

IS THE BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING (BPR) PROVED ITSELF TO BE A TRUSTABLE CHANGE MANAGEMENT APPROACH FOR MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS? CASE STUDIES FROM THE LITERATURE

Dr. Aslı ERİM*
İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi
Meslek Yüksekokulu
Küçükyalı/İstanbul
aerim@iticu.edu.tr

Doç. Dr. Özalp VAYVAY
Marmara Üniversitesi
Mühendislik Fakültesi Endüstri Mühendisliği
Göztepe/ İstanbul
ozalp@marmara.edu.tr

Received: 01 MAY 2010, Accepted: 20 JULY 2010

ABSTRACT

We are in a century of change. The thought of “the only constant is change” implies this truth. Whatever the circumstances are, both organizations and managers need to keep up with these changes in order to survive and compete better. Increased competition and globalization compels most organizations to become innovative and adopt approaches based on change. In literature, there is an abundance of information available on organizational change. Researchers have written numerous articles, papers and books in this topic and they have several different approaches to how organizations should manage change. Knowing how to adopt and change successfully has become a critical and timeless challenge for any organization. Business Process Reengineering (BPR) is one of these most popular change management approaches which have attracted great attention in this world of change recently. Even though there have been successful and unsuccessful cases stated in the literature, BPR has been touted as a vital management tool in order to achieve dramatic improvements and organizational competitiveness by business circles if it is implemented properly and carefully. Within this context; in this study, BPR’s emergence as a management concept was looked over initially and several definitions of BPR in literature along with its principles and factors which make reengineering projects successful were also alluded. After that, multinational corporations Ford Motor, IBM Credit, Kodak and Mutual Benefit Life which have fruitfully put reengineering into practice, were analyzed; their experiences on reengineering were discussed. Finally, the conclusion places the findings of this study and outlines the benefits of BPR.

Key Words: Organizational Change, Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Multinationals

ÖZET

Çağımız bir değişim çağıdır. “Değişmeyen tek şey değişimdir” düşüncesi de bu gerçeğin ifadesi olarak düşünülebilir. Şartlar ne olursa olsun, gerek örgütler gerekse yöneticiler yaşamlarını sürdürebilmek ve daha iyi rekabet edebilmek için bu değişikliklere ayak uydurmak zorundadırlar. Literatürde örgütsel değişim hakkında sayısız bilgi bulunur. Araştırmacılar bu konuda çok sayıda makale, tebliğ ve kitap yazmıştır ve örgütlerin değişimi nasıl yöneteceğine dair çok sayıda farklı yaklaşımlar sunulmuştur. Adaptasyonu gerçekleştirmek ve başarı ile değişmek örgütler için kritik ve zaman açısından çok önemlidir. Süreçlerin yeniden yapılanması, bu değişim dünyasında son zamanlarda oldukça dikkat çeken en popüler değişim yönetimi yaklaşımlarından birisidir. Küreselleşme ve artan rekabet pek çok organizasyonu yaratıcı ve yenilikçi olmaya ve değişime dayalı yaklaşımlar benimsemeye zorlamaktadır. Literatürde başarılı ve başarısız örnekleri görülse de; süreçlerin yeniden yapılanması iş çevrelerince doğru ve dikkatli uygulandığında dramatik gelişme ve organizasyonel rekabet avantajı elde etmeyi sağlayan çok önemli bir yönetim aracı olarak görülmektedir. Bu çerçevede, konuyu iyice kavrayabilmek için öncelikle süreçlerin yeniden yapılanmanın bir yönetim kavramı olarak ortaya çıkışı incelenmiş ve literatürde yer alan yeniden yapılanma tanımları ile birlikte; prensipleri, Yeniden Yapılanma projelerini başarıya ulaştıran başarı faktörlerine değinilmiştir. Süreçlerin yeniden yapılanması uygulamasını başarıyla gerçekleştirmiş çokuluslu şirketlerden Ford Motor, IBM Credit, Kodak ve Mutual Benefit Life analiz edilmiş; süreçlerin yeniden yapılanması ile ilgili deneyimleri tartışılmıştır. En sonda, yeniden yapılanmanın faydaları ve çalışmanın bulguları sonuç kısmında yer almıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel değişim, Süreçlerin Yeniden Yapılanması, Çokuluslu Şirketler, Değişim Mühendisliği

* Sorumlu Yazar

1. INTRODUCTION

If anything has remained constant in the history of organizations, it has been change. The first decade of the new millennium has been forecasted to be a period of tremendous change in the workplace [1]. For decades, organizational change has been the domain of many disciplines such as management, organizational development and organizational behavior; researchers and practitioners have written numerous articles, papers and books about organizational change and they establish several different approaches to how organizations should manage change successfully. Although organizational change is well documented in literature, there is always more to search and discover about change.

There are multitudinous definitions of the word “change”. Traditionally, it has been viewed as actions taken by organizations to alter their internal characteristics for better fit with their external environment [2]. Additionally, several studies suggested that changes in the environment tend to result in some forms of change in an organization [3].

In today’s business world, technology, competition, consumer demands, workforce, working conditions are all changing; values toward work have also changed. Organizational change occurs because of so many reasons; it can be external as well as internal. Organizations can’t stay stable. Because of increasingly dynamic environments, organizations are continually confronted with the need to implement changes in strategy, structure, process and culture as organizations are finding that existing organizational forms are not sufficient to meet these challenges [4]. There are many strategies and tools that organizations can choose from in order to manage change successfully, but it is well established in literature that the key to success in contemporary organization development is basically found in the nature of the fundamental attitudes, feelings and actions generated by the managerial leader [5].

During the past years, as a management concept, business process reengineering (BPR) has gained considerable attention in the world of change management. Because BPR has been touted as a vital management tool in order to achieve dramatic improvements and organizational competitiveness by business circles if it is implemented properly and carefully and also to re-invent themselves to achieve performance improvements within this continually changing business world and marketplace. It involves reinventing processes by abolishing the old ones and finding imaginative ways of accomplishing work while designing completely and radically new processes. In the 1990’s Michael Hammer and James Champy introduced their book “Reengineering the Corporation” emphasizing the need for organizational change and gave birth to this new term: Business

Process Reengineering [6]. In a global economy that competes on knowledge and time, organizations have been embarking on business process reengineering as a way of removing insufficiencies or sharpening their strategic edge [7]. Many firms engaged in business process reengineering projects reported success in cost saving, quality breakthrough, better customer services, time reduction and revenue increases [8].

Although BPR is a relatively new management concept, there are numerous definitions made by different academic scholars and practitioners in the literature. According to Lindsay et al., BPR is a management tool, in which business processes are examined and redesigned to improve cost efficiency and service effectiveness [9]. The principal aim of BPR is to design techniques to allow simulate and check different sets of processes that could improve its own organization [10]. In the view of Doornik and Jungum, BPR is an organizational initiative to fundamentally re-examine and redesign business processes with the objectives of achieving competitive breakthrough in quality, responsiveness, cost, satisfaction and other critical process performance measures [11]. Within all the above definitions, especially within the definition of Michael Hammer and James Champy, the pioneers of BPR, four key concepts can be introduced as fundamental, radical, and dramatic and processes.

Fundamental: Reengineering begins with no assumptions, and the most fundamental questions about the companies, and how they operate, need to be asked. So it can be said that, by fundamental, authors mean that businesspeople must ask themselves the basic questions about the way their company do business such as: why do we do what we do? And why we do it the way we do? For instance, the current practice of having separate departments performing their respective functions is the traditional way of operating a health care facility. Can this compartmentalization be reduced? [12]. By asking these fundamental questions, companies can judge the way they operate and this consequently leads to rules turning out to be obsolete, erroneous and unsuitable. As a result, companies undertake reengineering initiatives to change the obsolete way of conducting business and start from scratch [6].

Radical: Radical redesign of business process means getting the root of things, not improving existing processes or procedures, not making superficial changes. According to Hammer, radical redesign means disregarding all existing structures and procedures and inventing completely new ways of accomplishing work [6].

Dramatic: Reengineering is not about making small step improvements but accomplishing giant increases in performance. For example, if a company’s customer

Is the Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Proved Itself to Be a Trustable Change Management Approach or Multinational Corporations? Case Studies from the Literature

service speed falls % 10 behind it's competitors or if a company's products or services need % 10 improvement in quality and etc. this company doesn't need to be reengineered. Reengineering should only bring in when a need exists for large demolishing. Making dramatic improvements require demolishing the old ways of doing business and displace with something which is entirely new [6].

Processes: Process orientation is considered as being the most important aspect of business process reengineering. We can define a process as a set of linked activities that take an input and transform it to create an output. Ideally, the transformation that occurs in the process should add value to the input and create an output that is more useful and effective to the recipient either upstream or downstream. Reengineering must focus on redesigning fundamental business processes and not on departments or other organizational units. A core business process "creates" value by the capabilities it gives the company for competitiveness. Core business processes are valued by the customer, the shareholder and are critical to get right [6]. BPR involves reengineering processes to achieve radical improvements in cost, time, responsiveness, performance, quality, etc. and these reengineered processes should provide the company with dramatic improvements in cost, response time, and performance, as well as reflecting the company's overall strategy [13].

2. PRINCIPLES OF BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING

Organize around processes and outcomes, not tasks: Reengineering the system enables assigning the responsibility of an entire process to a single person and designing that person's job around an objective or outcome, such as a complete process, instead of one of the tasks necessary to complete the process.

Treat geographically dispersed resources as though they were centralized: Centralization of operations allows companies to achieve economies of scale while decentralization of operations gives companies the chance to be more responsive and speedy to their target market and provide better service and products. Today with the advances in current technology, companies can take the advantage of both approaches: Corporate – wide databases centralizes data and telecommunications technology disperses it.

Capture data once and at its source: Most companies have many different information systems such as an accounting system, a management information system, a marketing system, a production system, a finance system etc. which retrieves, collects, enters and processes some of the same information. This is not only inefficient and expensive but also poses redundancy in data which often contains

inconsistencies. Today in this age of technological advances, it is possible to capture data once at its source, enter and store it in databases and make the data available to all who need it. For instance, bar coding and Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) make it easy to collect, store and transmit information.

Subsume information - processing work into the real work that produces the information: This principle suggests that people who produce the information should also process it. Doing as this principle states, will allow companies reduce their time delays, errors and help them work more effectively and efficiently. In the past, we could see examples of companies which set up departments that are separate from other departments and just process information that are produced by other departments.

Have those who use the output of the process, perform the process: Organizations are composed of discrete departments each operates specific processes. Each department performs its specific type of work and transmits its finished work to another department. This way of doing business works but it is a slow and bureaucratic process. This principle states that people who use information from the system should be those who perform the process that produces that information.

Put the decision point where the work is performed and build control into the process: Most organizations have a hierarchical structure with one or more levels of management which supervises, directs and controls those below them. In those kinds of organizations, people who perform the work are set apart from people who make the decisions and control the work performed. In this hierarchical management structure employees who perform the work don't take part in making decisions and controlling. This principle states that employees who perform the work should also take role in decision making and control mechanisms associated with the work and therefore, organizations should be flattened. Nowadays, increasing number of organizations have realized that empowering employees and assigning them decision making responsibilities leads to higher quality product and service, faster responses to problems, and fewer levels of management. Expert systems and other newly developed information technology helps workers make correct decisions and avoid mistakes by providing them knowledge.

Link parallel activities instead of integrating their results: This principle claims that instead of integrating tasks after they are finished, connections should be formed between parallel functions, teams and coordination should be established while their tasks are being done [16].

3. COMPANIES IN NEED FOR BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING

According to Hammer and Champy there are three possible situations that a company takes on reengineering: Firstly, the company may be in a desperate situation. For instance, the company's costs may be higher than the competitors or than the one the business model allows. The customer service it provides may not be good enough and may not appeal to the customers in the market. The products the company offers may have a product failure rate higher than the competitors'. In other words, if the company needs dramatic improvement to survive, it needs reengineering [14]. Secondly, the company may be doing quite well, but management may anticipate and expect some serious and threatening problems or competition in the near future. Finally, the company may be doing well and being in a peak condition, but the ambitious and challenging management may want to do better and make it more difficult for others to enter into the competition [15].

4. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS FOR BPR

Drive from top: Top management should be committed to the Business Process Reengineering Project and should be willing to express that commitment across the enterprise. Especially if a significant portion of the enterprise is to be reengineered then this commitment must come from the very top. The support, energy and drive of top management must also be sustained over a long period to ensure things actually done.

Communication: In condition of a reengineering process the necessity and gaining's of such an improvement and change should be communicated clearly to the employees and across the organization even if job losses are likely to happen.

Treat people fairly and with respect: Management, in particular must set a clear example that manners, common courtesy and respect should not be left at home but should brought into work as well.

Ensure that right sponsor is chosen: Choosing the right sponsor for the reengineering initiative is one of the momentous factors for the success of BPR. A good sponsor can not succeed alone but a poor sponsor can kill BPR single handed very quickly. Best leaders recognize their own failings and recruit others to complement and challenge their skills and abilities.

Be clear about the purpose of the redesign: The vision set should be clear and reengineering initiative and purpose should be consistent with this vision. Customer requirements, patterns of demand, constraints and efficiency targets should all be analyzed and understood with the process

reengineering initiative targeted firmly on delivering performance improvements in performance to these.

Match the scale and scope of the project to the ambitions of the initiative: One of the guidelines for the success of BPR is the consistency between the expectations of the BPR project and its scale and scope. If a single department in a company is to be reengineered, this will have an effect on the performance of that department and the departments it deals with, but can not have the same effect as a company wide initiative. That's why, if management looks for company-wide improvements which will effect company's overall performance, it should focus on core processes which the company conducts its main business.

Set aggressive re-engineering performance targets: Establishing performance standards and targets and conducting the reengineering efforts to achieve these targets are keys to accomplish radical and dramatic performance improvements. Taken this into account, particular care must be taken in constructing a performance measurement system.

Understand the context of the process being redesigned: BPR, like other philosophies, must be undertaken within the context of the particular firm.

Treat BPR as a holistic philosophy: Organizations are composed of interdependent elements. Changing one in isolation is unlikely to produce the required results and may have adverse effects on other elements. That's why successful BPR requires action on a broad front.

Aim for some quick hits: Early demonstrable successes will help overcome resistance, build momentum and a 'can do' attitude and make people confident in their abilities. These 'quick hits', however, should be recognized for what they are and companies must then go on, often through a lot of pain, to achieve the longer term goals.

Ensure that processes match the needs of the markets they are to serve: The starting point of most reengineering initiatives is markets. Companies direct their reengineering efforts by considering the needs and requirements of the markets they aim at. That's why the importance of a 'match' between the market needs and the processes that are to serve them is paramount.

Involve customers and suppliers in the redesign process as appropriate: Customers and suppliers should be involved in the BPR program, especially where the process has direct relevance for them. They can give valuable insights and suggest ways in which the process could be redesigned. This may also prove useful in cultivating a closer relationship and have a

Is the Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Proved Itself to Be a Trustable Change Management Approach or Multinational Corporations? Case Studies from the Literature

positive effect on the volume of business conducted with the customer.

Dedicate resources to the project: Consultants and academics can help, support and encourage the reengineering process. If BPR is important it is worth the investment of these people's talents full time.

Recognize that IT provides opportunities for new designs: Information Technology (IT) can be a key enabler of BPR and that's why organizations must constantly evaluate how both old and new technology can be used.

Recognize that BPR may be just the beginning: In this highly competitive and challenging marketplace, organizations should continually try to renew themselves in order to surpass their competitors. For this reason, we can say that new process design is not an end, but another beginning [16].

5. BPR CASE STUDIES FROM LITERATURE

5.1. FORD-MOTOR COMPANY

In the early 1980's, Ford, like many other American corporations was exploring for ways to reduce overhead and administrative costs. One of the places Ford believed it could lower costs was in its accounts payable department, the organization that paid the bills submitted by Ford's suppliers [6]. At that time, accounts payable in North America alone employed more than 500 people. Ford's management thought that by automating the existing process and by using computers the head-count could be reduced by % 20. Ford was enthusiastic about its plan to tighten accounts payable until it looked at Mazda. While Ford was aspiring to a 400-person department, Mazda's account payable organization consisted of a total of 5 people. The difference in absolute numbers was astounding and even after adjusting for Mazda's smaller size, Ford figured that its accounts payable organization was five times the size it should be. Ford managers set up their goal: accounts payable would perform with not just a hundred but many hundreds fewer clerks. It then set out to achieve it. First, managers scrutinized the existing system. Accounts payable can not be reengineered, because it is not a process, but a department. The process that Ford redesigned was not "accounts payable" but "procurement" [17]. Ford's old parts acquisition process was rather conventional. It began with the purchasing sending a purchase order to a vendor, with a copy going to accounts payable. When the goods were arrived at Ford, "material control" filled a form describing the goods and sent it to accounts payable. The vendor, meanwhile, sent accounts payable an invoice. At this point, it was accounts payable duty to match the purchase order with the receiving document and the invoice. If these all three documents matched, the department made payment [6]. If they were any

incompatibilities between purchase orders, receiving document and invoice they payment was held. In case of such discrepancies the department had to spend a big portion of its time to figure out them. In these cases, an accounts payable clerk would investigate the discrepancy, hold up payment, generate documents and all in all gum up the works. One way to improve things was determined as hindering the discrepancies in the first place. In order to attain this, Ford put "invoiceless processing" in practice. Now, accounts payable clerks do not have to match purchase order with invoice with receiving document, primarily because the new process eliminates the invoice entirely [17]. Now, in this new process when a buyer in the purchasing department places a purchase order to a vendor, that buyer simultaneously enters the order into an on-line database. Vendors like before send the goods to material control. When they arrive responsible person in the material control checks a computer terminal to see the received shipment matches with an outstanding purchase order in the database. There are two chances: It does or it does not. If it does, the clerk at "material control" accepts the goods and pushes a button on the terminal keyboard that tells the database that the goods have arrived. Receipt of the goods is now saved in the database, and the computer will automatically issue and send a check to the vendor at the suitable time. On the other hand, if the goods arrived do not match with the outstanding purchase order in the database, the clerk at "material control" will refuse shipment and send it back to the vendor [6]. As it can be seen from the application, Ford made a radical change and attained dramatic improvement. By this way, Ford has achieved a % 75 reduction in head count, not the % 20 it would have gotten with a conventional program. Also, since there are no incompatibilities between the financial record and the physical record, material control is easier and financial information is more precise and correct [17].

5.2. IBM CREDIT

IBM Credit is in the business of financing the computers, software, and services that IBM Corporation sells. The IBM Credit's operation comprises of five steps as follows: (1) When an IBM field sales representative called in with a request for financing, one of the operators taking the call in the central office wrote down the request on a piece of paper. (2) The request was then dispatched to the credit department where a specialist checked the potential borrower's creditworthiness by entering information into a computer system wrote the result on the piece of paper and dispatched to the next link in the chain, which was the business practices department. (3) The business practices department was in charge of modifying the standard loan covenant in response to customer request. When this task was completed, the special terms to the request form were attached to the request if necessary. (4) Next, the

request went to the price department where a pricer determined the appropriate interest rate to charge the customer. (5) Finally, the administration department turned all this information into a quote letter that could be delivered to the field sales representative by Federal Express, air cargo company. This entire process was taken six days on average. From the sales representative's point of view, this turnaround was too long that another computer vendor could possibly attract the customer. Furthermore, when the sales representative called to learn the status of the deal no one could tell where the request was and when it could be done. To improve this process, IBM Credit tried several fixes. They decided, for instance, to install a control desk, so they could answer the sale representative's question about the status of the request. That is, instead of forwarding the request to the next step in the chain, each department would return the request to the control desk where an administrator logged the completion of each step before sending out the request again. This fix did indeed solve the problem, however, at the expense of adding more time to the turnaround [6]. Eventually, two senior managers at IBM Credit took a request and walked themselves through all five steps. They figured out that performing the actual work took only ninety minutes in total. Clearly, the problem did not lie in the tasks and the people performing them, but in the structure of the process itself. As a result, the management decided to re-engineer the overall credit issuance process. In the end, IBM Credit replaced its specialists - the credit checkers, pricers and so on - with generalists. Now, instead of sending an application form from one office to another, a generalist would process the entire request from beginning to end. How could one generalist replace four specialists? The old process design was, in fact, found on a deeply held assumption: that every bid request was unique and difficult to process, thereby requiring the intervention of four highly trained specialists. In fact, this assumption was false; most requests were simple and straight forward: finding a credit rating in a database, plugging numbers into a standard model, and pulling clauses from a file. These tasks fall well within the capability of a single individual when he or she is supported by an easy-to-use computer system, therefore, IBM Credit developed a new, sophisticated computer system to support the generalists. In most situations, the system provides guidance and data to all generalists. In really tough situations, he or she can get help from a small pool of real specialists who are assigned to work in the same team. The new turnaround becomes four hours instead of six days. The company achieved a dramatic performance breakthrough by making a radical change to the process - i.e. the definition of reengineering [6].

5.3. KODAK

Another example of re-engineering was executed in the production development process of Kodak in

response to a competitive challenge. In 1987, Kodak has no competitive offering against Fuji's newly announced 35 mm single use camera which the customer purchases loaded with film, uses once, and then returns to the manufacturer, who processes the film and breaks down the camera into parts for reuse. Kodak's traditional product design process would have taken seventy weeks to produce a rival to Fuji's camera. Such a time delay would have handed Fuji an enormous head start and advantage in a new market. To cut its time -to- market, Kodak decided to re-engineer its product development process. Kodak's old product development process was partly sequential and partly parallel, but entirely slow. At Kodak, the manufacturing engineers could begin their work only after twenty eight weeks the product designers had started. Kodak reengineered its product development process through the innovative use of a technology called computer aided design/computer aided manufacturing (CAD /CAM). With this technology, managers take the advantage of being able to design at computer workstations instead of drafting tables which have made them more productive in the end. The technology that has enabled Kodak to reengineer its process is an integrated product design database. Each day, each engineers' work is collected by the database and combined into a coherent whole. After that, design groups and individuals inspect the database to see whether someone else's work from previous day has created a problem for them and for the overall design. If so, the problem is resolved immediately, instead of after weeks or months of wasted work. Moreover, this technology allows manufacturing engineers to switch from their tooling design into the development process in no time lost, after some shape has given the first prototype by product designers. Furthermore, because the reengineered process allows tooling designers to participate before the product design is finished, their expertise can be utilized to create a design that is more easily and inexpensively manufactured [6].

5.4. MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE

Mutual Benefit Life (MBL) is an insurance company which reengineered its processing of insurance applications. Before reengineering, MBL handled customers' applications as its competitors did. The long, multi step process involved credit checking, quoting, rating, underwriting, and so on. An application would have to go through as many as 30 different steps, reaching 5 departments and including 19 people. At the very best, MBL could process an application in 24 hours, but in reality it was taking 5 days to 25 days, since most of the time was being spent in forwarding the necessary information from one department to another. Since the MBL's rigid, sequential process led to many applications the president of MBL decided that an improvement in customer was needed and demanded a %60 improvement in productivity. The management team

Is the Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Proved Itself to Be a Trustable Change Management Approach or Multinational Corporations? Case Studies from the Literature

authorized to executing the reengineering effort realized that shared databases and computer networks could make many different kinds of information available to a single person, while expert systems could help people with limited experience make correct decisions. MBL gave up existing job definitions and departmental boundaries and created a new position called a case manager. Case managers work autonomously and have total liability for an application from the time it is received to the time a policy is issued. Because they are supported by powerful PC (Personal Computer) based workstations that run an expert system they are able to perform all the tasks related with an insurance application. MBL reaped the benefits of assigning individuals to an entire process and empowering them to process the whole applications. MBL can now consummate an application in as little as four hours and average turnaround takes only two to five days. The company has eliminated 100 field office positions and case managers can handle more than twice the volume of new applications the company previously could process [17].

6. DISCUSSIONS AND EVALUATIONS

Based on the literature and sample case studies presented in this study, it can be established that BPR is an effective management approach adopted and applied widely by many multi national companies and can have very successful results if it is implemented properly and carefully. The important point that needs to be highlighted is that BPR is not a simple approach to attain and it can be a congruent solution for a company only if it is implemented successfully and ambitiously after a well designed plan. The current position and existing process/structure needs to be analyzed carefully. The problems should be addressed clearly. Before designing the new process, the new objectives and its scope must be addressed carefully. It can be pointed out that BPR is a team work, because it involves many people in different departments in the organization. Besides proper and careful implementation, there are also some other factors that play a significant role in the success of BPR projects. For example, if top management does not provide strong and consistent support in terms of capital, resources, or leadership over the life of the project, this weakens the BPR projects chance for success. Top management should also ensure constant control over the BPR projects to monitor how things are actually proceeding and to take action before any difficulty arises. Also, expressing the need for change and benefits that will be gained through reengineering before the implementation of reengineering project, helps employees have a thorough knowledge of the project, comprehend the necessity of change and as a result diminishes the resistance likely to come from employees. It was seen that IT is a major enabler and an essential element of most BPR projects and can

give companies a competitive advantage by improving their competitive position. Corporations need to position their customer to the center. Consequently, every reengineering effort should be directed to fulfill the needs and wants of customers in target markets. In addition to the above mentioned success factors, for BPR projects to be successful it is also important that they are conducted in accordance with the company's overall strategy. Every department can use this tool efficiently and effectively as long as it is well planned.

In today's global business world, multinational corporations are on the edge of learning how they can gain competitive advantage by integrating their geographically dispersed competencies, arbitrating comparative cost advantages, leveraging their strengths and avoiding dangers of economic exposure, therefore, BPR can be presented as a trustable change management approach for multinational corporations in this decade.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Gordon, S. S., Stewart, W. H., Sweo, Jr., R. and Luker, W. A., "Convergence Versus Strategic Reorientation: The Antecedents of Fast-Paced Organizational Change", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, No. 5, 911-945, 2000.
- [2] Mohrman, S. A., Mohrman, A. M. Jr, Ledford, G. E., "Large-scale Organizational Change", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 1989.
- [3] Zajac, E. J., Kraatz, M. S. and Bresser, R. K. F., "Modeling the Dynamics of Strategic Fit: A Normative Approach to Strategic Change", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 429-453, 2000.
- [4] Reeves-Ellington, R., "Organizing for Organizational Effectiveness: Ethnicity and Organizations", *Human Organization*, Vol. 53, 249-263, 1995.
- [5] Darling, J. R. and Heller, V. L., "Organization Development in an Era of Socioeconomic Change: A Focus on the Key to Successful Management Leadership", *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 27, No.2, 2009.
- [6] Hammer, M. and Champy, J., "Reengineering the Corporation - A Manifesto for Business Revolution", Harper Business, New York, USA, 35-49, 2001.
- [7] Sia, S. K. and Neo, B. S., "Business Process Engineering, Empowerment and Work Monitoring: An Empirical Analysis through the Panopticon", *Business Process Management*, Vol.14, No.5, 609-628, 2008.
- [8] Lee, Y., Chu, P. and Tseng, H., "Exploring the Relationships between Information Technology Adoption and Business Process Reengineering",

Is the Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Proved Itself to Be a Trustable Change Management Approach or Multinational Corporations? Case Studies from the Literature

Journal of Management and Organization, Vol.15, 170-185, 2009.

[9] Lindsay, A., Downs, D. and Lunn, K., "Business Processes- Attempts to Find a Definition", *Information and Software Technology*, Vol. 45, 1015-1019, 2003.

[10] Alera, R., Borrajo, D., Camachoa, D. and Sierra-Alonsob, A., "A knowledge-based Approach for Business Process Reengineering", *Knowledge-Based Systems*, Vol. 15, 473-483, 2002.

[11] Doomun, R. and Jungum, N. V., "Business Process Modelling, Simulation and Reengineering: Call Centers", *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol.14, No.6, 838-848, 2008.

[12] Stahl, D.A., "Reengineering: The Key to Survival and Growth under PPS", *Nursing Management*, Vol.29, No.4, 162, 1998.

[13] Browne, J. and O'Sullivan, D., "Reengineering the Enterprise", Cahpman & Hall, Galway, Ireland, 132-133, 1995.

[14] O'Neil, P. and Sohal, A., "Business Process Reengineering- A Review of Recent Literature" *Technovation*, 574, 1999.

[15] Chan, L. C. and Choi, C., "A Conceptual and Analytical Framework for Business Process Reengineering", *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol.50, 212-214, 1997.

[16] Peppard, J. and Rowland, P., "The Essence of Business Process Re-engineering", Prentice Hall, London, England, 237-244, 1995.

[17] Compiled by the Staff of the Institute of Industrial Engineers, "BPR: Business Process Re-engineering Current Issues and Applications", Institution of Industrial Engineers, Industrial Engineering and Management Press, Norcross, Georgia, 26-27,1993.

Dr. Aslı Erim

Aslı Erim, completed her MBA in Pace University, New York and earned her Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior in Marmara University. She is currently the Chairman of the Aviation Logistics Program in Istanbul Commerce University, teaching OB, Management and Human Resource Management. Her current research interest includes organizational change, change management, work family conflict, organizational reputation and communication.

Doç. Dr. Özalp Vayvay

Özalp Vayvay, Ph.D., is working of Industrial Engineering Department at Marmara University. He is

currently the Chairman of the Engineering Management Department at Marmara University. His current research interests include supply chain management, technology & innovation management, business process reengineering, operations management. Dr. Vayvay has been involved in R&D projects and education programs for an over the past 10 years.