

Don't automate, obliterate

Business



Introduction Despite the fact that many companies have restructured and downsized through automation and rationalization, many companies in the United States of America did not meet the improvements, intended by process engineering. Specifically, this happened in the 1990s, at a time when changing technologies appeared rapidly, shorter product life cycles and development of products happened in a glacial pace. This paper looks at do not automate, obliterate as brought out by Michael Hammer and its operations. Discussion Do not automate; obliterate acts as a remarkable advice for the process of re-engineering.

The common methods that companies applied to boost their performance in form of automation and rationalisation did not produce the results needed. In the same way, technological advancements have not addressed the matter because most companies use technological advancements to improve old and outdated ways of doing business. These ways leave the process undamaged and speed them. Reengineering does not involve a meticulous plan that involves cautious steps that do not show a complete entity. Process engineering involves an all round proposition, with an uncertain result. Do not automate, obliterate forms an investment to come out of the old ways of running business, to modernised ways which include innovation, quality of service and remarkable speed.

Hammer said this statement in 1990. The aim for his statement involved restructuring work procedures and processes in businesses. However, many Chief Executive Officers used this idea wrongly, to sack employees so as to achieve cost effectiveness of their companies (Grover & Markus, 2008, p 126). The confusion that Hammer's work caused a backlash against the <https://assignbuster.com/dont-automate-obliterate/>

propensity of some corporations rapt by the use of computer systems, to believe certain ideologies. They believed that redeployment of automation systems used in the office can help enhance productivity and excellence in business.

This saying has certain guidelines that provide direction to its application. The first guideline involves making organisations around outcomes, instead of tasks. This guideline suggests that companies use single persons to perform steps in the process. The job of the person can be designed, based on the objective or outcome of the task. The second guideline involves putting people who use the output of the process become responsible to execute the process. When companies do this, overhead associated with management becomes irrelevant.

This helps eliminate interfaces, mechanisms and liaisons to coordinate the people who perform the process. The third guiding principle involves subsume of processing of information in to the real work that establishes the information (Henry & Et. al, 2002, p 123). The next guideline involves the ability of businesses, to consider geographical resources as a centralized and a complete entity. In doing this, companies can use, databases, telecommunications networks and standard processing systems. This helps to get benefits of scale and coordination, while at the same time, maintaining reimbursement of flexibility and service.

The next guideline involves linking parallel activities, instead of integrating their results. This means that companies must forge links between parallel functions and coordinating them with their activities in the process, rather

than after their completion. The next guideline involves putting decisions to work performance and building process controls. The guideline suggests that the people who do the work should also do monitoring and make decisions, based on the process itself. The last guideline involves capturing information, at the source only once.

This forms a critical factor for re-engineering of the business process, to succeed, which includes executive leadership and vision. When the management supports the process fully, other employees such as employees start taking the process of re-engineering, in a more serious manner. These guidelines form a basis for the functions of do not automate; obliterate to operate in the best way possible. Do not automate obliterate has certain advantages. It helps companies to save costs by using employees for several tasks.

The saying helps companies to speed up their operations but also to make the operations efficient. This happens because of innovation, quality of service and time consciousness. Another advantage of the saying involves the fact that companies will no longer use computer and technological advancements without consideration of the process itself. The saying puts emphasis on both the process and the outcome. Therefore, the means and the outcomes of the process hold a considerable amount of benefits to business companies (Grover & Markus, 2008, p 26).

One of the most significant oppositions to this saying involves downsizing that happens in companies due to the practise. People argue that the application of do not automate, obliterate will render many people jobless.

People will suffer; families will struggle, and lose out on their security. While a few victims of downsizing may have experienced downsizing, basing on their inefficiency, other become victims of the changing economic surrounding. This does not create a fair ground for carrying out economic change strategies (Tompkins, Baughman, & Bondi, 2000, p 90). Another opposition brings out the idea that downsizing can fail to achieve its goals.

When downsizing seems effective, its functionality extracts a social cost. As a result of downsizing, people who showed commitment towards the job, lose their commitment after downsizing. Conclusion Do not automate, obliterate acted as a way that could help companies achieve their maximum production potential. However, the saying did not consider employment satisfaction which leads to lack of commitment to the process. However, the saying acted as a good advice that could help companies modify and change their ways of operation and achieve efficiency, in terms of innovation and time consciousness.

This helped companies pay attention to the process and the outcome, as significant components towards the success of business productivity.