

ISSN 1727-8766

& Problems Perspectives in Management



Volume 1, Issue #1, 2003

Editorial Office Contact Form

Send request to Editorial Office

Editor(s)-in-Chief

[Nada Korac Kakabadse](#) [CONTACT](#)



[Serhiy Kozmenko](#) [CONTACT](#) [id](#)

Section Editors

[Ola Honningdal Grytten](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Grigorios L. Kyriakopoulos](#) [id](#)

[Thurasamy Ramayah](#) [id](#) [R](#)

Editorial Board

[Ilias \(Elias\) Asproudis](#) [id](#)

[Lotfi Belkhir](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Olena Bilovodska](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Ghassen Bouslama](#) [id](#)

[Martin Cepel](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[H. Gin Chong](#) [id](#)

[Christine Cooper](#) [id](#)

[Patricio Ramírez Correa](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Yuriy Danko](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Massimo Franco](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Mariola Grzebyk](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Rudrarup Gupta](#) [id](#)

[Józef Antoni Haber](#) [id](#)

[Md. Mamun Habib](#) [id](#)

[Jokull Johannesson](#)

[Oleksandra Karintseva](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Nadeem Khan](#) [id](#)

[Pierre Kletz](#)

[Anatoliy Kolot](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Tamas Koltai](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Serhii Kozlovskyi](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Kurt Matzler](#) [id](#)

[Grzegorz Michalski](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Ladislav Mura](#) [id](#)

[Linda L. Neider](#) [id](#)

[Jelena Petrovic](#) [id](#)

[Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli](#) [id](#)

[Olha Prokopenko](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Danica Purg](#) [id](#) [R](#)

[Vichayanan Rattanawiboonsom](#)

[Robert W. \(Bill\) Service](#)

[Lukasz Sulkowski](#) [id](#)

[Vlad Vaiman](#) [id](#)

[Quan-Hoang Vuong](#)  

[Kuo-Jui Wu](#)  

[Alina M. Zapalska](#)

Editor(s)-in-Chief



Nada Korac Kakabadse 

Ph.D., Professor of Policy, Governance and Ethics and the Head of School, Marketing and Reputation at the Henley Business School, University of Reading, UK.



Serhiy Kozmenko 

Dr., Professor, Institute of Management, University of Social Sciences, Lodz, Poland.

Section Editors



Ola Honningdal Grytten  

Dr., Professor, Norwegian School of Economics, Special Adviser in Norwegian Central Bank, Norway (sphere of professional interests: crises economics, economic history (including macroeconomic history, financial history, business history)).



Grigorios L. Kyriakopoulos 


Dr., Ph.D., MEng Chemical Engineer, MA Economist, MSc Environmentalist, BA Hellenic Civilization, Teaching and Research Associate - School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, Greece (sphere of professional interests: human resource management, business administration, education, culture, extroversion and internationalization of SMEs, urban and regional development, waste management from organic pollutants, forest resource management, renewable energy sources).




Thurasamy Ramayah  

Associate Professor, Technology Management Lab, Operations Management Section, School of Management, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia (sphere of professional interests: information and uncertainty, econometric and statistical methods in management, technological changes management and economic development management).

Editorial Board



Ilias (Elias) Asproudis 

Dr., Lecturer in Economics, Department of Economics, School of Management, University of Swansea, UK.



Lotfi Belkhir  

Ph.D., Associate Professor, W. Booth School of Engineering Practice & Technology, McMaster University, Canada.




Olena Bilovodska  

Doctor of Economics, Professor of Department of International Economics and Marketing, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine.



Ghassen Bouzlama 

Associate Professor of Finance, NEOMA Business School, France.



Martin Cepel  

Dr., Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing, Pan-European University in Prague, Czech Republic; Faculty of Economics and Entrepreneurship, Pan-European University in Bratislava, Slovakia.



H. Gin Chong 

Ph.D., Dr., Professor of Accounting, Department of Accounting, Finance and MIS, College of Business, Prairie View A& University, USA.



Christine Cooper 

Professor, Ph.D., MSc, BA (Hons), University of Edinburgh, UK.



Patricio Ramírez Correa  

Ph.D. in Business (Seville), Associate Professor of the School of Engineering of Catholic University of the North, Chile.



Yuriy Danko  

Doctor of Economics, Professor of Department of Statistics, Economic Analysis and Marketing, Vice-rector on scientific of Sumy National Agrarian University, Ukraine.



Massimo Franco  

Professor in Organization and Management, Department of Political Science, University Federico II of Naples, Italy.



Mariola Grzebyk  

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of the Department of Economics and Management, Institute of Economics and Finance, University of Rzeszów, Poland.



Rudrarup Gupta 

Ph.D., Academic Researcher in Management from Kolkata, India. Commercial Manager, Multifarious Projects Group, Kolkata, India.



Józef Antoni Haber 

Dr., Professor at the WSB University in Poznań, Faculty in Chorzów; Hon. Prof. Multi Dr h.c. Multi; International expert i international relations, global economy, international management, and ecological security; practical experience in busi management, Poland.

[Scopus Author ID](#)



Md. Mamun Habib 

Dr., Professor, School of Business & Entrepreneurship (SBE), Independent University, Bangladesh; Visiting Scientist, Department of Industrial Engineering of University of Texas, USA; Visiting Professor at Unirazak, Malaysia and UCSI, Malaysia, PUP, Philippines.



Jokull Johannesson


Dr., Professor Strategy, Institute of Leadership and Strategy, School of Business and Law, University of Agder, Norway.



Oleksandra Karintseva  

Doctor in Economics, Professor, Head of the Department of Economics, Entrepreneurship and Business Administration Sumy State University, Ukraine.



Nadeem Khan 

Dr., Lecturer in Governance, Policy & Leadership, Programme Director of the MA Board, Practice and Directorship, Her Business School, University of Reading, UK.



Pierre Kletz

Professor, Chair, Department of Public Policy & Administration, Director, Mandel Social Leadership MBA Program, Gu Glazer Faculty of Business & Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel.



Anatoliy Kolot  

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Vice-rector on scientific and pedagogical work of State Higher Education Institution "TI Kyiv national economic university named after Vadym Hetman", member of Expert Board of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.



Tamas Koltai  

Dr., Professor of Production and Operations Management, Department of Management and Corporate Economics, Buc University of Technology and Economics, Hungary.



Serhii Kozlovskyi  

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Department of Entrepreneurship, Corporate and Spatial Economics of Vasyl' Stus Dor National University, Ukraine.



Kurt Matzler 

Professor of Strategic Management, University of Innsbruck, Austria.



Grzegorz Michalski  

Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Corporate Finance and Value Management, Finance Management Institute, Faculty of Management, Computer Science and Finance, Wroclaw University of Economics, Poland.



Ladislav Mura 

Doc. Mgr. Ing., Ph.D., Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics, Selye Janos University, Slovakia.



Linda L. Neider 

Ph.D., Professor and Department Chair, Department of Management, Director, M.S. Program in Leadership, Miami Sch Business, University of Miami, USA.



Jelena Petrovic 

Dr., Associate Professor, Director of Postgraduate HRM and Management programmes, Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, Kingston Business School, Kingston University London, UK.



Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli 

Ph.D., Associate Professor in Innovation Management, co-founder of the Innovation Management Group, Polytechnic University of Bari, Italy.



Olha Prokopenko  

Ph.D., Professor at the Marketing and Entrepreneurship Department, University of Bielsko-Biala; Business Project Coordinator at Merrit Group, Poland.



Danica Purg  

Professor, President of the IEDC-Bled School of Management, Slovenia.



Vichayanan Rattanawiboonsom

Ph.D., Senior Lecturer in Management Science (Operations and Logistics management), Faculty of Business, Economics and Communications, Naresuan University, Thailand.



Robert W. (Bill) Service

Ph.D., Professor of Management, and Leadership, Brock School of Business Samford University, USA.



Lukasz Sulkowski 

Dr., Professor, Department of Management of Higher Education Institutions, Faculty of Management, Jagiellonian University in Cracow, Poland.



Vlad Vaiman 


Dr., Professor of International Management, School of Management, California Lutheran University, USA.



Radka Vaníčková 

Dr., Assistant Professor, Faculty of Corporate Strategy, Department of Management, Institute of Technology and Business in Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic.



Quan-Hoang Vuong  

Ph.D., Phenikaa University, Vietnam, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium.



Kuo-Jui Wu  

Ph.D., Associate Professor, Dalian University of Technology, China.



Alina M. Zapalska

Tenured Professor of Economics, Department of Management, U.S. Coast Guard Academy, USA.

Issue #3 (Volume 16 2018)

OVERVIEW

KEYWORDS

Released September 27, 2018

Articles 40

130 Authors

206 Tables

91 Figures

Articles 40




Reengineering support for competitive advantage through organizational basis, information and communication technology: a literature review

Agus Riyanto  , Ina Primiana, Yunizar, Yudi Azis 

doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.37](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.37)

Problems and Perspectives in Management Volume 16, 2018 Issue #3 pp. 464-476
Views: 1130 Downloads: 563 [TO CITE](#) АНОТАЦІЯ

Monitoring of process performance by means of financial indicators

Renáta Turisová , Michal Tkáč , Miloš Pachta 

doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.38](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.38)

Problems and Perspectives in Management Volume 16, 2018 Issue #3 pp. 477-487
Views: 695 Downloads: 86 [TO CITE](#) АНОТАЦІЯ

Use of methods of operational cost management in the planning and accounting organization at the enterprises in Ukraine

Yuriy Pogorelov  , Ganna Kozachenko  , Ievgen Ovcharenko  , Olena Illiashenko  

doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.39](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.39)

Problems and Perspectives in Management Volume 16, 2018 Issue #3 pp. 488-500
Views: 947 Downloads: 213 [TO CITE](#) АНОТАЦІЯ

Autonomy of the system of higher education in the conditions of integration of Ukraine into the European educational area

Olena Rayevnyeva  , Kostyantyn Stryzhychenko  

doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.40](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.40)

Problems and Perspectives in Management Volume 16, 2018 Issue #3 pp. 501-510
Views: 728 Downloads: 101 [TO CITE](#) АНОТАЦІЯ

“Reengineering support for competitive advantage through organizational basis, information and communication technology: a literature review”

Agus Riyanto  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1781-7573>

 <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/R-6500-2018>

AUTHORS

Ina Primiana
Yunizar
Yudi Azis

ARTICLE INFO

Agus Riyanto, Ina Primiana, Yunizar and Yudi Azis (2018). Reengineering support for competitive advantage through organizational basis, information and communication technology: a literature review. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(3), 464-476. doi:[10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.37](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.37)

DOI

[http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.37](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.37)

RELEASED ON

Saturday, 22 September 2018

RECEIVED ON

Thursday, 17 May 2018

ACCEPTED ON

Thursday, 09 August 2018

LICENSE



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

JOURNAL

"Problems and Perspectives in Management"

ISSN PRINT

1727-7051

ISSN ONLINE

1810-5467

PUBLISHER

LLC "Consulting Publishing Company "Business Perspectives"

FOUNDER

LLC "Consulting Publishing Company "Business Perspectives"



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

47



NUMBER OF FIGURES

10



NUMBER OF TABLES

1

© The author(s) 2019. This publication is an open access article.



BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10, Sumy,
40022, Ukraine

www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 17th of May, 2018

Accepted on: 9th of August, 2018

© Agus Riyanto, Ina Primiana,
Yunizar, Yudi Azis, 2018

Agus Riyanto, Doctoral Student of
Science and Management, Universitas
Padjadjaran; Lecturer, Universitas
Komputer, Indonesia.

Ina Primiana, Lecturer of Doctoral
Science and Management, Universitas
Padjadjaran, Indonesia.

Yunizar, Lecturer of Doctoral Science
and Management, Universitas
Padjadjaran, Indonesia.

Yudi Azis, Lecturer of Doctoral
Science and Management, Universitas
Padjadjaran, Indonesia.



This is an Open Access article,
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution-Non-
Commercial 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/),
which permits re-use, distribution,
and reproduction, provided the
materials aren't used for commercial
purposes and the original work is
properly cited.

Agus Riyanto (Indonesia), Ina Primiana (Indonesia), Yunizar (Indonesia),
Yudi Azis (Indonesia)

REENGINEERING SUPPORT FOR COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL BASIS, INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Abstract

This research is intended to collect and investigate the previous research that is related to reengineering with Business Process Reengineering (BPR) in manufacturing industry to achieve a "competitive advantage". The purpose of this study is to provide a general overview of the relationship between BPR variables, competitive advantage variables, organizational commitment variables, organizational change management variables, information and communication technology variables, which are supported by IDEF0 method.

This research overall uses secondary data sources from a research published in a journal and proceeding for the variables of BPR, competitive advantage, organizational commitment, organizational change management, information and communication technology, which is supported by IDEF0 method.

This study is limited to the existing research subject that was in online media and the specific purpose is to review a progress in the BPR, which is mainly based on organization, information technology and engineering. The previous researches concluded that there were influencing variables toward BPR, which is related to competitive advantage.

Keywords

business process reengineering, competitive advantage,
organization, information and communication
technology

JEL Classification

M15, M21

INTRODUCTION

In the early 1990's, the term of Business Process Reengineering (BPR) was already known to the business world in America since its introduction by Hammer (1993). Business Process Reengineering was not only used in the manufacturing industry but also in the business sector for the service industry. Hammer was the first person to introduce the name of business process reengineering and he was considered as the father of business process reengineering. BPR was earlier considered as a tool to bring drastic changes to business processes and was adopted by an American Company, which focused on the private sector, in the early 1990's as a substitute for the use of total quality management (TQM), an improved method which was developed in Japan. BPR can be mentioned as a new approach for the organizations that require process management to bring drastic changes in the organizational performance.

The current competition is not only occurring regionally but also globally. The organizations seek to improve competitive advantage to deal with major changes, one of which can be done by conducting business

process reengineering, they redesign business process drastically. Besides, there is a problem that most of the organizations that implement business process reengineering as their main focus fail to implement BPR (Ramanigopal et al., 2011).

Nowadays this change occurs in every sector, such as transportation sector, and is implemented by on-line, online shops (e-commerce) such as Amazon.com and financial technology like the emergence of fintech in the world. The rapid change of information technology will be a commercial arena that gives a birth to organizational change. Organizations must restructure and redefine their business strategies to solve this major change. BPR is a popular management tool for dealing with a rapid technological and business changes (Ozcelik, 2010; Ranganathan et al., 2011). Beside that success, the research of Al-Mashari et al. (2011) and Chiplunkar et al. (2003) illustrates that up to 70% of BPR failure occurs at the implementation stage. It is caused by the lack of understanding of management within an organization.

The failure of BPR occurred at the implementation process (procedures, processes, management) stage, infrastructure (information technology facilities, technology), human error (leadership, employees), company characteristics (size and type of business) or the combination of them (Smith et al., 2013).

To solve these problems, the main purpose of this study is to provide a general overview of the relationship between BPR variables, competitive advantage variables, organizational commitment variables, organizational change management variables, information and communication technology variables, which is supported by IDEF0 method based on previous researches and proceeding.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. Competitive advantage

Competitive advantage is very important for a company, because it shows its performance. It is a company position for the competitors. According to Porter (1998), there are two methods to create a competitive advantage. The first is saving of cost that will make a cost advantage, it occurs when a company provides the same service as its competitors at a lower cost. The second is the differentiation, this advantage occurs when a company provides a larger service at the same price as its competitors. This is overall known as a position advantage, because it shows the company's position in its industry as a leader in service or superior cost.

The company has the advantages through resources and capabilities that are superior for the competitors. Then, as long as the company applies a strategy that utilizes these resources and capabilities effectively, so it is possible to create a competitive advantage. This is achieved through the plan and management strategy, which is an ongoing process that evaluates, controls and checks business, competitors and industry overall. Moreover,

it is necessary to set a goal and a strategy to overcome the obstacles in achieving success (Nimsith et al., 2016).

Competitive advantage can be described as a management concept that has been so popular in contemporary management literature. The reason behind this popularity is due to the rapid change that must be faced by a company today. The complexity of the business environment, the impact of globalization and an unstructured market, consumer needs, competition, revolution of information and communication technology and global trade continuously change (Moghli et al., 2012).

Porter (1998) considered that the competitive advantage is a corporate activity through flexibility, product or service supply, on time, cost efficiency and owned differentiation value, which can increase business performance toward competitors. Ferreira and Kittsteiner (2012) said that competitive advantage can be developed by a model where competitive pressure will become a stimulation for organizational changes. Competitive advantage can be through a business strategy based on differentiation, coordination and focus. According to Markiewicz (2011), a strategy process is influenced by the organization, innovation, creativity and perception.

Kasasbeh et al. (2017) explained that competitive advantage can be reached by a concept related to business process reengineering that will make the organization a leader toward competitors in its sector. Specifically, this is a stock of the organization that will make a profit in a competitive market. The dimensions of competitive advantage can be found through service quality, organization growth, performance, marketing innovation, creativity, customer orientation and market differentiation.

1.2. Business process reengineering

BPR is a set of management activities that replaces the traditional one and establishes a reasonable business process through optimization, employee authorization, customer suggestion and the application of information and communication technology. BPR replaces the traditional labor-sharing system and emphasizes the direction of work and process creating some new management principles for the business company (Ringim et al., 2013).

The failure of business process reengineering implementation was discussed by Altinkemer et al. (1998). There were two out of 35 companies that failed to implement business process reengineering. But both were aimed at successful BPR implementation after they did process repairing. Subramanian et al. (1999) had the same opinion that 50-70% support for reengineering was unable to bring dramatic changes.

Ramanigopal (2011) defined BPR as an available modern tool to manage the change for the purpose of BPR that can redesign and change existing business practices and processes to achieve an organization performance improvement dramatically. Ringim et al. (2013) said that BPR is defined as a complete and radical process transformation, which changes bureaucratic structure within the organization for core process specialization.

1.3. Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment in the BPR implementation is very influential to achieve the success of the company (Osano & Okwena, 2015). Every business process that has been undertaken and committed to the management is properly communicated to all elements within the organization.

This will make the implementation of BPR in progress can run well.

1.4. Organizational change management

Nzewi Hope et al. (2015) and Ringim et al. (2013) say that one of the factors affecting the BPR is organizational change management. Redesigning the entire process from the old approach to a newer one needs to be improved to achieve better performance due to changes in government policies and competition that exists today.

1.5. Information and communication technology

Osano and Okwena (2015) describe the BPR as the aspect that leads to a change and introduces new processes and a new working style, so that certain elements needed to make a change. Among them is the management of information technology (IT) that cannot be ignored for a radical redesign of an organization.

1.6. IDEF0 model

IDEF0 model (Integration Definition Language 0), is an SADT-based (Structure Analysis and Design Technique) system modelling method developed by Douglas T. Ross and SofTech, Inc. In its original form, IDEF0 includes a definition language and graphical modelling (syntax and semantics) that describes a comprehensive methodology for model building. IDEF0 (Integration Definition language 0) is a modelling language that uses images with a comprehensive explanation to explain the development stages or methodology of a system. The system is modelled as a group of functions that are interconnected with one another to form a major function. These functions describe what is done by the system, so anything that is controlled, processed, and generated by the system can be known (Clarence, 1998).

2. METHODOLOGY

This research uses qualitative methods by looking at the literature review of some journals, as well as by looking at secondary data coming from the internet, reports and review journals. In order to




Figure 1. Building blocks in the IDEF0 model




Figure 2. Decomposition in IDEF0

achieve a competitive advantage, every organization is required to conduct BPR. A radical business change will inevitably have to be done in the face of disruptive innovation. BPR implementation will be successful if supported in terms of an organization that is organizational commitment and organizational change management. In terms of technology platform implementation, business process reengineering must develop information and communication technology (ICT).

To support the BPR implementation, it can be done by developing the business process using IDEF0 model. The IDEF0 model for the business process will be shown as building blocks activity (see Figure 1).

IDEF0 considers a system as a collection of activities that use ICOM (Input-Control-Output-Mechanism) to embody its function. Activity and ICOM is a constituent component of the system that must be identified the model (Tsironis et al., 2008). In other words, the model of a system using the IDEF0 method is a depiction of the activity and ICOM of a system as in Figure 2.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The failure rate of the BPR implementation is large. The success of BPR is supported by organizational commitment, organizational change management and understanding of technology, especially information and communication technology (ICT).

3.1. Organizational commitment relationship toward business process reengineering

Jurisch et al. (2016) stated that organizational commitment affects the performance of business change and process performance. The study

by Mlay (2013) shows that 81% of employees believe in and agree to the implementation of business process reengineering, the others are still in doubt. This result shows that there is a great commitment of employees to the implementation of business process reengineering, similar to the result of this study, the study of Goksoy et al. (2012) showed 85.4% agreed to commitment and leadership support for the business process reengineering implementation.

To understand easily the relationship between the organizational commitment and business process reengineering, see Figure 3.

Three results of the study above show that there is a mutual interaction between organizational commitment and business process reengineering. It can be concluded that organizational commitment influences business process reengineering.

3.2. Organizational commitment relationship toward competitive advantage

The previous research showed that there is a relationship between an organizational commitment and a competitive advantage. The research of Zangene-Tabar (2013) explained that research findings based on structural equation model show that the quality of an organizational commitment has a significant effect on customer orientation as part of competitive advantage. The study of Savaneviciene (2012) explains that organizational commitment is the goal of human management based on quality and flexibility, which is the dimension of competitive advantage. And the research of De Brentani and Kleinschmidt (2004) also explained that organizational commitment and organizational culture are strongly influenced by new product development as part of superior product.




Figure 3. Organizational commitment relationship toward business process reengineering




Figure 4. Organizational commitment relationship toward competitive advantage

The relationship between the organizational commitment and competitive advantage is presented in Figure 4.

The results show that there is a relationship between the organization commitment and competitive advantage. Therefore, it can be concluded that an organization commitment has an effect on competitive advantage.

3.3. Organizational change management relationship toward business process reengineering

The previous research said that there is a relationship between organizational change management and BPR. In research of Mlay (2013) it is stated that the organizational commitment, organizational change management and information technology have a great effect on BPR. The research of Anand et al. (2009) explained that an organizational change that occurred in five companies requires continuous process improvement as a potential dynamic ability within an organization. Furthermore, Al-Mashari et al. (2001) point out that the success of BPR implementation is associated with a methodological use. Organizational change management is an area that needs to be methodologically handled by researchers. This case also shows that diagnosing the current process is an important BPR stage, and it is a difficult task for an organization

to implement it. It also shows the importance of commitment and process implementation of BPR. Similarly, Altinkemer (1998) explained that the organization requires a change in order to improve organizational performance, and the changes will occur when BPR is implemented.

The relationship between the organizational change management and BPR is presented in Figure 5.

According to four opinions above, there is a mutual influence between organizational change management and BPR. It can be concluded that the organizational change management has an effect on BPR.

3.4. Organizational change management relationship toward competitive advantage

There is a relationship between the organizational change management and competitive advantage. The research of Tudor Liviu and Bisa Christian (2015) explained that the organizational change management is a very important organizational competitive advantage. Thus, it can ensure organization's progress and facilitate a better performance than competitors. The study of Fok Yew Oon and Hartini (2014) said that the organizational change management had a strong effect toward operational advantage. The research of




Figure 5. Organizational change management relationship toward business process reengineering




Figure 6. Organizational change management relationship toward competitive advantage

Ferreira and Kittsteinner (2012) explained that the business strategy model is a catalyst for an organizational change. A simple business strategy is invaluable because an employee needs to coordinate his efforts to build strategic capabilities as a competitive advantage.

To understand easily the relationship between the organizational change management and competitive advantage see Figure 6.

The opinions above indicate a relationship between the organizational change management and competitive advantage. It can be concluded that the organizational change management has an effect on competitive advantage.

3.5. Information and communication technology relationship toward business process reengineering

In the previous section, it was said that there is a relationship between the information and communication technology and the BPR. Huang et al. (2014) revealed that the information and communication technology has a strong relationship toward the BPR and performance. The study of Mlay et al. (2013) explained that organizational commitment, organizational change

management and information and communication technology have a positive effect on BPR. Maroofi et al. (2013)'s research described that the information and communication technology has a strong influence on the BPR, internal business processes, organization, customer satisfaction and financial performance. The study of Anand et al. (2009) explained how the learning theory informs the theory of continuous improvement and allows to see such improvement as a dynamic ability in the organization through an information technology. The research of Shin and Jemella (2002) explained that BPR can be applied in a bank by using four variables. They are process, organization, finance, information and communication technology. Davenport and Short (1990) described that the information and communication technology has a major influence on the business process redesign.

To understand easily the relationship between the information and communication technology and BPR, see Figure 7.

The seven opinions above indicate that there is a relationship between the information and communication technology and BPR. So, it can be concluded that the information and communication technology has an effect toward BPR.



Figure 7. The information and communication technology relationship toward business process reengineering

3.6. Information and communication technology relationship toward competitive advantage

In the previous research it was said that there is a relationship between information and communication technology and competitive advantage. Patroba et al. (2016) explained that the information and communication technology through investment, risk management and operation has a strong influence toward competitive advantage. Similarly, Chi and Sun (2015) said that the competitive advantage is influenced by the information and communication technology through process, source and impact of information technology. Breznik (2012) revealed that the competitive advantage can occur when the information and communication technology is implemented. The study of Ong (2008) explained that the information and communication technology through knowledge, operation and object has a strong influence toward competitive advantage. Similarly, Vargas, Hernandez, and Bruque (2003) explained that the implementation of the information and communication technology has a strong influence toward competitive advantage through organizational performance. Human, management and technology have a strong influence on the competitive advantage through information technology function.

To understand easily the relationship between the information and communication technology and competitive advantage, see Figure 8.

The five studies above showed that there is a mutual influence between information and communication technology and competitive advantage. And finally, it can be concluded that the information and communication technology has an effect toward competitive advantage.

3.7. Business process reengineering relationship toward competitive advantage

Some previous studies showed that there is a relationship between BPR and competitive advantage. The research of Saeed and Nasar (2016) explained that Pakistani commercial banks are required to implement continuous improvement process in realizing the process of bank system, and to adjust themselves in focusing on the existing finance and trends at the international level to enlarge the competitive advantage. The study of Huang et al. (2014) explained that the information and communication technology has a strong influence toward performance as a competitive advantage. The research of Wang et al. (2012) said that the bank system process is a good management model to be implemented in China to build a modern commercial bank through an information technology. Then, Aregbeyen (2011) explained that the failure to review the implementation of BPR in Nigeria is because a decline occurred in the organizations' performance during 10 years. The study of Adeyemi and Aremu (2008) explained that an organization's performance is strongly influenced by process, quality and strategy as a dimension of competitive advantage. Similarly, Peterson et al. (2010) explained that the implementation of BPR can provide added value in the form of competitive advantage for Wrigley's company.

To understand easily the relationship between the BPR and competitive advantage, see Figure 9.

Finally, the opinions of researches above showed that there is a relationship between BPR and competitive advantage. So it can be concluded that BPR has an effect toward competitive advantage.




Figure 8. The information and communication technology relationship toward competitive advantage



Figure 9. Business process reengineering relationship toward competitive advantage

Table 1. The research of all variables

No.	Writer, year	Organizational commitment variable	Organization Change management variable	Information and communication technology variable	BPR variable	Competitive advantage variable	IDEFO	Method
1	Jurisch et al. (2015)	√	-	-	-	-	-	Quantitative, PLS
2	Mlay et al. (2013)	√	√	√	-	-	-	Qualitative, SPSS, EView3 and Excel 2007
3	Goksoy et al. (2012)	√	-	√	√	-	-	Quantitative, Regression analysis
4	Tabar et al. (2013)	√	-	-	-	√	-	Quantitative, SEM
5	Savaneviciene et al. (2012)	√	-	-	-	√	-	Quantitative, Qualitative
6	Brentani et al. (2004)	√	-	-	-	√	-	Quantitative, AMOS
7	Anand et al. (2009)	√	√	√	√	-	-	Quantitative, Qualitative
8	Shin et al. (2002)	-	√	√	√	-	-	Qualitative
9	Al-Mashari et al. (2001)	-	√	-	√	-	-	Qualitative
10	Altinkemer et al. (1998)	-	√	-	√	-	-	Qualitative
11	Tudor et al. (2015)	-	√	-	-	√	-	Quantitative
12	Fok et al. (2014)	-	√	-	-	√	-	Quantitative, SPSS
13	Ferreira et al. (2012)	-	√	-	-	√	-	Quantitative
14	Markiewicz (2011)	-	√	-	-	√	-	Qualitative
15	Huang et al. (2014)	-	-	√	√	√	-	Quantitative
16	Maroofi et al. (2013)	-	-	√	√	-	-	Quantitative, AMOS
17	Davenport et al. (1990)	-	-	√	√	-	-	Qualitative
18	Prasetyana (2005)	-	-	-	√	-	-	Qualitative
19	Ellitan (1999)	√	√	√	√	-	-	Qualitative
20	Acharya (2005)	-	-	√	√	-	-	Quantitative, SPSS
21	Waiganjo et al. (2012)	-	-	-	-	√	-	Qualitative
22	Patroba et al. (2016)	-	-	√	-	√	-	Quantitative, SPSS
23	Chi et al. (2015)	-	-	√	-	√	-	Qualitative
24	Breznik (2012)	-	-	√	-	√	-	Qualitative
25	Bulatovic et al. (2011)	-	-	√	-	-	-	Qualitative
26	Ong (2008)	-	-	√	-	√	-	Quantitative
27	Vargas et al. (2003)	-	-	√	-	√	-	Quantitative
28	Saeed et al. (2016)	-	-	-	-	√	-	Qualitative
29	Wang et al. (2012)	-	-	-	-	√	-	Qualitative

Table 1 (cont.). The research of all variables

No.	Writer, year	Organizational commitment variable	Organization Change management variable	Information and communication technology variable	BPR variable	Competitive advantage variable	IDEFO	Method
30	Aregbeyen (2011)	-	-	-	√	√	-	Qualitative
31	Sidikat et al. (2008)	-	-	-	√	√	-	Quantitative
32	Magutu et al. (2010)	-	-	-	√	√	-	Quantitative
33	Allen et al. (1993)	√	-	-	-	-	-	Quantitative, MANOVA
34	Xiaoli (2010)	-	-	-	√	√	-	Quantitative, SEM, SPSS, Lisrel
35	Sarkis et al. (1995)	-	-	-	-	-	√	Qualitative
36	Min et al. (1996)	-	-	-	√	-	√	Qualitative
37	Dachyar et al. (2016)	-	-	-	√	-	√	Qualitative




Figure 10. Paradigm model

Given the relationship between each variable that has a mutual influence, then in Figure 10 a model can be seen that describes the relationship and the influence between each variable contained in a paradigm model that is developed and sought for the influence of these variables.

Based on previous studies, a paradigm model can be developed for the manufacturing industry or service industry in the implementation of BPR to improve future competitive advantage.

CONCLUSION

The previous research or proceedings showed that the variables of competitive advantage, business process reengineering, organizational commitment, organizational change management and information and communication technology have interrelated relations. To be able to compete under the global changes, an organization must have a competitive advantage. This competitive advantage occurs by BPR implementation through the organizational change. In order to be successful in the BPR implementa-

tion, an organization must have an organizational commitment (from top to bottom level), organizational change management (vision, mission and strategy), capability and availability of information and communication technology.

IDEF0 model is one of the ways to support BPR. A process change due to a replacement from a traditional process to a technology-based one can be described by IDEF0 that explains the process order based on the hierarchy activity. For each building, blocks consist of input: something that is transformed by an activity; control: something that determines how an activity occurs but is not transformed by it; output: something that is produced by the activity; and mechanism: people, facilities, machines, or others that run the activities.

REFERENCES

1. Adeyemi, S., & Aremu, A. M. (2008). Impact Assessment of Business Process Reengineering on Organisational Performance. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 115-125. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/eb90/9f23c754fd109b13fa343da6c2e5e27bb90c.pdf>
2. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational Commitment: Evidence of Career Stage Effects? *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1), 49-61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(93\)90042-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(93)90042-N)
3. Al-Mashari, M., Irani, Z., & Zairi, M. (2001). Business Process Reengineering: A Survey of International Experience. *Business Process Management Journal*, 7(5), 437-455. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.456.391&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
4. Altinkemer, K., Chaturvedi, A., & Kondareddy, S. (1998). Business Process Reengineering and Organizational Performance: An Exploration of Issues. *International Journal of Information Management*, 18(6), 381-392. Retrieved from <http://isiarticles.com/bundles/Article/pre/pdf/440.pdf>
5. Anand, G., Ward, T. P., Tatikonda, M., & Schilling, A. D. (2009). Dynamic Capabilities thought Continuous Improvement Infrastructure. *Journal of Operations Management*, 27(6), 444-461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2009.02.002>
6. Aregbeyen, O. (2011). Business Re-Engineering and Organisational Performance in Nigeria: A Case Study of First Bank Nigeria Pic. *International Business Management*, 5(3), 151-158. <https://doi.org/10.3923/ibm.2011.151.158>
7. Azzam Azmi Abou-Moghli, Ghaith Mustafa Al Abdallah, & Ayed Al Muala (2012). Impact of Innovation on Realizing Competitive Advantage in Banking Sector in Jordan. *American Academic & Scholarly Research Journal*, 4(5). Retrieved from www.naturalspublishing.com/files/published/i5883cn9tb27t4.pdf
8. Breznik, L. (2012). Can Information Technology Be a Source of Competitive Advantage? *Economic and Business Review*, 14(3), 251-269. Retrieved from <http://ojs.ebrjournal.net/ojs/index.php/eb/article/viewFile/167/pdf>
9. Chi, J., & Sun, L. (2015). IT and Competitive Advantage: A Study from Micro Perspective. *Modern Economy*, 6(03), 404-410. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4236/me.2015.63038>
10. Chiplunkar, C., Deshmukh, S., & Chattopadhyay, R. (2003). Application of principles of event related open systems to business process reengineering. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 45(3), 347-374. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-8352\(03\)00029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-8352(03)00029-9)
11. Davenport, H. T., & Short, E. J. (1990). The New Industrial Engineering: Information Technology and Business Process Redesign. *Sloan Management Review*, 31(4), 11-27. Retrieved from <http://is.ieis.tue.nl/education/bpmcourse/papers/Davenport%20%281990%29%20-%20The%20New%20Industrial%20Engineering.pdf>
12. De Brentani, U., & Kleinschmidt, J. E. (2004). Corporate Culture and Commitment: Impact on Performance of International New Product Development Programs. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management, Product Development and Management Association*, 21, 309-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0737-6782.2004.00085.x>
13. Feldmann, C. G. (1998). *The Practical Guide to BPR Using IDEF0*. NY: Dorset House Publisher.
14. Ferreira, D., & Kittsteiner, T. (2012). *Competition and Organizational Change*. CRES Foundations of Business Strategy Conference. Washington University. Retrieved from http://www.mikrooekonomie.rwth-aachen.de/workingpaper/Competition_and_Organizational_Change.pdf
15. Fok-Yew Oon, & Hartini, A. (2014). The Effect of Change Management on Operational Excellence Moderated by Commitment to Change: Evidence from Malaysia. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 9(2), 615-631. Retrieved from <http://www.ijias.issr-journals.org/abstract.php?article=IJIAS-14-268-02>

16. Goksoy, A., Ozsoy Beliz, & Vayvay Ozalp (2012). Business Process Reengineering: Strategic Tool for Managing Organizational Change an Application in a Multinational Company. *International Journal of business and Management*, 7(2). Published by Canadian Center of science and Education.
17. Grover, V., Kettinger, W. J., & Teng, J. T. C. (1995). The Implementation of BPR. *Journal of Management Information System*, 12(1), 109-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1995.11518072>
18. Hall, G., Rosenthal, J., & Wade, J. (1993). How to make Reengineering Really Work. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec., 191-131. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1993/11/how-to-make-reengineering-really-work>
19. Huang, S. Y., Lee Hsiung Chao, & Chiu An-An (2014). How Business Process Reengineering Affects Information Technology Investment and Employee Performance Under Different Performance Measurement. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 17(5), 1133-1144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-014-9487-4>
20. Jurisch, M. C., Rosenberg, Z., & Krcmar, H. (2015). Emergent Risk in Business Process Change Projects. *Business Process Management Journal*, 22(4), 791-811. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-01-2015-0002>
21. Kasasbeh, E. A., Harada, Y., & Noor, I. M. (2017). Factors Influencing Competitive Advantage in Banking Sector: A Systematic Literature Review. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 11(2), 67-73. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3923/rjbm.2017.67.73>
22. Markiewicz, P. (2011). Change Management in The Strategy Implementation Process. *Intellectual Economics Journal*, 5(2), 257-267. Retrieved from <https://www.mruni.eu/upload/iblock/e15/MARKIEWICZ.pdf>
23. Maroofi, F., Kahrarian, F., & Dehghani, M. (2013). Evaluation of The Effect of Using Information Technology Infrastructure for Business Process Reengineering in Small and Medium Sized Entreprises of Kermanshah Province. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(9), 404-416. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v3-i9/229>
24. Masumi, M. (2013). The CSFs, Quality Governance, BPR Performance and Gaining Competitive Advantage. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(24), 1833-8119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v8n24p48>
25. Mlay, V. S., Zlotnikova, I., & Watundu, S. (2013). A Quantitative Analysis of Business Process Reengineering and Organizational Resistance: The Case of Uganda. *The African Journal of Information Systems*, 5(1). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.kenesaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1116&context=ajis>
26. Muthu Subramanian, Whitman, L., & Cheraghi, H. (1999). Business Process Reengineering: A Consolidated Methodology. *Proceeding of the 4th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering Theory, Applications and Practice*. San Antonio, Texas, USA. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c790/28e18c12be231acbdda3fef5855a6f8224d7.pdf>
27. Nimsith, S. I., Rifas, A. H., & Cader, M. J. A. (2016). Impact of Core Competency on Competitive Advantage of Banking Firms in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Innovative Technology*, 3(7), 64-72. Retrieved from https://www.ijrsrit.com/uploaded_all_files/1475528331_m6.pdf
28. Ong, W. J. (2008). Sustainable Competitive Advantage through Information Technology Competence: Resource-Based View on Small and Medium Enterprises. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 1. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.411.3288&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
29. Osano, M. H., & Okwena, D. (2015). Factors Influencing Performance of Business Process Reengineering Projects in Banks in Kenya: Case of Kenya Commercial Bank. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 12(11), 833-844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17265/1548-6591/2015.11.002>
30. Ozcelik, Y. (2010). Do business process reengineering projects payoff? Evidence from the United States. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(1), 7-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.03.004>
31. Patroba, M. M., Osoro, K., Nyagol, M., & Odoyo, F. (2016). Influence of Information Technology in Enhancement of Sustainable Advantage of Saccos in Kisii County. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 21(3), 103-117. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.%2021%20Issue3/Version-1/O210301103117.pdf>
32. Peterson, M., Onserio, S., & Kiplmo, G. (2010). Business Process Reengineering for Competitive Advantage. Key Factors That May Lead to Success or Failure of the BPR Implementation (The Wrigley Company). *African Journal of Business & Management*, 1, 135-150. Retrieved from http://www.uonbi.ac.ke/conferences/aibuma/journal/Paper11_Business_Process_Reengineering.pdf
33. Porter, E. M. (2008). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Maintaining Superior Performance*. Jakarta: Karisma Publishing Group.
34. Ramanigopal, C. S., Palaniappan, G., Hemalatha, N., & Murugan, T. (2011). Business Process Reengineering and Its Applications. *International Journal of Management Research and Review*, 1(5), 275-288. Retrieved from http://ijmrr.com/admin/upload_data/journal_full%20%20%2018.pdf
35. Ranganathan, C., Teo, T. S., & Dhaliwal, J. (2011). Web-enabled supply chain management: Key antecedents and performance

- impacts. *International Journal of Information Management*, 31(6), 533-545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2011.02.004>
36. Reger, R. K., Mullane, L. T., Gustafson, L. T., & DeMarie, S. (1994). Creating Earthquakes to Changes Organizational Mindsets. *Academy of Management Executive*, 8(4), 31-42. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1994.9412071701>
 37. Ringim, K. J., Osman Nor Hasni, Hasnan Norlena, & Razalli Mohd Rizal (2013). Exploring the Implementation of Business Process Reengineering in Banks. *Asian Social Science*, 9(11), 243-253. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n11p243>
 38. Saeed, M. S., & Nasar, A. (2016). Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) in Pakistani Banking Sector for Improving Overall Performance. *Journal of Business & Financial Affairs*, 5(3). Retrieved from <https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/continuous-process-improvement-cpi-in-pakistani-banking-sector-forimproving-overall-performance-2167-0234-1000210.pdf>
 39. Savaneviciene, A., & Stankeviciute, Z. (2012). Human Resource Management and Performance: From Practices Towards Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *InTech Globalization – Education and Management Agendas*. Chapter 8. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5772/47800>
 40. Shin, N., & Jemella, F. D. (2002). Business Process Reengineering and Performance Improvement the Case of Chase Manhattan Bank. *Business Process Management Journal Emerald*, 8(4), 351-363. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14637150210435008>
 41. Zangene-Tabar, M., Falahati, A., & Moradi, A. (2013). The Effect of Quality Commitment and Organizational Commitment on The Customer Orientation (Case Study: Kermanshah Tejarat Bank). *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Science: Science Explorer Publications*, 4(10), 3146-3153. Retrieved from <https://docplayer.net/48809315-The-effect-of-quality-commitment-and-organizational-commitment-on-the-customer-orientation-case-study-kermanshah-tejarat-bank.html>
 42. Thomas, O. O. (2014). Change Management and Its Effects on Organizational Performance of Nigerian Telecoms Industries: Empirical Insight from Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, 1(11), 170-179. Retrieved from <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijhsse/v1-i11/18.pdf>
 43. Todnem, Rune (2005). Organisational Change Management: A Critical Review. *Journal of Change Management*, 5(4), 369-380. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14697010500359250>
 44. Tsironis Loukas, Gentsos Andreas, & Moustakis Vassilis (2008). Empowerment The IDEF0 Modeling Language. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3(5). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41891191_Empowerment_the_IDEF0_modeling_language
 45. Tudor Liviu, & Bisa Christian. (2015). Change Management as a Competitive Advantage for Romanian Companies. *Proceedings of the 9th International Management Conference*. Retrieved from <http://conferinta.management.ase.ro/archives/2015/pdf/16.pdf>
 46. Vargas, A., Hernandez, M. J., & Bruque, S. (2003). Determinants of Information Technology Competitive Value Evidence from a Western European Industry. *Journal of High Technology Management Research 14: Elsevier Science Inc.*, 245-268. Retrieved from https://www.uhu.es/alfonso_vargas/archivos/JHTMRarticle.pdf
 47. Wang, L., Herve, G. D., & Shen, Y. (2012). Continuous Process Improvement in Banking Sector and a Model Design for Performance Enhancement. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(2), 130-141. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4111/0cf6197667f3310782137a27b9abfe931ef1.pdf>