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Abstract

Pressures to cut budgets and increase efficiency while maintaining performance prompted public managers to turn to the private sector for solutions. As a means of rightsizing government, cutting red tape, and reducing bureaucracy, the idea of BPR found its way into the realm of public organizations. The differing characteristics of private and public organizations introduce various challenges when transferring BPR methodologies between the sectors.

With this research paper we consolidate the ample literature on BPR success from the private and public sector. We identify the relevant success factors and show that a surprising similarity exists between private and public BPR related success factors. In addition, we determine the specific characteristics and requirements of the public sector highlighting gaps in current literature. Finally, we structure the research gap in five propositions and provide directions for further research.

1. Introduction

Companies continually monitor and improve their competitiveness to stay in business due to the growth of international trade, the demand for high-quality products and services, an increase in competition in the global market, the rapid development of new technologies as well as shortened product lifecycles [1-3]. A common way of meeting these challenges is the employment of a variety of business process management tools. As many of today’s businesses exhibit a process-oriented form of organization [4], the concept of Business Process Reengineering (BPR) has proven to be a powerful and elaborate tool. Yet, BPR projects still constitute complex and challenging endeavors. In spite of the concept’s popularity, between 60 and 80 percent of reengineering efforts fail to achieve their goals [5,6].

Similar to the business environment, the demands and requirements made on the public sector have undergone considerable changes in the past decades. In the early 1980s, criticism regarding the size and capabilities of the public sector emerged. Administrations found themselves confronted with rising expectations and fiscal problems [7]. Longwinded procedures, non-transparent processes, unclear responsibilities, increasing personnel costs, and complex communication paths exacerbated the situation [8].

The resulting pressures to cut budgets and increase efficiency while maintaining performance prompted public managers to turn to the private sector for solutions [7]. Originating from a business environment [9], the idea of BPR found its way into the realm of public organizations [7]. As a means of rightsizing government, cutting red tape, and reducing bureaucracy [9], BPR promises to become a valuable and much-needed tool in public administrations. By facilitating resource efficiency and allowing for a more straightforward way of service provision, BPR assumes a leading role in the transformation of public administrations. This transformation includes organizational, political, procedural and technological aspects [10], designating BPR a cross-sectional challenge for the future of public administration.

Past research suggests various differences between these sectors [11], including such aspects as their organizational structures, processes [12], and management styles. Assuming these suspected differing characteristics to hold true, diverging expectations and conditions regarding BPR projects in the public and the private sector arise. In order to
satisfy these requirements, public administrations are bound to modify the methods, implementations, and best practices established for BPR in private organizations.

As a consequence, various challenges would be introduced to the transfer of BPR methodologies between the sectors [13][14]. Generally, private businesses feature independent decision-making processes and flexible hierarchies. In contrast, public administrations are obligated to adhere to multiple external restrictions mainly embodied by laws and political guidelines [15]. While private entities are free to develop their own internal strategy, public organizations are bound to ensure the political alignment of their actions.

Within this paper we aim to identify and analyze the BPR related success factors and requirements in public and private institutions. Specifically, our objectives are to (1) examine current literature and analyze the factors needed for a BPR project to be successful in private and public institutions, (2) highlight the peculiarities and requirements of public BPR implementations in contrast to the private sector and (3) derive and structure the need for future research.

In order to achieve our goals we consolidate the ample literature on BPR success factors in the private and public sector. On the basis of this comprehensive analysis of the factors determining the success of a BPR project, this literature review provides a foundation for further evaluation of the differences between public and the private sector as pertaining to the implementation of BPR.

As a next step, we analyzed and structured the articles using a concept-centric methodology [16]. Multiple success factors were identified during the analysis and classified into certain dimensions. We used an existent model business process change as a basis to identify relevant dimensions [17]. The allocation of articles among them was based on thorough qualitative data analysis. Yet, any such classification is bound to be subject to the authors’ personal judgment. We will elaborate on each of the dimensions in the following.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 specifies the details of the literature review and displays an overview of its results. Afterwards, in section 3, we present the analysis of results. Based on this we synthesize the literature review results into five propositions and provide directions for further research.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 specifies the details of the literature review and displays an overview of its results. Afterwards, in section 3, we present the analysis of results. Based on this we synthesize the literature review results into five propositions and provide directions for further research.

2. BPR Success Factors – Literature Review

2.1. Methodology

The high failure rates of BPR efforts even in private organizations [5,6] call for a closer look at the factors impacting the success of such projects. As a first step to investigating the differences between public and private organizations, we analyzed the existent literature of BPR success factors. We focused on literature pertaining to business processes, business process change methods (in particular BPR) and the differentiation between the public and the private sector. We used “Business Process Reengineering” as the keyword for our initial search before scanning relevant databases (e.g., Emerald and ScienceDirect) for the term “BPR success factors”. Papers were selected according to their availability and relevance. Relevance was determined by reading the title and the abstract of each article and subsequently reading the full text of selected articles. Further, we identified additional literature by means of reference scanning. The final set included 67 articles on the topic of process reengineering in the private and public sector1. Of these articles, 29 dealt with the public sector, 16 with the private sector, and 22 were of general nature/applicable to both sectors. Setting out with a comprehensive analysis of the factors determining the success of a BPR project, this literature review provides a foundation for further evaluation of the differences between public and the private sector as pertaining to the implementation of BPR.

As a next step, we analyzed and structured the articles using a concept-centric methodology [16]. Multiple success factors were identified during the analysis and classified into certain dimensions. We used an existent model business process change as a basis to identify relevant dimensions [17]. The allocation of articles among them was based on thorough qualitative data analysis. Yet, any such classification is bound to be subject to the authors’ personal judgment. We will elaborate on each of the dimensions in the following.

2.2. Overview of Results

Our analysis yielded five dimensions: project scope, top-level management commitment, resources, project management, and change management. While the success factor top-level management commitment forms a dimension of itself, all other dimensions serve as umbrella terms subsuming several success factors of related nature.

Prior to the start of a BPR project, the project scope needs to be determined. This includes realistic expectations regarding the requirements and benefits entailed by the project as well as a clear vision and

1 A full list of the 67 articles is available upon request from the authors.
goals. Top-level management commitment and sufficient resources are crucial in ensuring project success. In particular, relevant resources comprise BPR know-how within the organization as well as a conducive use, role and adoption of IT. During the actual execution phase of a BPR undertaking, many aspects of project management influence the success of the project. In particular, a thorough process analysis as well as a suitable implementation map/concept provide a sound footing for any subsequent activities. Adequate plan execution as well as a flexible and adaptive methodology represent further important success factors as pertaining to BPR project management.

In order to ensure plan compliance and react to unforeseen circumstances, continuous control of the project and the appropriate handling of barriers and risks further benefit the success of the project. As the concept of change is inherent to BPR projects, the organizational readiness for change as well as the motivation and/or resistance to change among stakeholders constitute pivotal success factors. Further, appropriate training and development of new skills among staff as well as cooperation and communication among all stakeholders facilitate successful progress. Table 1 summarizes the identified success factors and their associated dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project scope</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic expectations</td>
<td>Clear vision and goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-level management commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPR know-how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Use, role and adoption of IT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation map/concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible and adaptive methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of barriers and risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational readiness for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation/resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/new skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Classification of success factors in subcategories

3. Analysis of Results

When analyzed separately, the success factors in the public sector largely conform to the ones in the private sector. This is surprising, considering the assumed differences between public and private organizations. Further, it does not yield an explanation for the continuing issues encountered by BPR projects in the public sector [18][19]. It stands to reason that while the relevant success factors are similar in both domains, different approaches are required to fully realize them.

The concept of BPR originated in the private sector and almost 70 percent of all private businesses in the US and Europe have been involved in some sort of a reengineering project [18]. Correspondingly, the majority of pertinent literature focuses on BPR in the private sector. The bulk of process designs and frameworks were developed for the private sector, tailored to its special circumstances and characteristics [20]. In contrast, the adoption of the BPR concept in the public sector is partly uncovered by the literature [21].

When trying to transfer existent methodologies from private businesses to public administrations, practitioners encounter difficulties since the premises affecting reengineering projects in both environments vary significantly. This is highlighted by existing literature, which assesses success rates of BPR projects in public administrations as considerably lower than in the private sector [19].

As a first step to exploring the underlying differences, we will take a closer look at the special characteristics of public administrations. We will split this analysis into six subsections. Each subsection starts out in highlighting a related group of peculiarities of the public sector necessitating a dedicated approach to process reengineering for public administrations. Following these assessments, we analyze the resulting challenges for practitioners as mentioned in the literature regarding each subsection.

3.1. Functions and Intention

Owing to their distinct purpose, public organizations differ from their private counterparts in regard to their functions and intentions. While the public sector is characterized by stability and risk aversion, entities in the private sector are prepared to take risks in order to ensure their competitiveness [9]. Private businesses represent independent entities, acting according to their own, internally developed strategy. In contrast, public administrations do not
formulate a strategy of their own. Rather, they aim to execute existing laws and policies [22]. This is exacerbated by public administrations being subject to bureaucratic principles [23], which require all functional departments and process owners to be predefined and transparent.

The obligation to strictly adhere to existent legislation restricts process change in the public sector [24]. Consequently, reengineering efforts in the private sector often assume a much more radical character than those in public organizations. In addition, all efforts made in public BPR projects need to be verified for their compliance with laws and legal regulations.

3.2. Processes

The characteristics of processes in public administrations differ heavily from their counterparts in the private sector. As a result of the aforementioned differences in purpose and function, public entities wield far less control over their processes [25], rendering radical change problematic. It is often not at the discretion of a public entity to freely modify the way it delivers its services. This circumstance is further illustrated in the way processes originate in each sector. Businesses in the private sector are guided by the effort to achieve client satisfaction [26]. Each process serves an internal or external customer, for whom it creates value, fulfilling his needs and requirements. A process is ultimately rooted in the customer’s requirements. Internal processes to achieve these goals are designed under the direction of the management. Hence, a private business is to independently develop its own process model [27]. Processes in public administration are ultimately motivated by the duty to conform to and implement legal guidelines [28]. In general, customers do not approach public entities as a means of fulfilling their needs and demands as they do in the private sector. Instead, they are compelled to get in touch with public administration on the grounds of laws and legal regulations. When filing out a visa application, for instance, a citizen does not strive to fulfill any of his personal needs but rather to fulfill legal requirements. In spite of these restrictions, it is to be noted that the concept of customer orientation is gaining increasing attention in the domain of public administration [14]. As compliance to laws and regulations is still obligatory, these efforts primarily pertain to the citizen-friendly provision of services and do not necessarily entail considerable changes within internal processes.

Consequently, process changes need to be approved by all relevant stakeholders as well as to comply with pertinent legal regulations [29]. A rigid process structure may prohibit large-scale change endeavors.

3.3. Organizational Structure

Every organization’s structure consists of various aspects, such as values, traditions, philosophies, hierarchies, authorities and rules [30]. Public administrations are organized according to bureaucratic paradigms. This entails the distribution of responsibilities among different departments as well as complex links to other organizations [7]. Each process is associated with multiple stakeholders and strictly monitored, controlled and documented.

Both in the private and the public sector, process reengineering holds significant potential to change such organizational structures [31]. This may include the establishment of new function-oriented teams or the integration of BPR experts [32]. Due to the more rigid nature of public organizations, these measures may easily transcend their respective capabilities for change [31]. In addition, being bound by legal regulations and bureaucratic principles, management in the public sector exerts far less power over their organization’s structure. Therefore, organizational changes in the public sector may only be achieved within certain limits [11]. In particular, support by top decision-makers may be regarded a prerequisite for wide-reaching change efforts. As an additional impediment to BPR in the public sector we perceived the lack of intraorganizational knowledge transfer. Instead of building upon experiences made in past BPR projects by other administrations, public institutions tend to start from scratch and consequently forfeit any potential advantages offered by a common knowledge database.

3.4. Economic Feasibility

Assuming a healthy economic foundation, private entities are at liberty to initiate investments and conduct business effort since their management wields full control over their resources. In contrast, public organizations are frequently not entitled to decide on significant political and financial matters [20].

Representing a costly and complex undertaking [9], BPR projects require significant financial investments. These efforts include the implementation of training programs for stakeholders and the upgrade of the IT environment. Additionally,
resources are often spent on the recruitment of consultants and the analysis of processes and data collection efforts [29]. The limited means available for BPR efforts in the public sector may significantly restrict personnel, know-how and IT resources. Owing to these economic constraints, BPR projects in the public sector frequently fail at the decision and planning stage [29].

While public administrations must fulfill their tasks economically and adhering to the given resources [28], they do not necessarily strive to maximize their economic efficiency or minimize costs. Rather, they aim to stay within their allocated budgets. This fact may lower the acceptance of BPR efforts in public administration as soon as budget targets are achieved and cost pressures lifted.

3.5. Political Feasibility

Bound by various political guidelines, bureaucratic principles, and organizational affiliations with related entities, public administrations need to adhere to a wide range of restrictions and conditions. In addition, rigid internal hierarchies [33] and the concept of legalism [9] take away from public institutions’ capability for change. In contrast, aside from the legal restrictions all legal entities are bound to observe, private businesses may freely and independently modify their own strategies and processes as they deem fit [20].

The radical changes entailed by BPR activities work against the political feasibility of this concept in the public sector [29]. As BPR may require the merging, automation and elimination of processes [11], the nature of public administration requires the surrounding political conditions to be considered before applying any modifications [29]. Existing structures and hierarchies may have been in place for decades and have not faced any pressure to change in the past. It is crucial to detect reservations borne by stakeholders and decision-makers early in the process and subsequently ensure their compliance and support.

3.6. Expectations from BPR

In the private sector, most activities are ultimately aimed at satisfying the customers’ needs and expectations [34]. Lacking such a concise concept of “value” [9], public administrations are primarily guided by their mission to execute laws and legal ordinance [28]. Hence, public institutions entertain different internal strategies and goals.

The main expectations associated with reengineering projects relate to improvements in regard to performance, costs, quality, service, customer relationships and delivery times [26]. According to their deviating goal structure, the motivations of public administrations to conduct BPR projects do not line up with the corresponding motivations of private businesses. While many private businesses may benefit from intangible knowledge and gradually developed internal procedures, clear and well-documented processes are fundamental to a functioning public organization. This also applies to BPR projects, where process transparency as well as the proper documentation of associated stakeholders and responsibilities is crucial in order to ensure compliance with legal regulations. Increased transparency, achieving more efficient and effective processes [35] as well as reducing “red tape” phenomena represent the core potential BPR in the public sector has to offer.

Comparatively static in nature, the bureaucratic frameworks surrounding public organizations are usually not immediately affected by emerging technologies and new process models [36]. In technological terms, public organizations tend to be followers instead of leaders [37], frequently adopting technologies after their benefit and application has been thoroughly established in the private sector [38]. Yet, as citizens and businesses put certain demands on the service quality delivered by administrations, these advancements have a bearing on the public sector as well (such as the necessity to interact with citizens via online communication channels).

Table 2 illustrates the results of this section. Listing relevant differentiating factors between public and private organizations, it highlights the need for the different implementation of BPR in the public administration and in private companies.

4. Five Propositions for Public Sector BPR

Within this chapter, we synthesize our literature review results into five propositions for successful BPR implementations in the public sector. For each proposition, we introduce shortly our underpinning reasoning.

Proposition 1: Public organizations are less likely to initiate BPR efforts.

Lacking competition, public administrations may tend to retain their current structure instead of initiating change. We propose that public administrations often lack the necessary motives for
change, forfeiting any potential benefits of BPR in the public sector (see Proposition 5). While public organizations frequently face budget pressures [39], they do not necessarily aim for further savings once their budget is met. Further, citizens are obliged to interact with their respective administrations instead of choosing to be “customers”.

**Proposition 2: Public and private organizations derive differing benefits from BPR projects.**

Due to their difference in purpose, function, and structure, public organizations focus on different goals when initiating BPR projects. Especially when facing budget cuts, public administrations aim to increase their internal efficiency and save resources [19]. Their focus is not on increasing the nature or scope of the services provided but rather on performing the existing tasks in the most efficient way possible [23]. Moreover, public administrations do not aim to attract new customers, maximize profits or adjust their structure to market requirements. As a result, many of the potential benefits entailed by radical process changes transcend their agenda.

The primary objective for most public administrations engaging in BPR efforts is often just to automate existing processes through the use of IT [19]. Most documents are still exchanged in paper based formats and then organized, stored, and archived in file cabinets [15]. However, also in the public sphere, information is increasingly exchanged and stored in digital formats. In fact, various public service organizations are currently in the stage of transforming into virtual organizations through the use of networked computing [40]. Therefore, they

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Situation in the private sector</th>
<th>Situation in the public sector</th>
<th>Consequences for public BPR initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Functions and Intentions | - Pursuit of profit and business growth  
- Aligned IT and business strategy  
- Part of a mostly vertical supply chain | - Execution of laws and policies  
- Stability and risk aversion  
- Controlling of compliance with laws  
- Concept of legalism  
- Part of a mostly horizontal supply chain | - Radical changes frequently unfeasible  
- BPR must be verified for legal compliance |
| Processes           | - Process initiated by customer  
- Customer-supplier relationship  
- Profit-driven processes  
- Full control over own process structure | - Processes based on legal regulations, laws and policies  
- Little control over process structure | - BPR as a top-down process  
- Radical changes frequently unfeasible  
- BPR must be verified for legal compliance |
| Organizational Structure | - Company sizes and structures highly variable  
- Affinity to recruiting  
- Different authority and autonomy levels | - Mandatory tasks and responsibilities  
- Management under political observation  
- Rigid hierarchies | - Formal decision-making  
- Top-down support as a prerequisite  
- Need for approval by all stakeholders involved  
- Involvement of internal experts across departments is challenging  
- Insufficient exchange of experiences regarding past BPR projects between administrations (ample potential for transinstitutional knowledge management platforms) |
| Economic Feasibility | - Freedom in allocating funds and controlling investments  
- Accountable to shareholders  
- Motivation to minimize costs | - Fiscal limitations  
- Pre-defined resources  
- Governmental authorization  
- Actions are subject to public scrutiny (public accountability)  
- Motivation to keep costs within budget (budget functions as a threshold value) | - Inflexible financial budgets  
- Resources (know-how, IT etc.) tend to be limited and may cause failure during early stages of the project  
- Acceptance of BPR efforts questionable once budgets are met and cost pressures decrease |
| Political Feasibility | - No dependencies  
- Internal financing  
- Consultation and agreement with cost centers (internal prices) | - Strict governmental and political restrictions  
- Feasibility of changes and amendments to laws and guidelines | - Proposed changes might face resistance by decision-makers and other stakeholders (especially when cross-functional departments are involved)  
- Political feasibility should be ensured early in the process as laws and regulations may prohibit planned measures |
| Expectations from BPR | - Increase business volume  
- Obtain market leadership  
- Cost savings | - Efficient use of resources  
- Identify redundancies in order to unify and automate processes  
- Alleviate costs of bureaucracy and cut down red tape  
- Improve service accessibility and usability | - Customer perspective matters, yet it does not represent the primary concern |

Table 2: Illustration of the identified differences between public and private organizations
also need to examine their underpinning processes.

Proposition 3: BPR efforts need to be initiated top-down in order to guarantee economic as well as political support and feasibility.

Even in private organizations, the commitment of superordinate decision makers greatly facilitates the successful implementation of changes [3]. It stands to reason that this is even more applicable to public administrations, for they lack essential freedom in economic and political terms. Once the appropriate financial, human and technological resources are ensured, success rates for BPR projects in the public sector will rise significantly. Scholl [19] argues that the support of senior executives is a vital point, particularly with the crossing of departmental and other organizational boundaries in BPR projects. Political and legal requirements may still act as constraints but may be reduced once a higher-level authority coordinates the change efforts of various agencies sharing a common hierarchy level.

Not only a top-down initiation is needed but the actual selection of the processes should also follow a top-down approach. This is achieved by a thorough top-down study of the respective domain and a subsequent selection of relevant processes [41]. In order to obtain a comprehensive knowledge of existing process landscape in a public administration, large numbers of potential reengineering candidates have to be analyzed. The bottom-up process analysis employed by many BPR-related approaches [42] is very expensive and time-consuming. Hence, we posit that a top-down approach [41,43] is needed in order to account for the special needs of the domain of public administration.

Proposition 4: A small-scale approach to BPR will increase success rates of BPR endeavors in the public sector.

The various functional, hierarchical and bureaucratic restrictions placed on public administrations challenge the transfer of methodology from the private sector. Public managers do not command sufficient authority to initiate the changes commonplace in private BPR efforts. This disparity may easily thwart proposed changes and result in failed BPR projects. Even when political support from superordinate levels is ensured, many legal restrictions and principles hinder BPR success. Further, media attention and the liability to public accountability increase with project size.

The inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in public BPR project is crucial [44]. However, a larger scope of a BPR initiative often results in bigger actor networks which exhibit even more diverse interests, goals and strategies [45]. Consequently, with every new stakeholder, the governance of such multi-actor networks becomes more difficult. Halachmi [29] argues that successful process-related change cannot occur without the consent of all the affected stakeholders. Thus, a small-scale BPR approach with fewer stakeholders involved may render more fruitful in the public sphere because it will ease coordination and communication efforts.

We propose that a dedicated approach in combination with a smaller project scope will ensure a higher success rate of BPR in the public sector.

Proposition 5: Sharing of knowledge and experiences via transinstitutional knowledge management platforms would positively impact the implementation of BPR in public administrations.

By benefitting from documented past experiences with BPR in other institutions, public entities would be able to achieve higher success rates in their own projects. This includes better anticipation of risks, lower costs incurred due to reusable artifacts, and more effective implementations based on documented best practices.

Constituting complex endeavors, BPR projects bear many potential barriers and risks capable of impacting project success or even halting a project altogether. This is especially true for the public sector, as illustrated by BPR success rates in the literature [46][19]. In contrast to the private sector, among public administrations accumulated knowledge is usually kept within the respective organization and not shared for the benefit of interested parties. Yet, the sheer number of merely horizontally separated – and thus similarly structured – public institutions demonstrates the potential of an integrated knowledge management platform documenting BPR experiences in the public sector. This platform may serve to document common risks, outline best practices, share reusable documents, and assist in the formation of realistic expectations regarding the benefits of BPR. As this calls for additional effort on part of the documenting institutions, the support and involvement of superordinate entities may be necessary. It needs to be noted that not only the limited availability of such information needs to be improved. In parallel, it is crucial to ensure the willingness of following BPR implementers to utilize this information in order to benefit from the experiences made by their predecessors. By building on the fundamentals provided by past projects, subsequent BPR projects in the public sector may achieve higher success rates with similar or even reduced resource expenditures.
5. Discussion & Conclusion

With this research paper we consolidated the ample literature on BPR success from the private and public sector. We identified the relevant success factors and showed that a surprising similarity exists between private and public BPR related success factors. In addition, we determined the specific characteristics and requirements of the public sector highlighting gaps in current literature. Finally, we structured the research gap in five propositions and provided directions for further research.

Our analysis shows that organizational, socio-technical and technical aspects each play a significant role in the success of BPR projects, illustrating the cross-sectional nature of the subject. Due to this extensive scope, BPR is fundamental to implementing transformational government. BPR has the potential to reform both front- and back-office service delivery, improve interorganizational communication and enhance usability for citizens and businesses.

In spite of the shared success factors, we identified differences between the two sectors regarding their structure, operation and objectives. Based on these differences, we propose that different approaches are necessary for realizing the identified success factors in public and private sector organizations. We derived five propositions aimed at encouraging future research into the subject matter. Firstly, the differing motivations of public and private entities when engaging in BPR projects need to be examined and incorporated in the design of a dedicated BPR methodology for the public sector. In order to ensure the necessary top-down commitment, the potential of BPR in the public sector needs to be validated and appropriately communicated. As a central focus, a dedicated methodology for BPR in the public sector should be derived. This methodology should account for the peculiarities in public administration, as exemplified in figure 1. Finally, in order to monitor and control the realized benefits, practical measures for efficiency and service quality need to be derived.

The established knowledge regarding success factors provides guidance to practitioners in both public and private BPR projects. Moreover, the results of our analysis regarding the specific characteristics of the public sector call attention to the need for an appropriate implementation strategy. Our findings may assist practitioners in the public sector to timely identify obstacles and impediments to their efforts and aid in the understanding of the underlying circumstances. Highlighting the need for top-down support of BPR initiatives, we encourage decision makers in the public sector to review the potentials of BPR for their organizations and initiate activities where appropriate.

Furthermore, we identify a need for practitioners to assess their organizations’ fitness for BPR before launching reengineering projects. Some of the issues impeding the adoption of BPR in the public sector are rooted in the fact that public administrations are still somewhat ill-prepared for the implementation of BPR activities [47]. This applies to both their organizational structure and their resources, such as available budgets and suitable personnel [15]. Qualified and experienced process managers are lacking in the public sector [36][23], as do incentive structures. To a certain extent, it is even disputable whether radical BPR activities as known from the private sector are appropriate measures for the private sector [14].

Two main limitations apply to our research. Firstly, the method used for obtaining literature was neither exhaustive nor necessarily representative of all existent literature. Secondly, the categorization used for structuring both the identified success factors (section 2.2) and the resulting challenges in section 3.2 was derived based on the subjective judgment of the authors. In general, our research was of qualitative nature and does not lend to quantitative analysis.
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