PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT: THE EVIDENCE FROM CZECH AND SLOVAK ENTERPRISES

Roman Zámečník, Rastislav Rajnoha

Abstract: *We are currently seeing the growth in significance and emphasis of a range of new success factors – which are for the time being under-used in Controlling, and which are mutually interlinked and interdependent. Performance Measurement tools can be successfully applied to the resolution of the above-mentioned problems. For this reason, this paper presents selected research results oriented on business process performance measurement in Czech and Slovak enterprises. The theoretical part of the paper provides a detailed characterisation of the current state of affairs of the investigated performance measurement issue. The following part of the paper defines the basic research methodology and expected contributions of the study. In the final part of the paper, results of the survey are introduced.*

Keywords*: Controlling, Performance Management, Performance Measurement, Business Process Management*

JEL classifications: *L25, M21*

1 INTRODUCTION

The traditional heavily financially-oriented management concept that predominantly works on the basis of numerical figures and on the balance sheet and accounting statements is being faced by an ever-growing degree of criticism both by academic scientists and working practice. This criticism is directed towards many differing aspects. Apart from the neglection of non-monetary indices, it points up among others, the lack of inter-linkage with strategic planning, its overly-dependent orientation on the past and on the short-term, its woefully insufficient orientation on the customer, and incorrect index points for incentives. Based upon these deficits, the end of the nineteen-eighties saw the first attempts to create new concepts. Professional literature written in English in the fields of Controlling and Management began to use the term "Performance Measurement" in order to describe conceptual new beginnings as well as the use of these new concepts and indices for the management of

enterprises. This paper is oriented on the presentation of selected research results relating to business process performance measurement in Czech and Slovak enterprises. The outcomes of our research study investigation are concurrently confronted with those arising from professional studies conducted above all in Germany and in Austria.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance measurement system define X. Gimbert, J. Bisbe and X. Mendoza (2010) as a set of financial and non-financial measures to support enterprise decision-making by collecting, processing and analyzing quantified information regarding its performance and presented in a brief review. A subset of this category is a strategic performance measurement system (SPMS), whose typical feature is the design of these systems to support decision making by managers through financial and also non-financial indicators covering different perspectives and which in combination enables to transform strategy into a comprehensive set of performance measures (Chenhall, 2005).

In the current conditions, competition in the market is not easy for businesses, without a critical information and data even impossible. At present, information is becoming one of the factors of production enterprises and therefore the enterprise's information system is a key factor in business competitiveness (Frankovský, Štefko, Baumgartner, 2006). Higher-quality, lower-cost information is a key to unlocking more sources of finance for SMEs (Belás et al., 2016). As the report of RSA Tomorrow's Company shows (Neely et al., 2000), to achieve a sustainable corporate success in the demanding world market the enterprise should use some relevant indicators to measure business performance. Among the contemporary problems which businesses have to face in connection with the strategic management we can mention the problem of strategy implementation. Currently, performance measuring can significantly contribute to achieving and solving this problem. The importance of these problems has significantly increased during the economic crisis, because many enterprises in the world reduced their performance (Novák, Popesko, 2014).

The most typical example of such systems is a system of balanced objectives and indicators so called Balanced Scorecard (BSC). This presents a fundamental change in the basic assumptions about performance measurement and complements traditional financial indicators with a measure the performance of the customer perspective, internal processes, perspective of

growth and learning with a focus on current and future success of the business (Kaplan, Norton, 1993). BSC can be also useful in creating a new corporate culture, corresponding to the strategy in terms of shared assumptions about the mission, strategy and objectives, in understanding the means to achieve these goals, measuring results and reactions when events do not respond to the plan (Gibbons, Kaplan, 2015).

The term "Performance Measurement (Business Performance Measurement, Corporate Performance Measurement or Enterprise Performance Measurement)" means the creation and use of usually several indicators of various dimensions (e.g., cost, time, quality, innovation capacity, customer satisfaction), which are used to assess effectiveness and efficiency of the performance and performance potentials of different objects in the enterprise, the so-called levels of performance (e.g., organizational units of various sizes, staff, processes), as indicated, e.g., by Reiss (1992), Neely et al. (1995) and Gleich (1997). Based on a critical literature review, we identified the following most frequently used methods and performance management and measurement tools (Young and O'Byrne, 2001; Neely et al., 2002; Gleich, 2002; Strack and Villis, 2002; Tangen, 2004; Wulf and Hoboken, 2006; Neely, 2007; and others:

- Management Accounting (based on the traditional absorption costing and alternative variable costing),
- Process management accounting method (including the concepts of ABM, ABC, ABB),
- Controlling,
- Classical financial performance indicators (especially indicators of the absolute value of earnings, cash flow and profitability indicators),
- Balanced Scorecard (BSC),
- Total Quality Management (including the concepts of European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM), Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, Six Sigma, Benchmarking),
- Value Based Management (VBM),
- Theory of Constraints,
- Business Process Reengineering,
- Lean Production (including JIT and Kanban concepts).

For several years, measuring corporate performance has been in the centre of attention not only in the academic field but also in business area. New approaches to corporate performance which support traditional indicators have been preferred for some years. The examination of the measuring corporate performance issues is dedicated to many authors from different points of view: the effect of the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) concept and its importance as a strategic tool for measuring and managing business and management performance (Knápková, Homolka, Pavelková, 2014), the effect of strategic performance measurement system of human resources and corporate results (Bento, White, 2014), the relations among customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and financial performance of a commercial bank (Belás, Gabčová, 2016), the customer satisfaction in banking business and its importance for financial performance of commercial bank (Korauš, Štefko, Dobrovič, 2015), the tax revenue administration and its process model for Slovakia's economic performance (Dobrovič, Korauš, 2015), the strategic business performance management on the base of controlling and managerial information support (Zámečník, Rajnoha, 2015). Štefko et al. analyzed the prices as a key competitive factor in the steel industry in Slovakia and Poland (Štefko, Slusarczyk, Kot, Kolmasiak, 2012).

Next research was focused on business performance in scope of investment measurement and management using of investment effectiveness evaluation methods. Research results confirmed some assumptions, that use of investment valuation methods is limited by foreign ownership of company and certain methods caused better business performance (Rajnoha, Novák, Merková, 2016). Similar study is dedicated to the issue of the process performance measurement in Czech companies (Tuček et al., 2013).

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper sets out to present selected results and outcomes of some research oriented on the mapping of the current situation in the field of activity performance measurement using Controlling in Czech and Slovak enterprises. To be specific, the results set out in the introductory section of the research study (i.e. the evaluation of the first two questions in the questionnaire) – which were targeted on the exploitation of Process Management (ProM) and the measurement and evaluation of an enterprise's processes Performance Measurement (PMes) in the enterprises that we addressed. Our research study was oriented on encouraging and determining responses to questions which characterise the situation extant in the field of the evaluation the quality of the

performance of the Controlling function in the enterprises we investigated. Our aim was above all to monitor the current situation regarding the given field of problems and issues in Czech and Slovak enterprises and, at the same time, equally to discover the potential opportunities, possibilities and interest of those questioned regarding their future implementation in the business practices of these enterprises. The research study we undertook sought for answers to the following basic questions:

- What is the current state of affairs pertaining in the fields of performance measurement and evaluation and the optimalisation of the Controlling processes in the everyday practices of Czech and Slovak enterprises?
- Is the measurement and evaluation of the enterprise's process ranked as one of the fundamental tasks of the enterprise's Controlling activities?
- What indices can (best) be used to realise such measurement and evaluation activities?
- Does Performance Measurement (i.e. Controlling) contribute to growth in the enterprise's value?
- If yes, how and in what ways can this contribution be quantified?

The research study took place in two phases – the quantitative and the qualitative. Herein below, we will outline the results and outcomes of the quantitative phase. In order to be able to create a sample, we used a technique based upon the Random selection Method – i.e. a targeted selection. While the random selection method does not guarantee in and of itself the true representative nature of the sample, and also makes generalisation on the basis of the attained results more difficult – it is, in essence, the only way to acquire certain "sensitive" data. This research study included individuals or enterprises of other organisations that the researchers considered to be suitable for the purposes of this research study.The user data-base of the company - Controller-Institut, Contrast Consulting Praha, spol. s.r.o (Prague, Co. Ltd.) was used for the purpose of identifying and selecting appropriate respondents. This database was deliberately chosen with a view to the character of the problems and issue to be resolved and to the narrowly sector-specificity of the investigative questionnaire – which presupposed (counted on) the existence of a Controlling department within the enterprises and organisations under investigation and which this database guarantees. The people addressed by our questionnaire were the Heads of the Controlling Department/Section in our selected targets. Overall, we addressed some 748 companies and organisations (652 Czech and

96 Slovak). We elected the quantitative investigative method to be the key method used for our questionnaire. We used the questionnaire method for the following reasons:

- To acquire data from a larger number of respondents than, for instance, from interviews.
- To try to ensure greater unity of the data, i.e. that it was more quantifiable and the ability to be able to process it using statistical approaches.
- To generate more openness and honesty from the respondents through the anonymity offered by a questionnaire.
- It is more efficient and leads to greater time savings than interviews and qualitative methods.
- To try to reduce the degree of subjectivity of the questioners.

The questionnaire was sent out to all of the above-mentioned 748 enterprises and organisations. We received 59 completed questionnaires. Relevant data for quantitative investigative purposes was contained in 56 of these questionnaires. Therefore, the so-called "return rate" amounted to not quite 8 %. We can therefore classify this as being a very low response rate. It is however necessary to take the very narrow orientation of the questionnaire into consideration as well as the "sensitivity" of the data under investigation. Were we to compare this response rate with similar research studies in the field of Controlling either in the Czech Republic or in Germany or Austria, we would begin to see the achieved rate in a somewhat different light. The Controller – Institut company shows a response rate of about 10 % for similar research it has conducted. Eschenbach (2004, pp. 158 – 159), mentions a response rate for research conducted in the field of Controlling in German-speaking countries for the period 1976 – 1993. This was within the range of 7 % to 47 %. These research studies were however much more general in their character and nature. The actual subject of our research study was therefore the 56 Czech and Slovak enterprises and organisations who filled in and returned our questionnaire and which were part of the Controller-Institut, Contrast Consulting Praha, spol. s r.o. `s database. The conception of the analysis of the individual responses to the questions was oriented on the determination of the basic indices for a given set – i.e. the absolute and relative frequency of the chosen distinguishing features. The results are presented in a descriptive, graphical form, accompanied by a statistical analysis.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section contains the results and outcomes of our evaluation of the introductory part of the questionnaire, which were targeted on the discovery of the basic areas requisite for the successful measurement and subsequent evaluation of the performance of an enterprise's activities (i.e. of its Controlling) processes. The intent was to discover whether the enterprise/organisation in question applied Process Management techniques, evaluated its processes with the aid of pre-defined indices, what measurement and evaluation tools it used for the measurement and evaluation of their performance, etc.

Evaluation of Question №. 1

Qn. 1. Please mark with a cross (x) the possibility which best corresponds to the situation in your company.

The first question in the questionnaire had a general orientation on the use of Process Management in the companies being analysed. This question is composed of a total of eight sub-questions (1a – 1h, see Table 1). In the course of the statistical evaluation, consideration was taken of the size of the company in question (1 – micro-enterprise, 2 – small enterprise, 3 – medium-sized enterprise, 4 – large-scale enterprise). This form of designation was used throughout the questionnaire for all of the other questions.

Tab. 1: Evaluation of Question № 1 in the questionnaire

	YES	NO
a) Has your company created a (complete) list of all of its processes?		
b) Are all of its activities a component of one of these company processes?		
c) Does each company process have its own defined indices, by means of which this process is measured and evaluated?		
d) Is there a set periodicity to the recording of the values of the given indices?		
e) Has responsibility for the evaluation of the given indices been allocated/defined?		
f) Have correctional measures been set in place to counter exceeding the set values for these indices?		
g) Does data regarding the cost of company processes exist for the last accounting period?		
h) Does company performance evaluation serve as the basis for its improvement?		

Source: Own

The Results and outcomes of the analysis of the first question are presented with the aid of Tab 2, which only depicts a summary of the values for the whole multiple of the enterprises/organisations under investigation (i.e. the mean

values for the individual sub-questions and the size of the enterprises/organisations are designated for their positive response). As is clear from Tab. 2, 63 % of the analysed enterprises/organisations have already created lists of all of their company processes. 59% of the v questioned indicated that all of their activities are components of some other process. Despite this fact however, only in 41 of these enterprises/organisations has each of these company processes been allocated a defined index by means of which these processes are measured and evaluated. 68% of these enterprises/organisations regularly record the values of the given index, and for 70 % of these enterprises/organisations, responsibility for the measurement and evaluation has also been allocated. 54% of the enterprises/organisations we investigated set corrective measures for cases where the set values of a given index have been exceeded. The costliness of a given process is tracked in 64% of these enterprises/organisations, and for 80 % of them the measurement and evaluation of its processes serves as the basis for their improvement.

Tab. 2: Relative frequency of responses – Evaluation of Question №. 1

	Size:				
Sub-question:	1	2	3	4	**Overall Average:**
1a	0.60	0.50	0.76	0.64	0.63
1b	0.80	0.31	0.65	0.72	0.59
1c	0.60	0.25	0.53	0.39	0.41
1d	0.60	0.50	0.82	0.72	0.68
1e	0.60	0.50	0.76	0.83	0.70
1f	0.40	0.31	0.59	0.72	0.54
1g	0.40	0.50	0.71	0.78	0.64
1h	0.60	0.63	0.94	0.89	0.80

Source:Own

Evaluation of Question №. 2

Qn. 2. Which of the following systems for the measurement and evaluation of enterprises or of its processes respectively (i.e. Performance Measurement – further only: PM) does your company use?

a) The Activity Based Costing (ABC) Method
b) The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) Method
c) The Benchmarking Method
d) The European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) Method
e) The Performance Pyramid Method
f) The Six Sigma Method
g) The Du Pont System of Indices
h) The Value Based Management (VBM) Method
i) Other …

The second question's aim was to clarify which systems for measuring and evaluating company performance levels are used most frequently in the everyday practices of Czech and Slovak enterprises. It is composed of 9 sub-questions in total, which represent concrete company process performance level measurement and evaluation tools (2a – 2i). The results and outcomes of the analysis of this part of the questionnaire are shown in Tab. 3.

Tab. 3: Relative frequency of responses – Evaluation of Question №. 2

Sub-question:	Size: 1	2	3	4	Overall Average:
2a	0.40	0.13	0.24	0.33	0.25
2b	0.00	0.25	0.09	0.39	0.22
2c	0.00	0.25	0.47	0.56	0.39
2d	0.00	0.06	0.12	0.11	0.09
2e	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2f	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.11	0.05
2g	0.20	0.13	0.15	0.17	0.15
2h	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.11	0.07
2i	0.00	0.06	0.24	0.33	0.20

Source: Own

As is clear from the distribution of the relative frequency (of responses), the method that is most frequently used for the measurement and evaluation of the performance levels of company processes is the Benchmarking Method. It is clear to see that this method has undergone a significant increase and expansion of its use in our enterprises and organisations over the past few years. Solař and Bartoš (2003, pp. 19 – 20) have stated that these methods are inadequately used in the Czech Republic, and have mentioned the following reasons for this insufficient widespread usage of the Benchmarking method as a suitable method for the measurement and evaluation of a company's performance levels:

- A general prevailing tendency to overvalue their own results.
- A generally accepted moral approach – in that, "it is dishonest to copy and to appropriate someone else's results for yourself."
- Little motivation on the part of analysts to improve their own enterprise.
- A company culture that refuses information from outside its own borders.

- The fundamental resistance of top managements to admit to their own insufficiencies and to adopt "foreign" approaches.
- Poor accessibility of the relevant information.

In total, this method is used by 39 % of the respondents` enterprises or organisations. A quarter of the enterprises under investigation (i.e. 14) indicated that they use the Activity Based Costing method. If we were to compare the general use of the ABC method with research studies which took place earlier here, then there is a clear shift in the use and exploitation of this method. Popesko (2004, p. 93), in his evaluation of his research study oriented on the use of calculation methods in Czech enterprises and organisations states, that only 5 % of the companies he analysed in the basic set made up of a total of 117 enterprises and organisations use the ABC/M method. Further, this piece of research was also targeted on discovering the reasons arguing for and against the implementation of the ABC/M method. An interesting outcome is the relatively high percentage of enterprises and organisations which have considered implementing the ABC/M method, but who subsequently discarded the implementation impulse. They mainly justify their decision especially on the basis of how demanding this method is due to the sheer expanse of the data to be processed, insufficient pre-suppositions, a bad IS system, their wide product and series range, the unsuitable character of the production process itself, or even the low share of overhead costs on overall costs. The reason why other organisations have never interested themselves in these methods is above all their lack of knowledge about it, or a lack of sufficient information regarding the use and exploitation of these methods, or as the case may be – the lack of independence of the leadership due to the dominance of decision-making by the owners of the enterprise or organisation.

The reasons which led these organisations and enterprises to implement these methods were ranked by Popesko (2004, p. 100) according to their frequency of occurrence in the responses and this ranking demonstrated their degree of importance within the sample set he investigated (Table 4).

Tab. 4: Reasons for implementing the ABC/M Method

	Reason for implementation:	Frequency Rate:
1.-2.	The original system did not reflect the differences in the execution of operations	6
1.-2.	Improving the quality of information about the operations	6
3.	The need to change prices due to greater competition	5
4.	The necessity to reduce costs	4
5.-6.	Growth in innovation activities	1
5.-6.	Changes in the processes of the creation of operations	1

Source: Popesko (2004, p. 100)

The EFQM system is used by approximately 9 % of the sample enterprises and organisations which took part in this research study. The Performance Pyramid Method remains for the time being a complete unknown for the Czech and Slovak enterprises and organisations we investigated. Not one of the enterprise or organisation makes use of this method. As was confirmed by Günther and Grüning (2000, p. 4), this method does not have great significance in everyday practice and is not so well-known. This was documented in a piece of research conducted in 2000, where only 3 of 123 German enterprises and organisations used this method and it was known by only 10 of the enterprises and organisations addressed in the research study. Recently, the buzzword on everyone's lips is the Six Sigma methd, but this is only used by 5 % enterprises and organisations within the context of the measurement and evaluation of their processes` performance. 15 % of the analysed enterprises and organisations use the classical (and well-known) Du Pont System of Indices method for these purposes. In the same piece of research mentioned above, Günther and Grüning (2000, p. 3) indicate its use in 7 enterprises and organisations and that it is known by 51 enterprises and organisations of the total number of 123 that they investigated. The Value-based Management Concept is used by 7 % of the enterprises and organisations in our sample. For comparison purposes, we once again will make use of the piece of research work conducted by Günther and Grüning (2000, p. 3):

- 11 enterprises and organisations put this method into practice.
- 12 enterprises and organisations were in the implementation phase.
- 23 enterprises and organisations made use of only the basic concepts of this method.
- 25 enterprises and organisations knew about this method, but did not use it.

For interest's sake, we will once again make use of the overall results of Günther and Grüning`s research study regarding the extent to which PM systems are in use in German enterprises and organisations. In 2000, 36 % of German enterprises and organisations already made use of PM systems in their working practices, while 17 % of the enterprises and organisations were in the implementation phase of some sort of PM system. 15 % of the enterprises and organisations at the time were investigating the possibilities and opportunities of using one or more of these systems in their enterprises and organisations. 20 % of the investigated enterprises and organisations mentioned that they used another system for measuring and evaluating the performance levels of their processes. The most frequently mentioned were the ISO 9001 and 14001 norms and the EVA indices for value-added. Furthermore, enterprises and organisations usually make use of a set of their own specific indicators for these purposes. One of the enterprises and organisations we investigated indicated that it used the Variable Costs Method and the Surcharge/Mark-up Calculation Method. We have left discussion of the Balanced Scorecard method – which somewhat surprisingly ranked third as to its level of use in the enterprises and organisations that we investigated to the conclusion of our evaluation. It is used by only 22 % of the enterprises and organisations to measure and evaluate their process performance levels. These results however, roughly correspond to the outcomes of the research that was conducted by the Controller-Institut, Contrast Consulting Praha, spol. s r.o. company in 2002. This study was in the form of a questionnaire-based investigation and was targeted on respondents in managerial positions. 384 enterprises and organisations were randomly selected from its database; of which 56 enterprises or organisations responded, which represents a return (response) rate of not quite l5 %. In view of the small number of those questioned, while it is not possible to generalise the results and outcomes of this study for the whole of the Czech Republic, they can however be used to indicate the current state of affairs regarding the use of BSC, as well as its potential trends here. BSC is used in 56 Czech enterprises or organisations. The first group is made up of enterprises or organisations which had set up a BSC system. If we were to add these to those enterprises or organisations which were in the process of creating such a system at the time the study was conducted, the result would then be 30 % who had actively encountered the use of the BSC method. A positive fact is the reality that 83 % of the respondents knew the term Balanced Scorecard. Unfortunately, however, at the present time a more detailed research study mapping the current extent of the use of BSC in our enterprises and organisations is still lacking. One year later, once again under the aegis of the Controller – Institut, a similar research

study was conducted that was oriented on the degree of familiarity with and the extent to which it was used of the concept of the BSC method. This study was targeted on large-scale Czech enterprises and organisations and the information acquired from the 68 respondents was processed and evaluated. From the results and outcomes of this study, it is clear that while the concept of the BSC method has a relatively widespread level of familiarity in these large-scale enterprises and organisations, its use continues to remain relatively low. This fact is documented by selected results from this study. To begin with, we shall first mention the results relating to the degree of familiarity of Czech large-scale enterprises and organisations with the concept of the BSC method:

- 16 % of them have a very good knowledge of the BSC concept.
- Another 37 % indicated that they have a good knowledge of this concept.
- 29 % of them have only "heard about" the BSC concept.
- 16 % have yet to hear about this concept.
- 2 % of the respondents did not reply to this question.

Within the context of this study, the extent to which the BSC concept is used was established:

- The extent of the use of the BSC method is relatively low in Czech enterprises and organisations – only 15 % of them indicated that they used the BSC method.
- 7 % of these enterprises and organisations were in the process of creating a BSC system, and in 2 % of these enterprises and organisations the creation of a BSC concept was in the planning stage.
- 10 % of these enterprises and organisations were considering the implementation of a BSC concept.
- 18 % of these enterprises and organisations had no plans at all to introduce a BSC system, and 45 % of them had "only heard about" the BSC method – or had not even heard about it; it can therefore be supposed that the introduction or implementation of a BSC system was not a matter of the "order of the day" for these enterprises or organisations.
- 2 % of these enterprises or organisations did not respond at all to this question. (Bazal, 2004)

What was interesting was the reasons given for not introducing or implementing a BSC system, these are shown in Table 5.

Tab. 5: Reasons for not implementing the BSC concept in large-scale Czech enterprises and organisations

Reasons for not implementing the BSC concept (n=11 enterprises and organisations)	**Agreement** (%)
A similar management system already exists within the enterprise or organisation	27
It very difficult to identify non-monetary indices and data	27
The high costs associated with the creation of a BSC system	18
The BSC method is just a fashionable trend	18
Success with the use of a BSC system is uncertain	18
The existing management system within the enterprise or organisation is sufficient	18

Source: Bazal (2004, p.15)

An important discovery was that 80 % of the enterprises and organisations that were approached perceived the BSC method as underpinning and supporting the measurement and evaluation of process performance levels, and 56 % of them also saw a link with the reward and remuneration system. We analyse this phenomenon more deeply in various industries in Slovakia, along with other select tools and concepts of strategic business performance management from the quantitative point of view analysing the frequency of their use in the firms.

The analysis of the frequency of use of the concepts, methods and tools for strategic management of business performance is based mostly on the data given in the Table 6. The analysis shows that in the long-term, companies most often use data mainly from financial accounting (the total as many as 86% of enterprises). The data taken from managerial accounting (47%) and quality management systems (45%) is also used quite intensely for more than 5 years. The concept of controlling is also relatively popular, as about 39% of companies reviewed use it and an additional 9% of companies plans to use it in the future. Other concepts and tools are used in very limited numbers.

Tab. 6: Frequency of response: The use of selected concepts and tools for strategic business performance management

	Selected concepts and tools for strategic business performance management	We do not use it	We do not use it but we plan to	We have used it for <2 year	We have used it for 2-5 years	We have used it for > 5 years
1	Financial indicators based on	17	6	20	20	101
%	data from financial accounting	10.37	3.66	12.20	12.20	61.59
2	The outputs from managerial	73	14	14	10	53
%	accounting	44.51	8.54	8.54	6.10	32.32
3	Controlling	85	15	16	13	35
%		51.83	9.15	9.76	7.93	21.34
4	Balanced Scorecard (BSC)	142	7	3	6	6
%		86.59	4.27	1.83	3.66	3.66
5	Economic Value Added	123	7	12	8	14
%	(EVA)	75.00	4.27	7.32	4.88	8.54
6	ABC costing (Activity Based	116	11	6	7	24
%	Costing)	70.73	6.71	3.66	4.27	14.63
7	Knowledge information	134	18	3	4	5
%	system type BI (Business Intelligence)	81.71	10.98	1.83	2.44	3.05
8	Quality Management System	78	12	9	18	47
%		47.56	7.32	5.49	10.98	28.66
9	Lean and Kaizen management	144	4	6	5	5
%		87.80	2.44	3.66	3.05	3.05
10	The concept of CRM	142	8	5	4	5
%		86.59	4.88	3.05	2.44	3.05
11	The KPI	129	7	4	12	12
%	(Key Performance Indicators)	78.66	4.27	2.44	7.32	7.32

Source: Own

5 CONCLUSION

The results and outcomes of our research study confirmed the fact, pointed out by Solař (2000, p.5) for instance, who stated that: "the field of the measurement and evaluation of enterprises and organisations performance is – both in theory and in the practices of Czech managements, unpopular and considered as a matter of course to be resolved within the framework of the existing information systems in these enterprises and organisations." Solař further went on to generalise and state, that without a basic feedback mechanism, which is created by systems for the measurement and evaluation of enterprises and organisations performance and processes, no progressive form of management

can exist or function – thus, not even the Controlling function, since the old saw: "What I don't (or can't) measure – I can't manage" still holds true and is generally valid. It was also obvious from the results and outcomes of the research study that was conducted that Czech and Slovak enterprises and organisations still devote a lot less than sufficient attention to the measurement and evaluation of their companies` processes, than these would actually deserve.

CITATION LIST

[1] BAZAL, I. *Balanced Scorecard ve velkých českých podnicích-výsledek empirické studie*. In: ControllerNews 1/2004. Praha: Controller-Institut, Contrast Consulting Praha spol. s r.o., 2004, pp. 14-18. ISSN 1214-5149

[2] BELÁS, J., VOJTOVIČ, S. and KLJUČNIKOV, A. *Microenterprises and Significant Risk Factors in Loan Process*. Economics and Sociology, 9(1), 2016, 43-59. doi: 10.14254/2071-789X.2016/9-1/3.

[3] BELÁS, J. and GABČOVÁ, L. *The Relationship among Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty and Financial Performance of Commercial Banks*. E + M Ekonomie a Management, 19(1), 2016, 132-147. doi: 10.15240/tul/001/2016-1-010

[4] BENTO, A., BENTO, R. and WHITE, L. F. (2014). *Strategic Performance Management Systems: Impact on business results*. Journal of Computer Information Systems, 54(3), 25-33. doi:10.1080 /08874417.2014.11645701.

[5] Controller-Institut, Contrast Consulting Praha spol. s r.o. *Studie rozšířenosti BSC v ČR a Rakousku. 2003*. [online] [cit. 2006-11-01]. Available at www: http://www.balancedscorecard.cz/down/studie_rozsirenosti_BSC.pdf

[6] DOBROVIČ, J. and KORAUŠ, A. *Management Trends in Slovakia's Tax Revenue Administration and its Process Model for Slovakia's Economic Performance*. 12th International Scientific Conference on European Financial Systems 2015. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brne, 2015, 87-92.

[7] ESCHENBACH. R. *Controlling*.1. vydání. Praha: ASPI publishing, s.r.o., 2000, 816 pages. ISBN 80-85963-86-8.

[8] FRANCO-SANTOS, M., KENNERLEY, M., MICHELI, P., MARTINEZ, V., MASON, S., MARR, B., GRAY, D. and NEELY, A. *Towards a definition of a business performance measurement system*.. International Journal of Operations & Production Management 27, 2007, 784-801.

[9] FRANKOVSKÝ, M., ŠTEFKO, R. and BAUMGARTNER, F. *Behavioral-situational approach to examining social intelligence*. Studia psychologica, 48 (3), 2006, 251-257. Retrieved from: http://search.proquest.com/docview/220103058?accountid=49283

[10] GIBBONS, R. and KAPLAN, R. S. *Formal Measures in Informal Management: Can a Balanced Scorecard Change a Culture?* American Economic Review, 105 (5), 2015, 447-451. doi: 10.1257/aer.p20151073.

[11] GIMBERT, X., BISBE, J. and MENDOZA, X. *Measurement Systems in Strategy Formulation Processes*. Long Range Planning 43 (4), 2010, 477-497. doi:10.1016/j.lrp.2010.01.001.

[12] GLEICH, R. *Stichwort Performance Measurement*. DBW 1, 1997. 114-117.

[13] GLEICH, R. *Performance Measurement als Controllingaufgabe*. Controlling Forschritte. Verlag Valen, München, 2002.

[14] GÜNTHER, T. and GRÜNING, M. *Performance Measurement – Systeme in praktischen Einsatz – deskriptiver Auswertungsbericht*. Band 44/00 der Dresdner Beitrage zur Betriebswirtschaftslehre der TU Dresden, Dresden, 2001.

[15] CHENHALL, R. H. *Integrative strategic performance measurement systems, strategic alignment of manufacturing, learning and strategic outcomes: an exploratory study*. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 30 (5), 2005, 395-422. doi: 10.1016/j.aos.2004.08.001

[16] KAPLAN, R. S. and NORTON, D. P. *Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work*. Harvard Business Review, 1993, 4-17. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/1993/09/putting-the-balanced-scorecard-to-work

[17] KAPLAN, R. S. and NORTON, D. P. *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Harvard Business School University Press Boston, 1996, pp. 336.

[18] KORAUŠ, A., ŠTEFKO, R. and DOBROVIČ, J. *Acqusition Activity in Financial Sector*. 12th International Scientific Conference on European Financial Systems 2015. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brne, 2015, 277-286.

[19] KNÁPKOVÁ, A., HOMOLKA, L. and PAVELKOVÁ, D. *Utilization of Balanced Scorecard and the effect of its use on the Financial Performance of Companies in the Czech Republic*. E + M Ekonomie a Management, 17 (2), 2014, 146-160. doi: doi.dx.org/10.15240/tul/001/2014-2-011

[20] NEELY, A., GREGORY, M. and PLATTS, K. *Performance measurement system design: A literature review and research agenda.* International Journal of Operations & Production Management 15, 1995, 80–116.

[21] NEELY, A., MILLS, J., GREGORY, M., RICHARDS, H., PLATTS, K. and BOURNE, M. *Getting the Measure of Your Business*. Works Management, Cambridge, 1996.

[22] NEELY et al. *Performance measurement system design: developing and testing a process-based approach*. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 20 (10), 2000, 1119-1145.

[23] NEELY, A., ADAMS and CH., KENNERLEY, M. *The Performance Prism: The Scorecard for Measuring and Managing Business Success*. Financial Times Prentice Hall, 2002.

[24] NEELY, A. D. *Business performance measurement, unifying theories and integrating practice*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[25] NOVÁK, P. and POPESKO, B. *Cost Variability and Cost Behaviour in Manufacturing Enterprises*, Economics and Sociology. 7 (4), 2014, 89-103. doi: 10.14254/2071-789X.2014/7-4/6.

[26] POPESKO, B. *Aplikace procesního řízení nákladů v podmínkách českých organizací*. Dissertation. Zlín: UTB, FaME 2004.

[27] RAJNOHA, R., NOVÁK, P. and MERKOVÁ, M. *Relationships between Investment Effectiveness Controlling and Business Performance*. Montenegerin Journal of Economics, 12 (2), 2016, 29-44. doi: 10.14254/1800-5845.2016/12-1/1.

[28] REISS, M. *Mit Blut, Schweiss und Tränen zum schlanken Unternehmen*. gfmt (Hrsg.). Lean Strategie, München, 1992.

[29] SOLAŘ, J. and BARTOŠ, V. *Rozbor výkonnosti firmy*. Brno: Vysoké učení technické, 2003, ISBN 80-214-2515-6.

[30] STRACK, R. and VILLIS, U. *RAVE: Integrated Value Management for Customer, Human, Supplier and Invested Capital*. European Management Journal 20, 2002, 147-158.

[31] ŠTEFKO, R., SLUSARCZYK, B., KOT, S. and KOLMASIAK, C. *Transformation on Steel Products Distribution in Poland and Slovakia*. Metalurgija, 51 (1), 2012, 133-136.

[32] TANGEN, S. *Professional Practice: Performance measurement: from philosophy to practice*. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management 53, 2004, 726-737.

[33] TUČEK, D. HÁJKOVÁ and M., TUČKOVÁ, Z. *Utilization level of Business management in Czech enterprises – objectives and factors*. E + M Ekonomie a Management, 16 (2), 2013, 81-98.

[34] WULF, C.C. and HOBOKEN, N.J. *CFO insights : enabling high performance through leading practices for finance ERP*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006, pp. 290.

[35] YOUNG, S. D, and O´BYRNE, S. F. *EVA and Value-Based Management: A Practical Guide to Implementation*. McGraw Hill, New York, 2001.

[36] ZÁMEČNÍK, R. and RAJNOHA, R. *Strategic Business Performance Management on the Base of Controlling and Managerial Information Support*, 4th World Conference on Business, Economics and Management, WCBEM, Book Series: Procedia Economics and Finance, Publisher Elsevier, Vol. 26, 2015, 769-776. doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00843-6.

AUTHORS

Assoc. Prof. Roman Zámečník, PhD., Department of Economics and Management, STING ACADEMY, o.p.s., Stromovka 1, 637 00 Brno, Czech Republic, e-mail: zamecnik@sting.cz

Assoc. Prof. Rastislav Rajnoha, PhD., Department of Industrial Engineering and Information Systems, Faculty of Management and Economics, Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Nám. T. G. Masaryka 5555, 760 01 Zlín, Czech Republic, E-mail: rajnoha@fame.utb.cz