method for selecting of ERP system based on business process reengineering (BPR) aims and includes the following phases: 1) transformation of management environment; 2) recognize the current mechanism of business operations; 3) confirm mismatches between the environmental transformation and current business operations; and 4) set necessary action aims (BPR aims) to resolve the mismatches. The BPR aims are the basis of the business requirements in the selection of system. Rolland & Prakash (2000) argue that ERP systems implementations are difficult to align to requirements because of the low level at which ERP systems functionality is described at. Organizations think in terms of their goals and objectives instead of functionality. They propose a mapping technique to match organizational goals with ERP functionality descriptions. These descriptions can be used to match functionality with organizational goals when selecting system. To select a system organizations have to describe all the desired functionally. The proposed technique is inspired by scenario techniques from requirements engineering. An iterative selection framework is present in the ERPS (ERP systems Selection) framework. This method includes three phases: 1) Business Vision, 2) Requirements, Desire to Change, and Constraints; and 3) ERP selection and Evaluation. The method is a synthesized product inspired by the ISD literature (Stefanou 2000). A different approach is Maiden & Ncube's (1998) proposed procurement-oriented requirements engineering (PORE) model for matching COTS functionality with user requirements. One of the more comprehensive methods for COTS selection is the SIV-method (Nilsson 1991). It contains three phases (selection, configuration, and implementation) with a number of work tasks and documentation forms. The method has been developed as joint effort between researchers and professional software acquirers in Sweden (Nilsson 1991). The method builds on the ISAC method (Lundeberg, Goldkuhl & Nilsson 1979).

To conclude the literature review on selection of COTS systems it is focused on 1. Functionality, i.e. the 'means', not the 'ends', one notable exception is Rolland & Prakash's (2000) goal-oriented method, 2. A simplistic view of management behavior and 3. A lack of an underlying design theory. Furthermore, most research is not focused on methods but on the process of selecting ERP systems, with a particular emphasis on evaluating functionality of the system (Beach et al, 2000) in relation to what it is supposed to support. The presented methods are based on a strict rational view of human behavior. The common thing is the three phases: problem-framing phase; requirements/appraisal phase; and selection phase. As Beach et al. (2000) concluded there is a need for more research on selection of IS and in particular conceptual ideas that could affect practice. The gap we attempts to fill is to suggest a 'means' oriented selection approach and how to incorporate a design theory in the development.

3. DEVELOPMENT OF ISD METHODS

The aim of this paper is to develop and present a method for selecting COTS systems. Thus, critical issues for this paper are: How can selection methods be designed? What level of analysis

(organizational/management/business/group) should be applied in the design? What theories (organizational/management/information) or frameworks can be used in the development? How should a method be evaluated? We will return to evaluation of the method in the discussion section.

As developers of methods we do however need to consider the constituents of methods. A method is guidelines for work (c.f. e.g. Avison & Fitzgerald 1995, Brinkkemper 1995, Jayaratna 1994). Its character is prescriptive. A method should tell what to do in different situations in order to reach certain goals (ends). Methods include representational guidelines as well as procedural guidelines (Goldkuhl et al. 1998, Goldkuhl 2004). Many times the procedure and notation are tightly coupled together. Modeling is about asking questions and documenting answers in different models. General concepts are used when asking questions and are also parts of the semantics of the notation. The concepts can therefore be regarded as the glue between procedure and notation. All methods are based on some implicit or explicit perspective, which includes values, principles and categories. Methods also consist of framework and co-operation procedures. The perspective influences the categories that are reflected in the questions and answers. In this paper perspective, i.e. what ends to achieve, and framework, i.e. what aspects to focus, are put in foreground. In a process of justification there is a need to perform different grounding processes, such as (Lind & Goldkuhl 2002):

- Internal grounding in which the method's coherency and consistency was checked. This was supported by meta-modeling. This meta-modeling included modeling of different parts of the method such as procedural rules, model types, concepts and values.
- Theoretical grounding in which conceptual grounding and value grounding was performed. We also performed explanatory grounding where other theories about change work were used as basis for justification.
- Empirical grounding which meant that we conceptualized observations and conducted interviews in order to investigate the effects from the method in use.

In general, the writings on IS development recommend that users should be involved in the design process (this refers to the traditional "building IS from scratch" paradigm) and it is also common in the development of ISD methods (cf. e.g. Avison & Fitzgerald 1995, Nilsson 1991). This is motivated by the assumption that the users know best and user participation increases acceptance. However, a problem encountered in ISD is that the users have limited time for participating in the process (Carlsson 2000), which also applies to the development of methods. Some ideas of how to develop new methods are provided by Fitzgerald (1993), who concludes that new methods can be based on theories.

The second question concerns the level of analysis addressed by the method. Based on the complexity of COTS systems, the conclusion made is the most appropriate level of analysis for COTS systems is organizational. Other argument for applying an organizational level is that decisions made regarding COTS systems are made by top mangers (Davenport 2000).

The third question raised what theoretical frame of reference or conceptual framework to be used in building a selection method. According to Fitzgerald (1993) new methods can be designed on

current management and organizational theories. Two examples of how theories can be used in the development of ISD are the critical success factors method (CSF) and Multiview. Multiview builds on work by socio-technical research, such as Checkland (1981) and Mumford & Weir (1979). The CSF method can be used to identify executives´ information needs (Bullen & Rockart 1981, Rockart 1979). It focuses primarily on identifying information needs. Although, it can be useful, it has have limitations. Since CSF to a large extent focus on information needs, they are not complete in generating suggestions for what goals an organization and its managers seek for the IS (Carlsson 2000), which this paper aims at. The approach taken in the development of the selection method was to review some of the descriptive and prescriptive management and organizational literature. The review should point to what 'ends', i.e. goals and values in the method's perspective, an organization could have. The design theory and model applied builds on the work of Robert Quinn and associates.

The Competing Values Framework (CVF) is a broad framework developed to understand the constructs of organizational effectiveness (Quinn & Rohrbaugh 1983). CVF assumes that organizations are purposeful systems that exist to achieve certain goals or ends, the existence of simultaneous and conflicting goals, and that organization must pay attention to all goals at the same time in order to be effective and efficient (Hart & Quinn 1993). CVF also addresses three fundamental paradoxes found in the organizational litterateur; flexibility and spontaneity versus stability and predictability (related to organizational structure); internal versus external (related to organizational focus); and means vs. ends. These paradoxes reflect the underlying competing value dimensions (Buenger et al. 1996; Quinn 1989).

By considering different value dimensions in the underlying perspective of the method proposed in this paper we come to following conclusion. The first value dimension is focus: Internal focus puts emphasis on well being in the organization while external focus addresses the environment. Structure is the second value dimension: stability refers to the need of top management to control and flexibility refers to adaptation and change. The last value dimension is means versus ends (Quinn & Rohrbaugh 1983). Using the two first value dimensions, four organizational models emerges including human relations model (HR), open systems model (OS), internal process model (IP), and rational goal model (RG), with its own means and ends. Based on the four organizational models (HR, OS, IP, and RG) and the competing values dimensions four organisational effectiveness constructs can be defined. The HR model focuses on internal flexibility and stresses human resource development. The OS model focuses on external flexibility and suggests readiness and flexibility as the reasons by which growth may be gained. The IP model focuses on internal stability and uses information management, information processing, and communication to develop stability and control. The RG model is characterized by a focus on external control and relies on planning and goal setting to gain productivity (Quinn 1989). A critical point to note is that while different organizational models reflect different effectiveness criteria, they are not dichotomic. Effectiveness may require that organizations are both flexible and stable and have a synchronous internal and external focus (Quinn & Cameron 1988). The models reflect opposing views of organizational effectiveness simultaneously.

4. THE END DRIVEN SELECTION APPROACH

The point of departure in developing the method has been that managers apply different rationales (economic, institutional, and individual) and therefore are not always systematic. This is one of the critiques of the reviewed selection methods, but also serves as motivation for the use of CVF, which include dichotomized values. The reviewed methods are also presented as deterministic step by step guides for 'successful' selection and implementation of solutions. People do not act in this way; they pick and chose steps as they feel. A point to make is that the method with its guidelines should not be viewed as an isolated project. The overall context of the method is that it should be viewed as an integral part of an ongoing evaluation of a firm's current and future state with or without IS.

The presentation of the method in the subsequent section is not a step by step procedure, but illustrated as a number of phases, i.e. areas to focus pinpointed as a part of the framework, addressing: 1) problem-framing; 2) requirements and appraisal; 3) and selection of solution.

4.1. Problem-framing phase

Based on the assumption that organizational behavior is at least bounded rational it is possible to specify some general organizational requirements in the problem domain. The subsequent list represents some requirements that pertain to the context of the problem domain (i.e. what problems a sought solution should solve):

- The need for the problem to actually involve a real problem (cf. e.g. the Y2K problem).
- The need to be able to define the type of problems (strategic, organizational, business, IS, or technical) in under investigation.
- The need to define what type of solution an organization is looking for (e.g. IS, organizational change, business process reengineering, training etc) and seek alternative solutions than IS that might be better and/or cheaper.
- The need to know that IS is a solution to the problems (the only problems that require IS solutions are IS problems).
- The need to know that COTS system is the right solution to the problems.

The preceding requirements are not confined to all organizations and all problems. It is not possible to meet all requirements for all situations either. To make this even more difficult the empirical and conceptual IS research on the fit between solution and problem is scarce. There are schemas for matching different IS application to hierarchical level and functional areas in all IS textbooks. However, they seldom address what problems an IS solves. An exception is Markus (2000) who discusses new business demands, such as "presenting one face to the customer", "availability to promise", "one face to the customer", and having "global inventory visibility", that IS can be a solution of. To select a specific solution is the above requirements not enough. They have to be more specific, which the next phase manages.

4.2. Requirements and appraisal phase

The second phase (requirements and appraisal phase) consists of gathering specific organizational requirements, i.e. achievement level/goals/ends, and evaluation of solutions. The

level of analysis, i.e. organizational effectiveness is motivated be the level of impact of COTS system. It is important to stress that requirements should focus on the 'ends', which the solution should be the means to, not the functionality of the solution. For instance, an 'end-driven' requirements specification focus on the performance improvements achieved through improved control whereas a functional requirements specification attempts to specify functionality that have to be included, e.g. cost centre controlling. The guidelines do not specify where to start – assessing requirements or evaluation of solution. It is the evaluators' choice dependent on contextual circumstances.

4.3. Assessing requirements

To assess the current and future requirements, different instruments can be applied (Cameron & Quinn 1999, Quinn 1989, Quinn et al, 1996). The instruments make it possible to assess what 'ends' managers perceive as important. For instance, the "competing values organizational effectiveness instrument" (Quinn et al. 1996) measures perceptions of organizational performance. Based on the CVF it is possible to outline four broad organizational requirements:

- Human Resource Model's (COTS-HS) requirement focuses on internal flexibility to develop employee cohesion and morale. It stresses human resource development, participation, empowerment, team building, trust building, conflict management, internal communication, feedback to individuals and groups, and development of individual plans and management skills (Quinn 1989).
- Open System Model's (COTS-OS) requirement focuses on external flexibility and suggests readiness and flexibility to provide the means for organizational growth. Important issues are acquisition resources, support of interaction with the environment, identification of major trends, facilitation of organizational change, research and development, problem identification, influence the environment, and maintenance of external legitimacy (Quinn 1989).
- Internal Goal Model's (COTS-IP) requirement focuses on internal stability and uses information management, information processing, and communication to develop stability and control. This is done by collecting data (mainly internal quantitative information used to check organizational performance) enhancing the understanding of activities, ensuring that standards, goals, and rules are met, maintaining organizational structure and workflow, coordinating activities, and collecting and distributing information internally (Quinn 1989).
- Rational Goal Model's (COTS-RG) requirement is characterized by a focus on external control and relies on planning and goal setting to gain productivity. This includes clarification of expectations, goals and purposes through planning and goal setting, definition of problems, generation and evaluation of alternatives, generation of rules and policies, evaluation of performance, decision support, and quality control, motivation of organizational members to enhance productivity, sales support, and maximization of profit (Quinn 1989).

The purpose of this phase is to derive different perceptions and requirements of what is important for stakeholders. This phase can take place several times in an iterative process, since an organisation can re-evaluate its requirements based on the preceding result.

4.4. Appraisal of COTS systems

The purpose of an ex ante evaluation of COTS systems is to assess which ends a system supports. These guidelines relates to the actual solution. Using the CVF it is possible can identify four ideal COTS subtypes, they are COTS-HR, COTS-OS, COTS-IP, and COTS-RG. A COTS system may include parts and characteristics of the four subsystems. The following step in the appraisal of COTS systems is to map the functionality (i.e. the means) of COTS systems into the four COTS subtypes; some functionality is applicable to more than one COTS subtype. The aim of mapping functionality of a COTS system is to derive the 'means' of the functionality, i.e. what support a COTS system provides. The four COTS subtypes and their supporting COTS functionality are described below.

COTS-HR is the first subtype and it supports an organization in the human resource development. COTS-HR functionality and features of importance are e-mail, voice mail, and videoconferencing and these capabilities overcomes distance and time. COTS human resource module also provides functionality for individual planning and training. COTS-HR does not provide support for team building, building trust and moral, developing management skills, and conflict management.

COTS-OS is the second subtype and it has an external focus and an emphasis on structural flexibility. This supports an organization in identifying problems and possibilities by supporting environmental scanning, issue tracking, and issue probing. Environmental scanning may be quantitatively or qualitatively oriented and may include industry and economic trends, legislative issues, competitor activities, new product and process development, patents, and allocation of scarce resources. COTS systems do not support COTS-OS sufficiently at all. In terms of structural flexibility, COTS systems are famous for their inflexibility, at least when installed. The definition of the OS model it seems very difficult to formalize these processes and support them through a COTS system. This is of the weakest spot of COTS systems.

COTS-IP is the third subtype and it has an internal, control, and stable structure emphasis. It supports the internal process model. From an organizational performance perspective, the objectives are to provide user-friendly support for auditing and control through formalization and standardization. COTS systems replace traditional legacy systems, such as accounting systems and production systems. Capabilities supporting this include controlling, investment controlling, material management (stock inventory), plant maintenance, production planning and control, financial accounting, project system, workflow, and master data.

COTS-RG is the last subtype and has an external focus and stable structure. This subtype supports managers in organizations, by providing 'means' for primary activities, such as production planning sales and distribution, and logistics. Capabilities and features found in traditional Decision Support Systems, such as goal setting, forecasting, simulations, and

sensitivity analyses, are available in some COTS. Other COTS capabilities include sales and distribution, quality management, materials management (procurement).

The evaluation of COTS systems functionality and the assessment of requirements make it possible to map requirements with support from the COTS system.

4.5. Selection phase

The final phase addressed is the actual selection of system or solution. The assumptions made are that the problems in the problem-framing phase may be solved with COTS systems and that there is to some degree a match between organizational requirements and the evaluated COTS a system from phase two. For instance, if an organizations requirement relates mainly to IP-model and RG-model and the evaluated system fulfill those requirements it is possible that this is the 'right' solution. However, if an organization on the other hand has requirements problems related to OS-model and HR-model in CVF our suggestion is that the organization should seek other solutions than COTS systems.

The actual decision of solution should involve the fulfillment of the following two requirements based on a Cost Benefits Analysis:

- Degree of match between requirements and solution – does the system give support to the desired ends, and
- A cost and benefit evaluation between the potential benefits of desired ends and cost for acquiring the means.

The above sections have presented the method for selecting COTS systems based on organizational requirements and the potential contribution of solution. The method is conceptual focusing aspects of the framework connected to values and goals in the framework. The method has not been empirically validated.

5. DISCUSSION

The presented selection approach is conceptual and has not yet been practically validated. It should so far be seen as theoretically and internally justified (c.f. section 3). By this we mean that that the framework and perspective are congruent and that the perspective and resulting framework are theoretically derived.

Validation of ISD methods is however many times limited (Nilsson 1991). For instance, Rolland & Prakash (2000) validates their framework through comparing characteristics in scenario-based approaches from requirements engineering to evaluate whether their framework provides better aligned to organizational requirements than traditional functional approaches. Komiya et al (2000) has no discussion about validity of the method except for stating that it reduce time with 70% and that organization can select COTS systems quicker and better. Illa et al. (2000) validates their method through a comparison of requirements engineering methods and especially

those for COTS, e.g. Maiden & Ncube (1998). Finally, Nilsson (1991) used three types of validation including eight cases, expert panels, and literature.

We propose that the COTS method differs in relation to the reviewed methods in the sense that the proposed method emphasize the underlying framework, i.e. have a theoretical ground. The potential contribution of CVF in the case of selecting COTS system is mainly related to the focus on ends, i.e. instead of focusing on the functionality of the systems. This might resolve one problem common in most requirements specification, namely organizations tendency "*…to focus on the solution, in large part because it is easier to notice a pattern in the systems that we build than it is to see the pattern in the problems we are solving that lead to the patterns in our solutions to them*" (Ralph Johnson in Jackson, 1995, p. 2). Organizational ends are related to the patterns in the problem, whereas other selection methods focus on the patterns in the systems, i.e. the functionality. By matching the problems identified in problem-framing phase and the support provided by the system identified during appraisal of COTS system it can be possible to better understand the problem sought to be solved by the selected system. A problem is conceived as a deviation to desired goal.

6. CONCLUSION

The presented method has in this paper been theoretically and conceptually validated, i.e. theoretically and internally grounded. The steps and iteration of steps in the method, i.e. problem phase, requirements and appraisal phase, and selection phase, are common in most methods (Maiden & Ncube 1998, Nilsson 1991, Rolland & Prakash 2000). The part of the methods that distinguish the method is the clear view of the role of COTS systems, i.e. to support organizational goals – not to select functionality. The underlying conceptual framework is the CVF, which represents values, goals and concepts that help organization to understand their own current and future situation. It is though needs in future work to also justify the method empirically.

The selection and acquisition of ERP system is often perceived as an investment and thereby viewed as an expense (Stefanou 2000), based on some economic model (Murphy & Simon 2002). Organizations are therefore measuring there IS selections in economic terms (Nievelt 1998) if they evaluate their IS investments (Seddon et al. 2002). This paper has presented a COTS selection method as an end driven selection method, which complements the traditional models, based on an economic and rational view of mangers and emphasizes the selection of functionality, used to select COTS systems. The method is conceptual and its theoretical foundation is the CVF by Quinn and associates. The development builds upon ideas from design science and the need for method development pointed out by Beach et al. (2000). The use of the method supports the selection by improving the understanding of both the management and organizational requirements and what ends a system can provide means for. The first phase of the method is problem-framing with the explicit goal of evaluating whether COTS systems are a solution to current and future problems. The second phase supports the appraisal of a specific solution and the requirements specification of the system. The final phase is the actual selection of COTS system.

The development of the method builds on knowledge and experiences reported in IS writings, for example, information systems failure, top-management support, relationship between designers, system and user, evaluation, and d continuous improvement. The framework has thereby positioned itself against the technical orientation in some COTS systems implementation methods. However, this is not a critic of those methods. The goal has merely been to point out some shortcomings. The proposed method has several characteristics making it useful and to be validated as a practical method (i.e. a practical theory according to e.g. Cronen 2001). It relates to a critical construct, i.e. organizational effectiveness. It has a paradox and complexity perspective, which has been pointed out as necessary in IS research and practice (Robey & Boudreau 1999). The overall contingency approach makes it possible to evaluate and select COTS systems in context. Hence, the method stresses that not all COTS systems are equally effective in a specific context.

7. REFERENCES

Avison, D.E. and G. Fitzgerald (1995). Information Systems Development: Methodologies, Techniques, and Tools. 2nd ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Beach, R., A.P. Muhlemann, D.H.R. Price, A. Paterson and J.A. Sharp (2000). The selection of information systems for production management: An evolving problem. International Journal of Production Economics,64, 319-29.

Bernroider, E. and S. Koch (2001). ERP selection process in midsize and large organizations. Business Process Management Journal, 7 (3), 251-57.

Brinkkemper S (1995). Method engineering: engineering of information systems development methods and tools, Information & Software Technology, 37, (11).

Brown, C.V., I. Vessey and A. Powell (2000). The ERP purchase decision: Influential business and IT factors. Paper presented at Sixth Americas Conference on Information Systems, Long Beach, CA.

Buenger, V., R.L. Daft, E.J. Conlon and J. Austin (1996). Competing values in organizations: contextual influences and structural consequences. Organization Science, 7 (5), 557-76.

Bullen, C.V. and J.F. Rockart (1981). A primer on critical success factors. Cambridge, MA: Center for Information Systems Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Cameron, K.S. and R.E. Quinn (1999). Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Carlsson, S.A. (2000). The CESS method for guiding executive support systems design. Paper presented at Eighth European Conference on Information Systems, Vienna.

Checkland, P. (1981). Systems Thinking, Systems Practice. Chichester: Wiley.

Cronen V. (2001). Practical theory, practical art, and the pragmatic-systemic account of inquiry, Communication theory, 11(1).

Davenport, T.H. (2000). Mission Critical: Realizing the Promise of Enterprise Systems. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48 (2), 147-60.

Fayol, H. (1949). General and Industrial Management. London: Pitman.

Fitzgerald, G. (1993). Approaches to the Development of Executive Information Systems and the Contrast with Traditional System Development. In Avison, Kendall and DeGross (eds.), Human, Organizational, and Social Dimensions of Information Systems Development. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Goldkuhl, G. (2004). Design theories in information systems - a need for multi-grounding, Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application (JITTA), 6 (2), 59-72

Goldkuhl G., Lind M., Seigerroth U. (1998): ”Method Integration: The Need for a Learning Perspective” i Magee J. N., Sommerville I. (Eds): Special Issue of the IEE Proceedings - Software and Distributed Systems Engineering Journal, vol 145, no 4. s 113-118

Hart, S.L. and R.E. Quinn (1993). Roles executives play: CEOs, behavioral complexity, and firm performance. Human Relations, 46 (5), 543-74.

Hedman, J. and A. Borell (2002). The impact of enterprise resource planning systems on organizational effectiveness: An Artifact Evaluation. In Hossain, Patrick and Rashid, editors, Enterprise Resource Planning: Global Opportunities & Challenges. Hersey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.

Hoy, W.K. and C.J. Tarter (1995). Administrators Solving the Problems of Practice: Decision-Making Concepts, Cases, and Consequences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Illa, X.B., X. Franch and J.A. Pastor (2000). Formalising ERP Selection Criteria. Software Specification and Design, 2000. Tenth International Workshop, 115-22.

Jackson, M. (1995). Software Requirements & Specifications: A lexicon of Practice: Principles and Prejudices. Harlow, England: Addison-Wesley.

Jayaratna N (1994) Understanding and Evaluating Methodologies - NIMSAD: A Systematic Framework, McGraw-Hill, London

Komiya, F., K. Mitsukuni and N. Komoda (2000). An Efficient Method of Setting BPR themes Suitable for ERP Package Selection. Paper presented at Systems, Man, and Cybernetics.

Lindblom, C.E. (1959). The science of muddling through. The Public Administration Review, 19 (2), 79-88.

Lind M., Goldkuhl G. (2002). Grounding of Methods for Business Change: Altering between Empirical, Theoretical and Internal Grounding, Proceedings of European Conference on Research Methodology for Business and Management Studies, MCIL, Reading, UK

Lundeberg, M., G. Goldkuhl and A.G. Nilsson (1979). A systematic approach to information systems development - I. Introduction. Information and Systems, 4, 1-12.

Maiden, N.A. and C. Ncube (1998). Acquiring COTS software selection requirements. IEEE Software, 15 (2), 46-56.

Markus, M.L. (2000). Paradigm Shifts - E-Business and Business/Systems Integration. Communications of the AIS, 4 (10), 1-45.

Meyer, J.W. and B. Rowan (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 82 (2), 340-63.

Mumford, E. and M. Weir (1979). Computer Systems in Work Design - The ETHICS Method: Effective Technical and Human Implementation of computer systems: A Work Design Exercise Book for Individuals and Groups. New York: Wiley.

Murphy, K.E. and S.J. Simon (2002). Using Cost Benefit Analysis for Enterprise Resource Planning Project Evaluation: A Case for Including Intangibles. In Hossain, Patrick and Rashid, editors, Enterprise Resource Planning: Global Opportunities & Challenges. Hersey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.

Nievelt, M. (1998). Benchmarking Organizational and IT Performance. In Willcocks and Lester, (eds.), Beyond the IT Productivity Paradox. Chichester: Wiley.

Nilsson, A.G. 1991 Anskaffning av Standardsystem för att Utveckla Verksamheter: Utveckling och Prövning av SIV-Metoden, Ekonomiska forskningsinstitutet vid Handelshögskolan i Stockholm, Stockholm.

O'Callaghan, R. (1998). Technology Diffusion and Organizational Transformation: An Integrative Framework. In Larsen and McGuire, editors, Information Systems Innovation and Diffusion: Issues and Directions. Hershey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.

Parr, A. and G. Shanks (2000). A Model of ERP Project Implementation. Journal of Information Technology, 15 (4), 289-303.

Quinn, R.E. (1989). Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the Paradoxes and Competing Demands of High Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Quinn, R.E. and K.S. Cameron (1988). Paradox and Transformation. In Quinn and Cameron, editors, Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Quinn, R.E., S. Faerman, R., M.P. Thompson and M.R. McGrath (1996). Becoming a Master Manager: A Competency Framework. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Quinn, R.E. and J. Rohrbaugh (1983). A Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis. Management Science, 29 (3), 363-77.

Robey, D. and M.C. Boudreau (1999). Accounting for the Contradictory Organizational Consequences of Information Technology: Theoretical Directions and Methodological Implications. Information Systems Research, 10 (2), 167-85.

Rockart, J.F. (1979). Chief Executives Define Their Own Data Needs. Harvard Business Review, 57 (2), 81-93.

Rolland, C. and N. Prakash (2000). Bridging the Gap Between Organisational Needs and ERP Functionality. Requirements Engineering, 5 (3), 180-93.

Scott, W.R. (2001). Institutions and Organizations. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Seddon, P.B., V. Graeser and L.P. Willcocks (2002). Measuring Organizational IS Effectiveness: An Overview and Update of Senior Management Perspectives. The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems, 33 (2), 11-27.

Shakir, M. (2000). Decision Making in the Evaluation, Selection and Implementation of ERP Systems. Paper presented at Sixth Americas Conference on Information Systems, Long Beach, CA.

Shakir, M. and L. Hossain (2002). A Study of the ERP selection Process in New Zealand.In Hossain, Patrick and Rashid, editors, Enterprise Resource Planning: Global Opportunities & Challenges. Hershey: Idea Group Publishing.

Shang, S. and P.B. Seddon (2000). A Comprehensive Framework for Classifying the Benefits of ERP Systems. Paper presented at Americas Conference on Information Systems.

Simon, H.A. (1976). Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization. 3d ed. New York, NY: Free Press.

Sjöstrand, S.-E. (1997). The Two Faces of Management: The Janus Factor. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Stafyla, A. and C.J. Stefanou (2000). ERP Software Selection: A Study Using Cognitive Maps. Paper presented at Seventh European Conference on Information Technology Evaluation.

Stefanou, C.J. (2000). The Selection Process of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Systems. Paper presented at Sixth Americas Conference on Information Systems, Long Beach, CA.

Swanson, E.B. and E. Dans (2000). System Life Expectancy and the Maintenance Effort: Exploring their Equilibration. MIS Quarterly, 24 (2), 277-97.

Taudes, A., M. Feurstein and A. Mild (2000). Options Analysis of Software Platform Decisions: A Case Study. MIS Quarterly, 24 (2), 227-43.

Taylor, F.W. (1911). The Principles of Scientific Management. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Taylor, J.C. (1998). Participative Design: Linking BPR and SAP with an STS Approach. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 11 (3), 233-45.

Weber, M., H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills (1946). From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. New York,: Oxford university press.

Welti, N. (1999). Successful SAP R/3 Implementation: Practical Management of ERP Projects. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.