

The Contribution of Business Process Reengineering Factors towards Employee Performance- The Case of SNNPRS Transport Bureau, Hawassa

*Gebre Sorsatakarro, **Mesele Abera Wako

Abstract

This research project is conducted with the objective of to know the contribution of BPR factors towards employee performance in the public organization of the S/N/N/P/R Transport Bureau Hawassa. The indicators that measure employee performance in the study were both success and failure factors of BPR such as egalitarian leadership, cooperative working environment, top management commitment, management system, information technology and resistance to change were major factors dealt in the process. This study was done using descriptive survey method and the study covers all employees of the organization together with its manager. The researcher used questionnaire, interview, secondary documents and observation to collect the data. Data presentation, analysis and interpretation have been applied with the help of descriptive analysis, correlation and regression statistics. The analysis of the findings clearly shows that cooperative working environment, egalitarian leadership, top management commitment, information technology and management system had direct and positive relationship towards employee performance, all except top management commitment were significant because of p-value <0.01. In spite of the fact that resistance to change has inversely contributed to wards employee performance. Even if, the results show that there was positive relationship between BPR success factors and employees performance, the researcher suggest to the leader & top management of the organization, to be committed, work correspond to change and to give concentration & attention towards BPR project to achieve over all organizational goal and to enhance employees performance.

Key words: - Business Process Reengineering, Success and Failure Factors, Employee Performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The concept of Business Process Reengineering is an American idea and began as a private sector technique to help organizations to fundamentally rethink how they do their work in order to dramatically improve customer service, cut operational

cost and become world class competitors. Business Process Reengineering (BPR) is the analysis and redesign of workflow within and between enterprises (Hammer and Champy, 1990). After the global recession of early 1980s, many organizations and firms across the world

The Contribution of Business Process Reengineering Factors towards Employee Performance- The Case of SNNPRS Transport Bureau, Hawassa

made attempts to revitalize their performances.

According to Hailekiros & Ajit (2012) Business process reengineering is dramatic change that represents the overall of organizational structures, management system, employee responsibilities and empowerment, performance measurements, incentive system, skills development, and the use of information technology. Successful BPR model can result in great reductions in cost or cycle time, and improvements in quality and customer services. On the other hand, BPR projects can fail to meet the inherently high expectations of reengineering. Some organizations even destroy the morale and momentum of employee built up over their lifetime cause of poor BPR implementation.

BPR has been defined by different scholars. Among the different definitions the one given by (Hammer and Champy, 1993) is widely accepted and worth considering:

BPR as "... the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service, and speed."

Thomas H. Davenport (1993), another well-known BPR theorist, uses the term process innovation, which he says "... encompasses the envisioning of new work strategies, the actual process design activity, and the implementation of the change in all its complex technological, human, and organizational dimensions."

BPR is world-wide applicable technique of business restructuring focusing on business processes, providing vast improvements in a short period of time. The technique implements organizational change based on the close coordination of a methodology for rapid change, employee empowerment

and training and support by information technology.

Few years after the downfall of the military government, the new Ethiopian government recognized the importance of improving the performance of service delivery and the creation of accountable and responsible civil service institutions that would support the development efforts in the country. Since 2004, based on the general direction of the Ministry of Capacity Building, most federal civil service organizations have directed their efforts and resources towards implementing BPR (Tesfaye 2009).

S/N/N/P/R Transport bureau One of service rendering governmental organization officially starts BPR implementation in 2009. Bureau of transport is one of the executive organs of the SNNPRS re-established in accordance with a proclamation (No.133/2011) issued to amend the power and duties of the executive organs of the regional state. Accordingly the bureau has responsible and mandated to be manage the transport sector this comprises the transport services and road infrastructure. So as to bring this in to effect basing on its new organizational structure this is formulated from the result of business reengineering process study. Currently the bureau has undergoing tremendous efforts to be achieving its vision and mission.

According to the data acquired from the bureau there is no survey study was implemented on BPR implementation and employee performance. After the public institutions began implementing BPR, various stories of success as well as failure have been heard through different channels of communications. Therefore, the researcher in this study is want to assess the contribution of BPR factors on employee

performance of the S/N/N/P/R Transport bureau in Hawassa city

1.2 Statement of the problem

BPR was designed for performance improvement of the existing system of organization and control so that organizations will be abreast with the technology and current innovations. And also emphasizes every line up in every organization affects the responses of their workforce performance. (Hammer, 1993)

According to Hammer (1990), Davenport & Short (1990), many organizations have reported dramatic benefits gained from the successful implementation of BPR. However, not all organizations implementing BPR projects achieve their desired results. In addition to this Hammer & Champy (1993) 70% and Hall et al (1993), 50-70% of BPR initiatives fail to deliver the expected results. Implementation of BPR requires fundamental organizational transformations. Thus the implementation process is complex, difficult and needs to be checked against several success and failure factors.

In few years before BPR has become the principal agenda in many governmental organizations of the country Ethiopia and also our organization, but now a time BPR is not a big issue as before and there is resistance to change from both management & employees' side.

According to S/N/N/P/R civil service bureau, from monitoring and evaluation of change management survey result from the total of 33 governmental organization 9% shows low change management performance 73% shows medium change management performance and 18% shows high change management performance. From this data, the selected organization can be categorized at medium level. As we

know BPR was designed to change the previous old routine work activities radically change to team process activities by reducing cost, by enhancing quality, by providing efficient and effective service for service provider/customer, and by increasing the speed of the process (Hammer and Champy, 1993). Even if BPR project is good for governmental organization but there is some problem in the time of implementation. And also researcher observe that Since BPR has been designed and implemented in this organization the performance of employees not measured according to BPR , not corresponds to change management and not adjust employees salary accordingly.

The outcome of this study was important to know the weakness and strength of BPR implementation on the organization. And also the findings of the study may be useful for civil service bureau of the region for monitoring and evaluation purpose, for academicians, and for further researches to be done for the completeness of the issue.

The source of this problem may be collaborative working environment, top management commitment, egalitarian leadership, supportive management, use of technology and resistance to change. There for the purpose of this research project to know how all these factors (top management commitment, collaborative working environment, supportive management, use of information technology and resistance to change) are contributing to the differences among employee performance, which of these factors have greater influence and Knowing the dramatic effect of these factors on employee performance is the interest of this research. The research answered for the following research questions.

1. What are the contributions of BPR successes factors on employee performance of the organization?
2. What is the failure factor that influence employee performance in the organization?

1.3 Objective of the study

The study was conducted with the aim of attaining the following objectives:

1.3.1 General objective

To investigate the success and failure factors of BPR and their contribution toward employee performance at the S/N/N/P/R Transport bureau in Hawassa city.

1.3.4 Specific objectives

To investigate the relationship between employee performance and the related factors influencing employee performance such as collaborative working environment, top management commitment, egalitarian leadership, management system, and use of information technology and change resistance.

To know how the organization could maintain positive employee performance.

To know what decision made to improve employee performances to strengthen BPR project.

Delimitation /the Scope of the Study

Even though, BPR was conducted in different public institutions and organizations, the researcher focuses in S/N/N/P/R Transport bureau in Hawassa city. The study was mainly focused on about contribution of BPR factors such as cooperative working environment, top management commitment, management system good leader ship and information technology towards employees performance.

2 Limitations of the study

Though, there was great commitment and eagerness to participate knowledge that acquired in class rooms and fear to implement the knowledge due to

1. In adequate time to precede the study in depth.
2. Respondents may hide valuable information that may reveal the actual situation.
3. Lack of adequate experience in conducting research
4. Lack of budget to execute
5. The study covers only after implementation of BPR in the organization (2009).

2. Methodology

2.1 Description of the organization

S/N/N/P/R Transport bureau is located in Hawassa city in front of " Meskel sqoure". It is one of governmental organization in the region, the bureau has responsible and mandated to manage the transport sector, and to provide its service the bureau divided in to two work possess 4-core business process the transport services such as driver and vehicle competence assurance, provision of transport service, road traffic safety and road infrastructure that is URRAP (Universal Rural Road Access Program) indicated as core processes of the organization and the remaining 10-supportive business processes Such as human resource management, procurement and finance, (Development plan, monitoring and evaluation) internal audit, ICT, government Communication, Gender, HIV mainstreaming, Record and documentation and Ethical control department indicated as Supportive business process of government organization of SNNPR transport bureau.

Transport Bureau is one of service rendering governmental organization, officially starts BPR implementation in

2009. Bureau of transport is one of the executive organs of the SNNPRS re-established in accordance with a proclamation No.133/2003 et.c issued to amend the power and duties of the executive organs of the regional state. Accordingly the bureau has responsible and mandated to be manage the transport sector this comprises the transport services and road infrastructure. So as to bring this in to effect basing on its new organizational structure this is formulated from the result of business reengineering process study. Currently the bureau has undergoing tremendous efforts to be achieving its vision and mission.

2.2 Study Approach

The study used both qualitative and quantitative research methods. By using the qualitative method, the researcher was explore the psychological, social and personal negative or positive attitudes of the leader of the organization, towards contribution of BPR factors on employee performance and by using quantitative approaches collect questioner response and present the findings using tables and percentages.

2.3 Study Design

The descriptive survey method was used to gather data concerning the variables related to BPR factors and employee performance of Transport bureau employees. It describes the issue conducted through structured questionnaires. Since the intention of the study is to describe the present situation of BPR and the employee performance on it, each descriptive factor represents the situation under each respondent. The questionnaires were converted in to the direct version of Amharic and also the data was collected with this version.

2.4 Study population

Among the total (33) bureaus found in S/N/N/P/R, Transport bureau was selected for the purpose of this project since majority of the bureaus (73%) including it can categorized in the medium level in their BPR performance. According to Transport bureau of HRM supportive work process, there are four core business process and ten supportive business work process with a total of 108 employees in it. During the survey study, a total of 108 questionnaires were distributed to all employees of the bureau. 105 (98%) distributed questionnaires were returned while 3 questionnaires were not returned due to different reason. From 105 returned questionnaires, 100 (95%) questionnaires were used in the analysis while the remaining 5 were ignored in the time of editing due to inappropriate responding. As a result the analysis was made based on 100 returned questionnaires.

In order to increase the validity and reliability of the study, the researcher was applied all population (employees).

2.5 Sampling & techniques

The researcher was use the whole population or census data collection methods. By census data collection method the researcher was collect quantitative information from every unit of population. As a result, the data was a truly representative of the whole population and detailed accurate data can be made.

2.6 Source of Data

The study used both primary and secondary data as a source of information. Primary data was collected based on Close-ended questionnaire and structured interview. The secondary data was collected by reviewing books, previous research works, articles and journals related, annual reports, published and unpublished materials, and online information available.

For the validity of the study, the researcher used tested questionnaires by adopting from Abdolvand, et al. (2008) and Mohammed.k(2011). The questionnaire consists of two parts. Part one was prepared to gather general information about the respondents' work process, sex, Job status, age, educational background, work experience and monthly salary of the respondents working at SNNPR transport bureau. This part consists of 7 questions. Part two was prepared to ask respondents to answer independent variable such as change resistance, egalitarian leadership, information technology, management system, cooperative working environment and top management commitment and the dependent variable employee performance questions. And also this part consists of 30 questions; the questions assess and measure the contribution of BPR factors on employee performance. The other data collecting tool was interview which consists of 9 structured interview questions with regard to BPR factors activities and employee performance. More over data was collected from the head of the selected bureau through structured interview with the intention of strength the finding.

Questions in part two were assessed by using a five point Lickert scale. Each question of the questionnaire is assigned a number indicating strongly disagree measured as 1, disagree measured as 2, neutral measured as 3, agree measured as 4, and strongly agree measured as 5. The independent variable such as success and failure factors of BPR and measured by six dimensions such as egalitarian leadership, information technology, management system, cooperative working environment and top management commitment and change resistance. The dependent variable has one dimension and measured by employee

performance towards SNNPR transport bureau.

2.7 Data processing and Analysis

After collecting the data through questionnaire and interview, the data was edited and processed by using SPSS software version 17. Analysis of data in this research was done by using descriptive analysis method for both demographic and main body research questions by applying the instrument such us frequency, percentage, mean, table . And also the statistical tools bivariate correlation models were used. 2-tailed Pearson correlation test was conducted to measure the strength of the association between independent variable (change resistance, egalitarian leadership, information technology, management system, cooperative working environment and top management commitment) and employee performance.

Employee performance is the function of egalitarian leadership, cooperative working environment, top management commitment, management system, information technology and resistance to change. Generally, the model is represented by the following function.

$$Ep = \beta_1 + \beta_2 (EL) + \beta_3 (CWE) + \beta_4 (TMC) + \beta_5 (MSY) + \beta_6 (IT) + \beta_7 (RTC) + \epsilon_i$$

Where

1. EP- Employee performance
2. EL- Egalitarian leadership
3. CWE- Cooperative working environment
4. TMC- Top management commitment
5. MSY - Management system
6. IT- Information technology
7. RTC- Resistance to change

The beta values are representing the following: - β_1 represents constant beta value for the model β_2 shows the beta value of egalitarian leadership, β_3 indicates the

beta value of cooperative working environment, β_4 reflect beta value of top management commitment, β_5 represent beta value of management system, β_6 values of information technology and β_7 shows the beta values of resistance to change factors.

β_1 - is known as parameters of the model. It represents the intercept of the model Gujarati (2004).

$\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6$ and β_7 - represent the slop coefficients Gujarati (2004).

ϵ_i - is representing the error term. It is a surrogate/substitute for all those variables that are omitted from the model but that collectively affect employee performance. The model determining the behavior of employee performance may be incomplete; it is common experience in empirical analysis that the data we would ideally like to have often are not available. All this and other things we overlook are absorbed by this error term Gujarati (2004).

2.8 Variables included in the Study

In this study the following dependent and independent variables was included.

1. **Dependent variable:** The dependent variable that applied in the study was the employee performance.
2. **Independent variables:** The independent variables considered in this study can be categorized in to two: success and failure factors. Success factors Such as collaborative working environment, top management commitment, egalitarian leadership, supportive management, use of

technology and failure factor (resistance to change).

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter deals with analysis of results and discussion. It consists of two sections, the first section deals with the socio –demographic characteristics of respondents, the second section discusses the main part of the study, the analysis and interpretation of data collected through questioner and interview.

To analyze the collected data in line with the overall objective to investigate the success and failure factors of BPR and their contribution toward employee performance at the S/N/N/P/R Transport bureau in Hawassa city. The chapter indentifies and analysis the major issues raised in the study.

The questionnaires were developed in likert scale model ranging from one to five; where 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 represents strongly agree. All questionnaires were filled by the employees of the bureau.

3.1 Analyzing of demographic factors of the respondents

This descriptive analysis is used to describe the demographic factors. It is mainly important to make some general observations about the data gathered for general or demographics questions. This section analyzes the respondent’s work process, sex, Job status, age, educational background, work experience and monthly salary of the respondents working at SNNPR transport bureau.

Table-1: demographic factors of respondents

No	Item	Respondents	
		F	%
1	Work process		

	Core process	56	56.0
	Supportive process	44	44.0
	Total	100	100.0
2	Sex		
	Male	60	60.0
	Female	40	40.0
	Total	100	100.0
3	Job status		
	Permanent	79	79.0
	Contract	21	21.0
	Total	100	100.0
4	Age group		
	22-29 year	34	34.0
	30-39 year	45	45.0
	40-49 year	16	16.0
	>50	5	5.0
	Total	100	100.0
5	Educational background		
	<12 grade	15	15.0
	12 grade	17	17.0
	Diploma	11	11.0
	Degree	46	46.0
	Masters	11	11.0
	Total	100	100.0
6.	Service year		
	<2 year	13	13.0
	2-10 year	44	44.0

	11-20 year	25	25.0
	21-30 year	17	17.0
	>31 year	1	1.0
	Total	100	100.0
7.	Monthly salary		
	<1000	27	27.0
	1001-2000	21	21.0
	2001-3000	10	10.0
	3001-4000	22	22.0
	4001-4343	5	5.0
	>4343	15	15.0
	Total	100	100.0

Source: Primary Data-2013

As shown in table 1, out of the 100 respondents, (56%) of them were working in core work process such as driver and vehicle competence assurance, provision of transport service, road traffic safety and URRAP(Universal Rural Road Access Program) indicated as core processes of the organization and the remaining (44%) of the respondents were working in Supportive work process Such as human resource management, procurement and finance, Development plan, monitoring and evaluation, internal audit, ICT, government Communication, Gender, HIV mainstreaming, Record and documentation and Ethical control department indicated as Supportive work process of government organization of SNNPR transport bureau. Thus, majority of the respondents are working in core work process.

The respondents which account 79% are working in permanent bases and the

remaining 21% are working in contractual bases.

When we see the age category of the respondents, 34% of the total respondents are in the age category of 22-29years, 45% of them belong in the age of 30-39 years, 16% of the respondents in the age category of 40-49years, and the rest are at the age category of above 50 years old.

Concerning to the educational background of the respondents: 15% of the total respondents are less than grade 12, 17% of them are grade 12/Certificate holders, 11% of the respondents are Diploma holders, 46% are Degree holders and 11% of them are 2nd degree holder /masters holders.

Regarding to the respondents working experience, 13% of the respondents have work experience of < 2 year, 44% have work experience of 2-10year years, 25%of the respondents have work experience of 11-20 year , 17% workers have work

experience of 21-30 and the remaining 1% have work experience of >31 years.

The last demographic factor dealt in this study was the monthly salary of the employees. Of the total respondent, 27% of them earned monthly salary of < 1000 Birr, 21% of the respondents earned monthly salary of 1001-2000 Birr, 10% of the

respondents earned monthly salary of 2001-3000 Birr, 22% of the respondents earned monthly salary of 3001-4000 Birr, 5% of the respondents earned monthly salary of 4001-4343 Birr, and the remaining 15% of the respondents earned monthly salary of more than 4343 Birr.

4.2 Descriptive analysis of success and failure factors of BPR

Table 2: Egalitarian leadership indicators

Questions	Respondents					Mean	Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
A. Egalitarian leadership indicators	%	%	%	%	%		100
1)Your manager share vision and information of the bureau to you	11	44	15	23	7	2.71	100
2)You and your supervisors have an open communication	3	11	11	59	16	3.74	100
3)Your manager place full confidence on you	3	6	13	61	17	3.83	100
4)Your manager listen and use your ideas positively	5	18	16	45	16	3.49	100

Source: Primary Data-2013

As shown in table 2: According to best, (1977) to make easy the interpretation of the mean value the researcher was use for less than or equal to 1.5 strongly disagreed, 1.51-2.49 disagree, 2.5-3.49 neutral, 3.5-4.49 agree and 4.5-5 strongly agreed.

Out of total employees the mean value of 2.71 of respondents reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue. In other wards 55% respondents disagreed that the

manager shared vision and information to the employees according to needed and also, 30% respondents agreed that the manager shared vision and information to the employees and also. However, the remaining 15% they were neutral about the issue.

Consequently, with the mean value of 3.74 respondents agreed that there is an open communication between supervisors and

the employees. In other words 75% agreed that there is an open communication between supervisors and the employees, while 11% of respondents said that they were neutral regarding to the issue and also 14% disagreed that there is absent of open communication between supervisors and the employees.

Besides with the mean value of 3.83 respondents agreed that their manager and supervisors had confident on the employee’s performance. In other words 87% agreed that their manager and supervisors had confident on the employee’s performance, 13% answered that they were neutral about the issue. But 9% of them answered that they disagreed manager and supervisors are not confident on employees’ performance.

Furthermore, with the mean value 3.49 of respondents agreed that they did not know whether the manager listen and use the employees ideas positively or not. In other words 61% of respondents agreed that the manager listen and use employees ideas positively, 23% disagreed that the manager was not listen and use employees ideas positively and 16% said neutral.

Therefore, the findings of this research clearly show that there is positive and direct

relationship between egalitarian leadership and employee performance.

Moreover, the above results the leaders of the organization agreed that employees have different knowledge and attitude towards BPR. This difference also affects their performance in the time of BPR implementation.

In addition to, the above result similar result shown in different researcher in different organization such as Naod.M,(2011) Ethiopian Public Universities, Mohammed. K (2011) in Addis Ababa City Administration and Abdolvand, et al. (2008), transport organization found in Iran have described that egalitarian leadership has little but direct contribution to employee performance and their readiness.

In contrast to, the above results a research of Yared.A,(2010) in Ethiopian Postal Service at Addis Ababa General Post Office and Crowe, (2002) held in seven different organizations over the issue of egalitarian leadership, majority (four of the seven) of the organizations brought a negative correlation with employee and organizational efforts to get success under reengineered environments.

The reason for different results on this research can be a different environment adopted by organizations.

Table 3: Cooperative working environment indicators

B. Cooperative working environment factors	Respondents					Mean	Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
	%	%	%	%	%		
1) You have a friendly interaction with other workers at the work place	-	-	1	62	37	4.36	100

2) Coworkers have confidence and trust to each other in the office	5	16	19	52	8	3.42	100
3) Team working has played a role in problem solving.	2	2	6	68	22	4.06	100
4) You feel coworkers are working in a cooperative environment	1	5	5	71	18	4.00	100
5) coworkers have performance for recognition	2	10	8	70	10	3.76	100

Source: Primary Data-2013

According to the finding of the present study, the mean value of 4.36 respondents reported that they agreed there is a friendly interaction between employees in the organization. In other words 99% of respondents agreed that there is a friendly interaction between employees in the organization. But the remaining 1% of respondents said that they were neutral to the issue.

Additionally, with the mean value of 3.42 respondents agreed that they were neutral/did not know whether coworkers have confidence and trust with each other or not. In other words 60% of respondents agreed that coworkers have confidence and trust with each other, 21% of the respondents answered that they were disagreed and coworkers have not had confidence and trust to each other and also 19% said neutral about the issue.

Meanwhile, (mean=4.06) agreed that team working have a significant role for problem solving. In other words 90% of respondents agreed that team working have a significant role for problem solving While, 6% answered that they were neutral and 4% respondents responded that they disagreed that team working have no significant role in problem solving.

Inconsequence, the majority (mean = 4.00) agreed that they believe coworkers are working in a cooperative environment. In other words 79% of respondents agreed that coworkers are working in a cooperative environment, 6% of the respondents answered that they disagreed and they were not think coworkers are working in a cooperative environment, and 5% of them did not know whether there is cooperative working environment or not.

Finally, (mean=3.76) respondents agreed that there is performance recognition among coworkers. In other words 80% of respondents agreed that there is performance recognition among coworkers, 12% agreed that there is no performance recognition among coworkers, and 8% said neutral regarding to the issue.

The findings of this research clearly show that there is positive and direct relationship between cooperative working environment and employee performance.

Additionally, the manager agreed that, BPR create a suitable cooperative working environment for employees and also team working has a significant role for their problem solving.

In addition to, the above result similar result shown in different researcher in

different organization such as Naod.M,(2011) in Ethiopian Public Universities, Mohammed. K (2011) Addis Ababa City Administration and Abdolvand, et al. (2008), transport organizations found in Iran have described that cooperative

working environment has direct contribution to employee performance and their readiness. Many researches not contrast about cooperative working environment issues.

Table 4: Top management commitment indicators

C. Top management commitment factors	Respondents					Mean	Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
	%	%	%	%	%		
1)Your bureau's top management officials have a realistic expectation to BPR project	12	51	22	14	1	2.41	100
2)Your bureau's officials have sufficient knowledge about BPR	5	35	26	26	8	2.97	100
3) Your bureau management officials communicate with you and users frequently	6	38	21	33	3	2.87	100

Source: Primary Data-2013

From table 4 out of 100 respondents (mean = 2.41) disagreed that top management officials did not have a realistic expectation to BPR. In other words 63% of respondents disagreed that top management officials did not have a realistic expectation to BPR, 22% said neutral about the issue and also 15% agreed that top management officials have a realistic expectation to BPR project.

Furthermore, (mean=2.97) of respondents reported that they did not know whether the bureau's officials have sufficient knowledge about BPR or not. In other words 40% of respondents disagreed that the bureau's officials have sufficient knowledge about BPR while 34% of them agreed that bureau's officials have

sufficient knowledge about BPR, and also the remaining 26% answered that they were neutral about the issue.

Finally, (mean=2.87) respondents reported that they did not know whether the bureau's management officials frequently communicate with employees and customers or not. In other words 44% of respondents disagreed that bureau's management officials did not frequently communicate with employees and customers, and 36% of respondents agreed that bureau's management officials frequently communicate with employees and customers, and also the remaining 21% answered that they were neutral about the issue.

Therefore, the finding of this research clearly show that there is positive and direct relationship between top management commitment and employee performance. Besides to the above result similar finding shown in different researcher in different organization such as Mohammed. K (2011) in Addis Ababa City Administration and Abdolvand, et al. (2008), transport organizations found in Iran have described

that top management commitment and employee performances have direct relationship. But the research results of Crowe, et al. (2002) show that negative relationship between top management commitment and employee performance. The causes for different results on this research may be a different environment adopted by organizations and other factors.

Table 5: Management system indicators

D. Management system factors	Respondents					Mean	Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
	%	%	%	%	%		
1)Your bureau adjust your salary accordingly	46	30	12	10	2	1.92	100
2)Your bureau's performance measurement corresponds to changes	41	27	12	14	6	2.17	100
3)Your bureau empowers you to make decisions when performing jobs	47	26	10	16	1	1.98	100
4) There is training and/or educational programs to update employees skill	51	28	10	8	3	1.84	100

Source: Primary Data-2013

From table 5 the results of survey clearly show that, (mean = 1.92) of respondents disagreed that the bureau did not adjust salary according to BPR principle. In other words 76% of respondents disagreed that the bureau did not adjust the employee's salary and also the remaining 12% respondents answered that they were agreed and neutral regarding to the issue.

Among all respondents the majority, (mean=2.17) respondents disagreed that bureau's performance measurement was

not corresponds to changes. In other words 68% of respondents disagreed that bureau's performance measurement was not corresponds to changes, 20% agreed that bureau's performance measurement corresponds to changes. However, the remaining 12% answered that they did not know whether bureau's performance measurement corresponds to changes or not.

Inconsequence, (mean=1.98) respondents disagree that the bureau did not empower

employees to make decisions when performing jobs. In other words 73% of respondents disagreed that the bureau did not empower employees to make decisions while 17% of respondents agreed that the bureau empowers the employees to make decisions when performing jobs. However, the remaining 10% respondents answered that they were neutral regarding to the issue.

Furthermore, (mean =1.84) respondents' disagreed that the bureau was not facilitate training and/or educational programs to update their skill. In other words 79% of respondents disagreed that the bureau was not facilitate training and/or educational programs to update their skill, 11% of respondents agreed that there is training and/or educational programs to update employees skill. However, the remaining 10% respondents answered that they were neutral concerning to the issue.

The project research clearly shows that there is positive and direct relationship between management system and employee performance.

Meanwhile, manager and employees agreed regarding to the reward system of the

organizations. Both were sure salaries of permanent and civil service workers, yet not adjusted according to change management (BPR). Similarly, manager of the bureau believed that majority of the employees were trained on BPR concept unless new employees but not facilitate education program for them based on their performance.

And also the leader of the organization agreed that there is no any decision was applied for negative employee performances and not promote their positive performance according BPR concepts.

In addition to the above result similar result shown in different researcher in different organizations Mohammed. K (2011) in Addis Ababa City Administration and Abdolvand, et al. (2008), transport organizations found in Iran have described that management system positively contributed to employee performance. Many researches accept that there is management system problem to promote employees but not many researchers contradict to this issue

Table 6: Information technology indicators

E. Information technology factors	Respondents					Mean	Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
	%	%	%	%	%		
1) Your bureau has integrated IT with its working plan	8	14	12	61	5	3.41	100
2)The bureau extensively use information system	4	15	14	62	5	3.49	100
3)Your bureau use effective communication channel in transferring information	5	27	22	40	6	3.15	100

Source: Primary Data-2013

From table 6 the results of census survey clearly show that, (mean= 3.41) respondents answered that they did not know whether the bureau applied integrated IT or not. In other words 66% of respondents agreed that the bureau use integrated IT, 22% respondents disagreed that bureaus did not have integrated IT, and 12% said that they were neutral about the issue.

From total, (mean=3.49) respondents answered that they did not know whether the bureaus extensively use information system or not. In other words 67% of respondents agreed that the organization extensively use information system 19% respondents disagreed that bureaus did not use information system extensively, and also 14% said that they were neutral about the issue.

Out of 100 employees, (mean=3.15) respondents answered that they did not know whether the bureaus use effective communication channel or not for transferring information to internal and external user. In other words 46% respondents agreed that the bureaus use effective communication channel to transfer information, 32% respondents

disagreed that the bureau not use effective communication channel to transfer information to internal and external user and 22% said that they were neutral about the issue.

From the above results there is positive and direct relationship between information technology and employee performance.

Besides to the above result similar finding shown in different researcher in different organization such as Mohammed. K (2011) in Addis Ababa City Administration and Abdolvand, et al. (2008), transport organizations found in Iran study showed that the induction of information technology brought greater contribution for employee readiness and performances.

But the research results of Zucco (1996) and Hall, (1993) showed that there is no significant correlation between the increased use of information technology in BPR and employee performance in cycle time reduction and also indicated redesigning BPR within existing IT constraints are limiting employee performance potential.

The causes for different results on this research may be a different environment adopted by organizations and other factors.

Table 7: Change resistance indicators

E. Change resistance factors	Respondents					Mean	Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
	%	%	%	%	%		
1)Your Managers feel anxiety of losing their authority after changes	7	9	40	40	4	3.25	100

2)There is skepticism among employees about the results of the project	10	7	26	51	6	3.36	100
3) Employees feel uncomfortable with the new environment	10	41	25	19	5	2.68	100

Source: Primary Data-2013

From table 7, among all respondents (mean = 3.25) employees reported that they did not know whether the manager feel anxiety of losing their authority or not. In other words 44% employees agreed that the manager feel anxiety of losing their authority after changes, 40% said that they were neutral about the issue and 16% of respondents disagreed that manager of the bureau did not feel anxiety of losing their authority after changes.

Additionally, (mean=3.36) employees reported that they did not know whether there is skepticism among employees about the results of BPR project or not. In other words 57% employees reported that they agreed that there is skepticism among employees about the results of BPR project, 26% said that they were neutral about the issue and 17% of respondents disagreed that there is no doubt among employees about the results of BPR project.

Respondents, (mean= 2.68) employees reported that they did not know whether the bureau agreed and feel comfortable with the new environment or not. In other words 51% of employees reported that they disagreed that employees feel uncomfortable with the new environment,

25% said that they were neutral about the issue and 24% respondents reported that employees of the bureau agreed and feel comfortable with the new environment

Therefore, the findings of this research clearly show that there is negative and inverse relationship between change resistance and employee performance.

Generally, from the interview result the manager accepts that there was resistance to change in the organization Such as unstable and less commitment of top management, not work for change and not give concentration to BPR project.

In addition to, the above result study show that in different researcher in different organization such as, Mohammed. K (2011) Addis Ababa City Administration, Abdolvand, et al. (2008) and Crowe, et al. (2002) studies showed that resistance to change has significant effect on employee performance.

In contrast to, the above results a research finding of Zairi and Sinclair (1995) shown resistance to change has negatively influenced employee performance.

The reason for different results on this research can be a different environment adopted by organizations.

Table 8 Employee performance indicators

Source own survey data (2013)

Out of total employees the mean value of 3.38 of respondents reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue. In other

wards 61% respondents agreed that they understood well and adhere to policies and procedures 30% respondents disagreed that they did not understand the policies and

procedures manager of the organization. However, the remaining 9% they were neutral about the issue.

Consequently, with the mean value of 3.73 respondents agreed that they were effectively use resources including time and materials. In other words 75% agreed that they were effectively use resources including time and materials, while 18% disagreed that they did not effectively use resources including time and materials and also 7% of respondents said that they were neutral regarding to the issue.

Besides with the mean value of 4 respondents agreed that they were serving their customers as possible as they can. In other words 85% agreed that they were serve their customers as possible as they can, 12% answered that they disagreed they were not serve their customers as possible as they can. But 3% of them answered that they were neutral about the issue

Furthermore, with the mean value 4.09 of respondents agreed that they were kept their supervisor information. In other words 84% of respondents agreed that they can kept their supervisor information, 8% disagreed and neutral about the issue.

From total employees the mean value of 3.40 of respondents reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue. In other wards 55% respondents agreed that they were actively peruse or initiate projects for the benefit the organization, 31% respondents disagreed that they did not

actively peruse or initiate projects for the benefit the organization. However, the remaining 14% they were neutral about the issue.

Furthermore, with the mean value 4.18 of respondents agreed that they were neutral. In other words 91% of respondents agreed that they can develop logical and creative solution to the problems, 5% and 4 % disagreed and neutral respectively about the issue.

Consequently, with the mean value 4.22 of respondents agreed that they were work with other employees. In other words 92% of respondents agreed that they can effectively work with other employees, 5% and 3 % neutral and disagreed respectively about the issue.

Besides with the mean value 4.21 of respondents agreed that they were receptive to new idea and concepts. In other words 90% of respondents agreed that they can receptive to new idea and concepts, 7% and 3 % neutral and disagreed respectively about the issue.

4.3 Correlation and Regression analysis

4.3.1 Correlation analysis

Like the demographic factors, the scale typed question entered to the SPSS software version 17.00, to process correlation analysis. Based on the question which was filled by all employees of the bureau, the following main correlation analysis was made.

Table 9: correlation of independent variable with Employee performance (dependant)

No	Variables	Mean	Pearson correlation	Sig	N
1	egalitarian leader ship	3.99	.291**	.003	100
2	Cooperative working environment	4.91	.63**	.000	100

3	top management commitment	3.04	.148	.142	100
4	management system	3.05	.321**	.001	100
5	information technology	3.67	.0290**	.000	100
6	change resistance	3.43	-.56**	.000	100
7	employee performance	4.39	1		100

Source: Primary Data-2013

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Generally, according to the researcher proposed on the theoretical view of diamond model in the literature review that egalitarian leadership, Cooperative working environment, top management commitment, management system, and information technology indicator were among the success factors of BPR. According to J.pallant (2007 pp; 132) stated that (the value $r = 0.10$ to 0.29 have small relationship, 0.3 to 0.49 have medium relationship and 0.5 to 1 have strong relationship). The analysis of the findings also discovered that all success factors of BPR contributed towards employee performance of the organization right from strong positive to weak positive correlation which that, cooperative working environment (mean=4.91) and had strong relationship, egalitarian leadership (mean=3.99) and had medium relationship, information technology(mean=3.67)and had medium relationship, management system(mean=3.05) and had small relationship and top management commitment(mean=3.04) and had small relationship towards employee performance respectively, in spite of the fact that resistance to change(mean=4.43) and had medium relationship has inversely contributed to employee performance. This

clearly shows that cooperative working environment, egalitarian leadership, information technology and management system had direct and positive relationship towards employee performance, all except top management commitment were significant because of p-value < 0.01 .

4.3.2 Regression analysis

This regression analysis was conducted to know by how much the independent variable explains the dependent variable. It is also used to understand by how much each independent variable (change resistance, egalitarian leadership, information technology, management system, cooperative working environment and top management commitment) explains the dependent variable that is employee performance. Even if, not proposed to apply the regression analysis in the study, but to know their relation and contribution of the independent variable on dependant variable explained as follows: From regression analysis result the above factors had explain employee performance. In addition to this, there were other factors that affect employee performance which was not included in this study such as structure, culture, and design of BPR project of the organization.

The regression analysis model summary indicates that all independent variables which are entered into the regression model on SPSS have

relationship with employee performance with correlation coefficient of 0.593. The R square is the explained variance and it is actually the square of the multiple R $(0.593)^2$. Therefore, it is pointed out that 35 percent of independent variable (change resistance, egalitarian leader ship, information technology, management system, cooperative working environment and top management

commitment) had an effect on the dependent variable that is employee performance. Change resistance, egalitarian leader ship, information technology, management system, cooperative working environment and top management commitment were considered as predictors of employee performance and reported high level of Significance because the p value <0.01 .

Table 10: Regression and coefficients of BPR factors

Model	Standardized Coefficients		T	Sig.
	Beta			
1 (Constant)			2.173	.006
Egalitarian leader ship	.207		1.975	.007
Cooperative working environment	.270		2.882	.000
Top management commitment	-.144		-1.234	.220
Management system	.339		2.974	.004
Information technology	.177		1.846	.005
Change resistance	.126		1.459	.148
Adjusted R ²	.352			

Source: Primary Data-2013

Dependent variable: Employee performance

According to the regression analysis result in the above table 9; Top management commitment and Change resistance had direct and positive relationship towards employee performance, but not significant because of $(p>0.05)$. Because of this the researcher not discuss this two variable.

Egalitarian leader ship, had direct and positive relationship towards employee performance, and statistically significant with $(\beta=0.207, p<0.05)$.

Cooperative working environment, had direct and positive relationship towards

employee performance, and statistically significant with $(\beta=0.270, p<0.05)$.

Management system, had direct and positive relationship towards employee performance, and statistically significant with $(\beta=0.339, p<0.05)$.

Information technology, had direct and positive relationship towards employee performance, and statistically significant with $(\beta=0.177, p<0.05)$.

Finally, the findings of this study showed that all, except top management commitment had positively contribute to employee performance and significant. But resistance to change and top management

commitment were not significant. The degree at which BPR success and failure factors contributed is determined with levels of beta. Factors with high beta value indicate high contribution to employee performance when compared to other factors having less beta value.

4. Finding, Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1 Findings

Based on the theoretical framework and through the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from different sources, the researcher has come up with the following findings.

From the total employees, majority (56%) of them were working in core process, (60%) are male, (79%) workers are working in permanent base, (45%) workers are categorized in the age groups of 30-39 years, (46%) are degree holders, (44%) have 2-10 service year experience and (27%) earned below 1000 Birr. As a result of this data it can find that the majority of the employees of the organization are young, male, degree holders and had adequate experience.

1. Egalitarian leadership indicators

Of the total respondents whose mean was resemble to 2.71 reported that they were neutral whether the manager of the bureau shared vision, mission and information of the organization to the employees of the, where as respondents with a mean value of above 3.74 agreed that there is an open communication between supervisors and the employees, the manager have confident on their performance and the mean 3.49 of them did not know whether the manager listen and use the employees ideas positively or not.

Therefore, the findings of this research clearly show that there is positive and direct relationship between egalitarian leadership and employee performance. Their mean value 3.99 shows that the majority of employees reported that they agreed regarding to the issue. In other words egalitarian leadership has medium and positive contribution to employee performance.

2. Cooperative working environment indicators

According to the finding of the present study, the mean value of above 3.76 agreed that there is a friendly interaction between employees, team working have a significant role for problem solving, they believe that coworkers are working in a cooperative environment and there is performance recognition among coworkers. But the mean value of 3.42 respondents agreed that they were neutral/did not know whether coworkers have confidence and trust with each other or not.

The findings of this research clearly show that there is positive and direct relationship between cooperative working environment and employee performance and also their mean value was 4.91. In addition to the above result the manager agreed that BPR create a suitable cooperative working environment for employees and also team working has a significant role for their problem solving.

3. Top management commitment indicators

The majority, of respondents reported that they were neutral that they did not know whether the bureau's officials have sufficient knowledge about BPR project and the bureau's management officials frequently communicate with employees and customers or not.

Therefore, the finding of this research clearly show that there is positive and direct relationship between top management commitment and employee performance and also their mean value was 3.04 these show that the majority of employees reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue.

4. Management system indicators

The majority, of respondents reported that they disagreed that the bureau did not adjust the salary of employees according to BPR principle, bureau's performance measurement not corresponds to changes, not empower employees to make decisions by themselves and not facilitate training and/or educational programs to update their skill.

The project research clearly shows that there is positive and direct relationship between management system and employee performance and their mean value was 3.05 these show that the majority of employees reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue. Meanwhile, the manager and employees agreed regarding to the reward system of the organizations. Both are sure that salaries of permanent worker not adjusted according to change management. Similarly manager of the bureau believed the majority of the employees were trained on BPR concept except new employees. But the organization not facilitate education program based on their performance. And also the leader of the organization agreed that there is no any decision was applied for negative employee performances and not promote their positive performance according BPR concepts.

5. Information technology indicators

Of the total respondents the majority of respondents reported that they were neutral whether the bureau applied integrated IT,

extensively use information system and whether the bureaus use effective communication channel or not.

There is positive and direct relationship between information technology and employee performance and also their mean was 3.67 these shows that the majority of employees reported that they agreed regarding to the issue.

6. Change resistance indicators

The majority of respondents reported that they were neutral whether the manager feel anxiety of losing their authority, whether there is skepticism among employees about the results of BPR project and whether the employees feel comfortable with the new environment/BPR project or not.

Therefore, the findings of this research clearly show that there is negative and inverse relationship between change resistance and employee performance. Their mean average was 3.43 these show that the majority of employees reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue.

Generally, from the interview result the manager accepts that there was resistance to change, unstable and less committed top management, their work was not correspond to change, and lack of concentration towards BPR project.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on results, finding and recommendation mentioned the following conclusion:-

1. Therefore, from the finding it can conclude that the majority of the respondents (mean=3.99) agreed to the egalitarian leadership indicators as whole had direct and positive relation towards employees performance. This implies, the leader effectively communicates with employees, listen and use their

- ideas positively, and confident on them.
2. Based on the findings, it is possible to conclude that cooperative working environment have Strong and positive contribution to employee performance concerning to the issue. This means that employees of the bureau had a friendly interaction, working under a cooperative working environment, coworkers have confidence and trust with each other and also team working have a significant role for problem solving in the organization.
 3. Therefore, the finding show that the majority of employees reported that they were neutral regarding to the issue; Sufficient knowledge about BPR and frequently communicate with employees and customers. This implies the respondents did not know whether top management officials have a realistic expectation to BPR or not. And also had small and positive contribution towards employee performance.
 4. Based on the results of the study, both the manager and employees agreed that the bureau not adjust the salary of employees based on their performance, not empower the employees to make decisions by themselves, not facilitate training and/or educational programs to update their skill and also bureau's performance measurement was not corresponds to changes. Because of this the bureau's management system had a medium contribution towards employee performance.
 5. From the finding it is possible to conclude that information technology have medium and positive contribution to employee performance concerning to the issue. This implies that the bureau was implement integrated IT, extensively use information system to facilitate its work and slightly use effective communication channel in transferring information to internal and external user by using FM Radio, Magazine, and wabe site(www.stb.gov.et).
 6. From the data it can conclude that the majority of employees reported that they were neural and did not know whether the manager feel anxiety of losing their authority after change, there is doubt among employees about the implementation of BPR project and also employee's feel comfortable with the new environment/BPR project or not. In other words change resistance has strong but inversely contributed to employee performance.
 7. From regression analysis the findings clearly show that all, except top management had positively contribute to employee performance and significant.
 8. This study has some limitations: First, it involved only in one organization. Second, the study's findings may not be generalized to other organization.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and the conclusions of the research, the following points are recommended.

1. According to BPR theory, executives change from score

keepers to leader, and Values change from supervisors to coaches. Even if, the results show that there was positive relationship between employees and the leader of the organization, the manager was not share vision and information of the bureau to the employee as much as possible. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the leader of the organization should be committed to share vision and information of the bureau to the employee.

2. The researcher recommend that top management should be committed and work for change, update their skill towards BPR project, and frequently communicate with employees and customers.
3. In order to enhance the employees performance in a suitable manner, the researcher has suggested that the organization should adjust employee's salary based on their results, to facilitate training and/or educational programs to update their skill, promote those employees who achieved high performance and should apply the performance measurement to be corresponds to changes. In addition to this, the bureau should frequently monitor, evaluate and motivate employees' who are devoted to wards the achievement of the organization's goal, while arranging various corrective measures for those employees whose performance become under the standard.
4. Implementing BPR project is one of the major tasks of top managers, so that they should work for change management and committed, not

feel as losing their position and authority, appropriately coaches their employee's towards BPR project and aware them to the new environment/BPR project/.

5. Lack of leadership is frequently a cause for the high failure rate of business process reengineering (BPR) projects. According to many experts, BPR implementation requires a top-down, directive leadership style. Yet, it also requires the management of motivated, skilled, independent-thinking people doing non-programmable tasks for which a non-directive leadership style is most suited.
6. From the interview result the manager accepts that there was resistance to change, unstable and less committed top management, their work was not correspond to change, and lack of concentration towards BPR project. Therefore, the researcher suggest for management body of the organization, to be committed, work correspond to change and to give concentration& attention towards BPR project to achieve over all organizational goal and to enhance employees performance.
7. This study directly focuses on the contribution of BPR factors towards employee performance in governmental organization, particularly SNNPR Bureau of Transport. This research can be further explored by adding more factors such as BPR structure of the organization, culture of the organization, and design of BPR project in the organization. Future research can explain more when increase the

sample size of the organization and apply more variable.

REFERENCES

1. Abdolvand, N., Albadvi, A., & Ferdowsi, Z., (2008). Assessing readiness for business process reengineering. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol.14 (No.4), pp.497.
2. Aggarwal, S.,(1998). Reengineering: a breaking or little new?, *Journal of socio economic planning*, Vol.32(No.2), PP. 155-67.
3. Alter, A. (1994). Re-engineering tops list again, *Computerworld*, Vol. 28 No.5, January 31,p.8.
4. Attaran, M.,(2000). Information technology and business-process redesign. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol.9(No.4), PP.440-58.
5. Bashein, B., Markus, M., & Riley, P., (1994). Preconditions for BPR success and how to prevent failures, *Information systems Management*. Vol. 5(No 1), PP. 7-13.
6. Belete, N. (2006). Concepts, Techniques, Tools, and Implementing Guidelines (manuals) .Addis Ababa: Ministry of Capacity Building.
7. Belete,N, Tgegaye,T, Aysheshim,M, Teka,G(2007) Reengineering the organization working manual ministry of capacity building.
8. Berrington, C., & Oblich, R., (1995). Translating re-engineering in to bottom line results, *Journal of industrial reengineering*, Vol.6(No.2), PP.24-7.
9. Boer, J.H.,(1995).Reengineering the consultative process between industry, labor and government trade unions in South Africa, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol 61 (No. 3), PP.343-354.
10. Business Process Reengineering. Available at: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business process reengineering](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_process_reengineering) accessed on 15 January 2010.
11. Campell, J. P., (1990). Modeling the prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology, *Handbook of Industrial and organizational psychology*, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting psychology press.
12. Carr, D., & Johanson., (1995). Best practices in Reengineering: What works and what does not in the reengineering process, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
13. Cetro, C. S.,(2001). Modern management. International Edition: Prentice Hall, 2001.Cook, S.
14. Crowe,T.J., Fong,P.M., & Zayas-Castro,J.L.,(2002). Quantitative risk level estimation of business Process reengineering efforts. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol.8 (No.5), PP.490-511.
15. Davenport, T.H. & Short, J.E. (1990 summer). "The New Industrial Engineering: Information Technology and Business Process Redesign," *Sloan Management Review*, pp. 11-27.
16. Davenport, T. H., (1993). "Need radical innovation and continuous improvement? Integrate process reengineering and TQM", *Planning Review*, Vol.21(No.3), PP.6-12.

17. Davenport, T., & Nohria, N.,(1994).Case management and the integrationof Labor, Sloan management review, PP.11-23.
18. Dixon, J., Arnold, P., Kim,J., & Mulligan, P.,(1994). Business process reengineering: improving in new strategic directions, California management review, PP.108.
19. Fadel, K. J., & Tanniru, M.,(2005). Acknowledge-centric framework for process redesign. ACMSIGMISCPR Conference on Computer Personnel Research, Atlanta, GA, pp.49-58.
20. Grant,D.,(2002). A wider view of business process reengineering. Communications of the ACM, Vol.45(No.2), pp.84-92.
21. Green,P., & Roseman, M.,(2000). Integrated process modeling: an ontological evaluation. Information Systems,Vol.25(No.2), PP.73-87.
22. Grover, V., Jeong,S., Kettinger, W., & Teng, J.,(1995). The implementation of business process reengineering , Journal of management information systems, Vol.12(No.1), PP.109.
23. Guimaraes,T.,(1999). Field testing of the proposed predictors of BPR success in Manufacturing firms. Journal of Manufacturing Systems, Vol.18 (No.1), PP.53-65.
24. Gujarati, N. D.,(2004). Basic Econometrics. 4th ed. McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.
25. Gunasekaran, A., & Nath, B.,(1997). The role of information technology in business process reengineering. International Journal of Economics. Vol.50, PP.91-104.
26. Habib,M(2013). Understanding Critical Success and Failure Factors of Business Process Reengineering. International Review of Management and Business ResearchVol. 26(pp2).
27. Hailekiros Sibhato & Ajit Pal Singh,(2012) Evaluation on BPR Implementation in
28. Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions. Global Journal of Management and Business Research,vol.12,pp.2.
29. Hall,G., Rothenthal,J., & Wade, J.,(1993). How to make reengineering work. Harvard business review Vol.12(No.1), PP.119-131.
30. Hammer, M., & Champy, J.,(1993). Reengineering the corporation: a manifesto for business revolution. Nicholas Breay Publishing, London.
31. Hammer, M., & Stanton, S., (1995). The reengineering revolution. Happer Collins, New York, NY.
32. Hinterhuber, H.,(1995) business process management: the European approach. Business change and reengineering, Vol.2 (No.4).PP.63-73.
33. Klempa, M.,(1995). Understanding business process reengineering: a socio-cognitive contingency model, In Grover, V., & Kettinger, W., (Eds), business process change: reengineering concepts, methods and technologies, Idea group publishing, London, PP.78-122.
34. Levy,R.,(1998).Reengineering audit and performance management

- System for multi-level governance: the European union experience. International review of administrative Sciences, Vol.64(No.1), PP.55-71.
35. Little, J.,(1996).Thinking government: bringing democratic awareness to public administration, in Gary L.W & James, F.W.,(Eds), Refunding democratic Public administration.
 36. Luthans, F., (1997). Occupational Stress: organizational Behavior. In Richardson, L., & Alpert, D., & Rehberger, P (Eds), McGraw-Hill, Singapore , pp. 298-307.
 37. Manganelli, R. L., & Klein, M.M.,(1994).The reengineering handbook: A step by step Guide to Business transformation, America management association, New York.
 38. Mansar,S.L., Marir, F., & Reijers,H.A.,(2003). Case-based reasoning as a technique for Knowledge management in business process redesign. Electronic Journal on Knowledge Management, Vol.1(No.2), PP.113-24.
 39. Marchington, M., (2000). Team working and employee involvement: Terminology Evaluation and context.In Proctor, S., & Mueller, F.,(Eds), Team working Basingstoke. McMillan.PP.60-80.
 40. Marjanovic, O.,(2000). Supporting the soft side of business process reengineering. Journal of business management, Vol.6 (No.1), PP.43-53.
 41. Maull,R.S., Tranfield, D.R., & Maull,W.,(2003). Factors characterizing the maturity of BPR programs. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol.23 (No.6),P.596-624.
 42. Mohammed K, (2011).Business Process Reengineering Factors and Employee Performance: The case of Addis Ababa City Administration.
 43. Moore, M.,(2010). Employee Attitude vs. Job Performance. Accessed from <http://www.ehow.com/about631940-employee-attitude-vs-jobperformance>.
 44. Morgan,G.,(1982).Cybernetics and organization theory: Epistemology or Technique. Human relations Journal, Vol.33, (No.7), PP.521-537.
 45. Motwani,J., Subramanian, R., & Gopalakrishna,P.,(2005). Critical factors for successful ERP implementation: Exploratory findings from four case studies. Computers in Industry, Vol.56, pp.529-44.
 46. Mueller, F.,(1994). Teams between hierarchy and commitment: Change strategy and the internal environment. Journal of management studies, vol.31 (No.3), PP.383-404.
 47. Naod, M. (2011). Prospects and Challenges to Implement Business Process Reengineering (BPR) in Ethiopian Public Universities.pp-46
 48. Ostroff, F., & Smith, D.S., (1992). The horizontal organization, The Mckinsey Quarter, Vol 11(No.1), pp. 67- 148.

Author's Profile



Gebre Sorsa Takaro (MBA), 28 years old Ethiopian. Working as a lecturer and Director at School of Management and Accounting in Hawassa University. I am graduated my first degree in Business Management and second degree in MBA.



Mesele Abera Wako (MBA)
I am an Ethiopian and 35 years old. Working in governmental organization; Transport bureau as Development planning, Monitoring and Evaluation officer. I have 1st degree in Business management and 2nd degree MBA in marketing management).