

**ASSESSING THE EFFECT OF BUSINESS PROCESS
REENGINEERING ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE:
A CASE STUDY OF BUREAU OF FINANCE AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (BoFED),
OROMIA REGIONAL STATE, ETHIOPIA**

Degu Setegn,

Lecturer, Dilla University, Ethiopia.

Matiwos Ensermu,

Assistant Professor,
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

P. Krishna Moorthy,

Professor,
Dilla University, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

Organizational processes today are markedly different than they were 100 years ago. Processes are what organizations do. When processes become old and inefficient and can't deliver results that they were originally designed to, they can't cope up the business dynamics in the environment in which they operate, they must be redesigned or replaced. Business Process Reengineering (BPR) is a process-based management tool that can deliver, redesign or replace inefficient processes, as required, with a breakthrough results. As such it can be applied to a single process, a group of processes, or the entire processes comprising the organization. The purpose of this study is to assess the effect of BPR on organizational performance of Bureau of Finance and Economic Development(BoFED).The data for this current study were obtained from primary source that was analyzed . In the study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were employed. The instrument used to gather data for quantitative study was Likert scale questionnaire whereas for qualitative was used observation and interview. Major findings were customers of BoFED satisfied with speed of service delivery, quality of service, cycle time. However in the bureau still there is no strong base line performance evaluation system, employees have not given any benefits regarding salary increment, compensation, promotion and empowerment up to this moment. Based on the finding of the study the paper concludes that business process reengineering has become useful weapon for any organization that is seeking for improvement in their current organizational performance and intends to achieve organizational objective. It recommends that reengineering process remains effective tool for organizations striving to operate effectively and efficiently.

Keywords: Business Process Reengineering, Organizational Performance, Processes.

INTRODUCTION:

Organizational processes today are markedly different than they were 100 years ago. It has been estimated that a century before about nine out of ten workers produced and moved tangible, material things. In the mid-1990s this ratio was down to one out of five. The other four out of five workers currently produce and deliver intangible products such as information and services (Drucker, 1993). In today's service dominating world the foundations of any organization are the people and the processes. If people are motivated and working hard, but the business processes are not good and remain as non-value-adding activities, organizational performance will be poor (Peter & Sohal, 1999). As Lindet, (1994) stated that all organizations, whether service giving or manufacturing, are struggling to meet the tough and new competitive standards of the 1990s speed, quality, efficiency and increased productivity in order to become more competitive, and flexible to meet the desired standard.

In order to create a dramatic increase in efficiency, productivity, or profitability, a drastic change in the design of the organization's processes is required. That is why Graham says reengineering is a useful tool that has been adopted by and hailed as one of the current major drivers of change within many organizations (Graham, 2010). Business Process Reengineering is playing a vital role in the enhancement of productivity and efficiency of many organizations. A crowd of interrelated tasks that creates value is called a business process (Habib & Wazir, 2012).

Reengineering primary goals aimed at to reduce wastage, improve efficiency and ultimately reduce costs (Lotfollah *et al.*, 2012). And an increase in consumer requirements for both product and service efficiency and effectiveness has resulted in Business Process Reengineering (Al-Mashir *et al.*, 2001). Reengineering also helps organizations to throw away their old fashioned processes to achieve new heights of success (Jemal *et al.*, 2011). Hammer and Champy, (1993) also stated that BPR focuses on processes and not on tasks, jobs or people. It endeavors to redesign the strategic and value added processes that transcend organizational boundaries.

Since 2004, the government of Ethiopia has also endorsed Business Process Reengineering as a foundation for strengthening Result Based Performance Management System in the Civil Service organizations and the study for this has begun in 2001/02 in Federal and Regional government institutions (Tesfaye Debela, 2009).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

According to Balasubramanian, (2010) Business Process Reengineering means not only change but dramatic change. What constitutes dramatic change is the overall of organizational structures, management systems, employee responsibilities and performance measurements, incentive systems, skill development, and the use of information technology. BPR can potentially impact every aspect of how conduct business today. Change on this scale can cause results ranging from enviable success to complete failure (Khuzaimah, 2011).

Business Process Reengineering offers one method for managing profoundly changed the way organizations do business during the past decade while at the same time making it possible to achieve dramatic gains in business performance. However, not all BPR projects have been successful in achieving dramatic performance gains (Shin and Donald, 2002).

As lack of dramatic change is one of the major problems facing organizations now- a- days, reengineering has become an alternative mechanism for providing new working conditions to the organization and its employees who are previously not much actively participate to overcome the problem. Reasons for such a problem can be due to the fact that; senior management does not always have a clear vision of what the BPR effort intends to achieve, or how to gauge or monitor the success of the programmed objectives and lack of commitment and support (Graham, 2010). And in BoFED the biggest challenge would then be able to manage the service of balancing organizational performance measured in such as cost, quality, service and speed and also customer and stakeholders' desires.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To determine how Business Process Reengineering had performance effect as measured in terms of cost, cycle time, quality
- To assess the effect of Business Process Reengineering on customer satisfaction

- To assess how Business Process Reengineering can affect employee's skills and knowledge, behavior, attitude and team coordination.
- To find out how management and employees can benefit from a re-engineering process without affecting the objectives of the organization

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

The study was significant for its contribution:

- ✓ It is more significant because the world is going towards the global competition, in this scenario all the people try to understand the effect of reengineering on different variables like cost, cycle time, service, and quality.
- ✓ By understanding above factors organizations would like to change their activities towards achieving their objectives in a meaningful manner. That is why this study is significant for the researcher, organizations and individual employees.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Based on the work of Maureen *et al.*, (1995) the idea of reengineering sketches its origin back to management theories built-up in the early nineteenth century and the aim of BPR is to revamp and modify the on hand business practices or processes to attain remarkable development in organizational performance. During the industrial age of mass production, organizations and companies were built around Adam Smith's brilliant discovery of: 'work should be broken down into its simplest components and be assigned to specialists (the notion of division of labor and specialization)'. The new world requires organizations to build working system that can make them responsive, flexible and customer focus. The fragmentation and traditional bureaucratic organization of mass production era do not fit to these requirements.

These new feature of organization (responsiveness, flexibility and customer focus) achieved in new perspective shift the approach of work from task based to process based thinking. Now, the conclusion above tells us that any organization which hopes to thrive in today's world must shift approach to work and organization to process centering in order to provide seamless services. The key issue raised here is then the way to transform to seamless government and process centering.

Business Process Reengineering has risen during the early 1990s as an approach mainly developed by practitioners. It gained prominence in the work of writers such as Davenport and Short (1990), Hammer (1990), Hammer and Champy (1993), the concept is currently very topical and ubiquitous in many organizational, management and information technology literature.

According to Berihu Assefas' (2009) work, Business Process Reengineering began as a private sector technique to help organizations fundamentally rethink how they do their work in order to dramatically improve customer service, cut operational costs, and become world-class competitors. According to Al-Mashari, (2001) an increase in consumer requirements for both product and service efficiency and effectiveness has resulted in BPR. Since the 1990s Process Redesign or Business Process Reengineering has been embraced by organizations as a means to cut non-value-added activities (Grover & Malhotra, 1997).

A number of studies in the literature present the improvements, radical as well as incremental, resulting from BPR (Hammer, 1990). As stated by Hammer and Champy, (1993) the reengineering of business processes is concerned with fundamentally rethinking and redesigning business processes to obtain dramatic and sustaining improvements in quality, cost, service, lead-times, outcomes, flexibility and innovation which guarantee the performance of the organization in the world of competition that is why Reengineering has become a fairly accepted approach today in the reform efforts of any organizations.

BPR has been implemented in both service and manufacturing firms in different countries around the world (Shin and Jemella, 2002). Successful implementation of BPR brings many benefits to the organization and it increases customer satisfaction, increased productivity, higher flexibility, increased employees and improved coordination, and improved competitive advantage are the main benefits of successful BPR implementation. BPR helps organizations to achieve new heights of success by dramatically changing existing business processes (Holland and Kumar, 1995)

METHODOLOGY:

RESEARCH DESIGN:

The descriptive survey method used in this study. Since the study involved different group of people from different angles it is appropriate to use this method.

DATA SOURCES TOOLS:

In conducting this research the researchers were used both primary and secondary sources of data. Both of them were collected through data collection method. Quantitative tools were used to collect numerical information like employees' demographic information and organizations performance level since BPR. Qualitative tools were being used to collect and analyze information on non numeric data on effect of BPR implementation practice.

The questionnaire was employed to obtain factual information, opinions, and attitudes from respondents. The questionnaire contains closed ended and open ended questions to help the flow of adequate information as much as possible. Data also gathered through interview and observation.

METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS:

The quantitative data gathered through questionnaire were analyzed by employing the computer software known as Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS version 20). The descriptive statistical methods such as frequency, percentage, Chi-Square test were used. The data obtained through interview and observations were analyzed qualitatively.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

The necessary data involved in the study obtained from employees, process owners, institutional customers and documents of BoFED.

RESPONSES BY EMPLOYEES AND CUSTOMERS:

Table 1-Respondentes expectation on major improvements after BPR

Q1. Did you observe major improvements on speed of service delivery?

Q2. Did you notice major improvements on cost?

Q3. Did you observe major improvements on service quality?

Q4. Did you observe improvements on efficiency and productivity?

No	Respondents	Responses										Computed χ^2
Q1		SA		A		N		D		SD		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Q1	Employees	7	8.8	61	76.3	6	7.5	5	6.3	1	1.3	139.04*
	Customers	23	45.1	16	31.4	8	15.7	1	2.0	3	5.9	
	Total	30	22.9	77	58.8	14	10.7	5	3.8	5	3.8	
Q2	Employees	6	7.5	38	47.5	9	11.3	11	13.8	16	20.0	45.45*
	Customers	19	37.3	18	35.3	5	9.8	5	9.8	4	7.8	
	Total	25	19.1	56	42.7	14	10.7	15	11.5	21	16.0	
Q3	Employees	9	11.3	55	68.8	8	10.0	6	7.5	2	2.5	145.99*
	Customers	14	27.5	25	49.0	8	15.7	1	2.0	3	5.9	
	Total	23	17.6	80	61.1	16	12.2	6	4.6	6	4.6	
Q4	Employees	12	15.0	40	50.0	17	21.3	7	8.8	4	5.0	62.55*
	Customers	14	27.5	19	37.3	10	19.6	4	7.8	4	7.8	
	Total	26	19.8	59	45.0	27	20.6	11	8.4	8	6.1	

*The table value $\chi^2 = 9.487$ at 0.05 significant levels with four degrees of freedom

Table 1 summarizes the various effects of BPR in the organizational performance and Employees' and Customers expectation after the implementation of BPR.

Hence, **the first item** aims at knowing whether major improvements have been made on speed of service provision for customers or not. Accordingly, 61(76.3%) of employees and 23(45.1%) customers, totally on

average 84(64.12%) respondents, assured that major improvements have been made on speed of service delivery and cycle time. The computed chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 139.04$, $p < 0.05$) is greater than table value ($\chi^2 = 9.487$) at a significant level of 0.05 with four degrees of freedom.

This is better to say that there is a significance difference between the views of employees and customers on major improvements made on speed of service provision. Differences in between them are not due to chance alone.

Responses for item two, in the same table shows those 38 (47.5%) employees and 19(37.3%) customers, totally 57(42.4%) respondents agreed that major improvement on cost observed after the implementation of BPR. The computed chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 45.45$, $p < 0.05$) is greater than table value ($\chi^2 = 9.487$) at a significant level of 0.05 with four degree of freedom. This implies that the chi-square test signifies that there are significant differences of opinions between the two groups of respondents.

The third item was to check if major improvements on service quality have been made or not. Accordingly, 55(68.8%) employees and 25(49.0%) customers, totally 80(58.9%) respondents agreed that there were major improvements on service quality. Accordingly the calculated chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 145.99$, $p < 0.05$) is far above the table value ($\chi^2 = 9.487$) at significant level of 0.05 with four degree of freedom. Hence, it can be concluded that there is significant statistical difference between the two groups of respondents' response.

The fourth item of table 1 depicts that 40(50.0%) employees and 19(37.3%) of customers totally 59(43.65%) of respondents agreed that major improvement on efficiency and productivity have been observed. The test revealed that the calculated chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 62.55$, $p < 0.05$) was more than the table value of $\chi^2 = 9.487$ at significant level of 0.05 with four degree of freedom, which implies there is significance difference among the two group of respondents' response.

Moreover the statically result calculated was ($\chi^2(4,131) = 139.04$, 45.45, 145.99 and 62.55, $p < 0.05$) by far greater than table value of ($\chi^2 = 9.49$).

From the findings it is better to say that, after BPR implementation there were major improvements on speed of service provision, cost, quality and efficiency and productivity which may increase customer satisfaction and organizational performance.

Table 2- Respondents expectation on major changes after implementation of BPR

Q1. Did you observe improvement on employee's behavior and attitude?

Q2. Did you observe change in skill and knowledge of employees?

Q3. Did you observe improvement on team coordination and management system?

Q4. Did you observe radical change?

No	Respondents	Responses										Computed χ^2
		SA		A		N		D		SD		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Q1	Employees	12	15.0	33	41.3	27	33.8	5	6.3	3	3.8	67.36*
	Customers	9	17.6	20	39.2	16	31.4	2	3.9	4	7.8	
	Total	21	16.0	53	40.5	43	32.8	7	5.3	7	5.3	
Q2	Employees	14	17.5	34	42.5	19	23.8	9	11.3	4	5.0	39.27
	Customers	15	29.4	17	33.3	5	9.8	3	5.9	11	21.6	
	Total	29	22.1	52	39.7	24	18.3	12	9.2	14	10.7	
Q3	Employees	21	26.3	39	48.8	12	15.0	6	7.5	2	2.5	61.79*
	Customers	18	35.3	15	29.3	10	19.6	3	5.9	5	9.8	
	Total	39	29.8	54	41.2	22	16.8	9	6.9	7	5.3	
Q4	Employees	11	13.8	16	20.0	25	31.3	27	33.8	1	1.3	29.88*
	Customers	10	19.6	15	29.4	17	33.3	5	9.8	4	7.8	
	Total	21	16.0	31	23.7	42	32.1	32	24.4	5	3.8	

*The table value $\chi^2 = 9.487$ at 0.05 significant levels with four degrees of freedom

Table 2 summarizes the various effects of BPR in the Major changes after implementation of BPR. Hence, **the first item** aims at knowing whether improvement observed on employees behavior and attitude or not. Accordingly, 33(41.3%) of employees and 20(39.2%) customers, totally 53(40.25%) respondents, said that improvement observed on employees behavior and attitude. The computed chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 67.36$,

$p < 0.05$) is greater than table value ($\chi^2 = 9.487$) at a significant level of 0.05 with four degrees of freedom. This implies that there is a significance difference among the response of the two groups of respondents.

Responses for item two, in the same table shows those 34(42.5%) employees and 17(33.3%) customers, totally 51(37.9%) respondents agreed that change in skill and knowledge of employees observed after the implementation of BPR. The chi-square test signifies that there are significant differences of opinions between the two groups of respondents.

Accordingly, 39(48.8%) employees and 18(35.3%) customers, totally 57(42.05%) respondents agreed that there were major improvements on team coordination and management system. Accordingly the calculated chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 61.79$, $p < 0.05$) is far above the table value ($\chi^2 = 9.487$) at significant level of 0.05 with four degree of freedom. Hence, it can be concluded that there is significant statistical difference between the two groups of respondents' response.

The fourth item of above table depicts that 25(31.3%) employees and 17(33.3%) of customers totally 52(32.3%) of respondents neutral that radical change has observed. The test revealed that the calculated chi-square value ($\chi^2(4,131) = 29.88$, $p < 0.05$) was more than the table value of $\chi^2 = 9.487$ at significant level of 0.05 with four degree of freedom, which implies there is significance difference among the two group of respondents' response.

Moreover the statically result calculated was ($\chi^2(4,131) = 67.36$, 39.27, 61.79 and 29.88, $p < 0.05$) by far greater than table value of ($\chi^2 = 9.49$).

RESPONSES BY EMPLOYEES:

Table 3- Fruitfulness after BPR implementation.

Q1. The respondents were also asked whether their expectations was fruitful after BPR implementation.

	Yes		No		Total		Total	
	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%
Q1	54	67.5	26	32.5	77	96.2	80	100.0

As we refer from Table 3, out of 80 respondents, 54, i.e. 67.5% respondents agreed that their expectation was fruitful after BPR implementation

Table 4 - Personal gain after BPR

- Q1. Did you benefit with salary increment?
 Q2. Did you have Benefit in promotion?
 Q3. Did you have involvement in the reengineering process?
 Q4. Did you have empowerment?
 Q5. Did you have work satisfaction?
 Q6. Did you have benefit of simple work load?
 Q7. Did you have utilization of Information Technology?
 Q8. Did you have compensation?

No	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total	
	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%
Q1	3	3.8	3	3.8	12	15.0	3	3.8	59	73.8	80	100
Q2	8	10.1	3	3.8	10	12.5	17	21.3	42	52.5	80	100
Q3	6	7.6	19	23.8	28	35.0	20	25.0	7	8.8	80	100
Q4	11	13.8	27	33.8	9	11.3	30	37.5	3	3.8	80	100
Q5	15	18.8	48	60.0	5	6.3	8	10.0	4	5.0	80	100
Q6	13	16.3	40	50.0	13	16.3	9	11.3	5	6.3	80	100
Q7	9	11.3	14	17.5	36	45.0	21	26.3			80	100
Q8	7	8.8	8	10.0	18	22.5	24	30.0	23	28.7	80	100

Table 4 summarizes employees' personal gain after the implementation of BPR. Based on above table, 73.8% of the respondents agreed that they didn't get salary increment benefit after implementation of BPR. Also 52.5% of them so far didn't get benefit in promotion. 35.0% of the respondents agreed that they have

had involvement in the reengineering process.

The respondents were also requested whether they have been empowered. Based on above table, 30 out of 80 (37.5%) respondents disagreed that they are empowered and 60.0% of them show that they do have work satisfaction. Table 9 also shows that, 30.0% of the respondents reported that they didn't get a change in compensation after the BPR.

The question raised for the interviewee is concerning if management members benefitted in salary, promotion, compensation, empowerment after BPR in the organization, and according to the opinion of the interviewee till this moment no benefit seen in regards to BPR implementation in the bureau. But they replied that they have gotten work satisfaction.

From respondent, employees and management members, one can deduced after BPR no one has beneficiary especially in salary increment, promotion, and compensation.

Table 5- Measurement to evaluate performance

Q1. Did the measurement put into practice to evaluate your performance in terms of time?

Q2. Did the measurement put into practice to evaluate your performance in terms of cost?

Q3. Did the measurement put into practice to evaluate your performance in terms of quality?

Q4. Did the measurement put into practice to evaluate your performance in terms of efficiency?

Q5. Did the measurement put into practice to evaluate your performance none of the above?

Q6. Did the measurement put into practice to evaluate your performance in all of the above?

No	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total	
	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%
Q1	27	33.8	21	26.3	11	13.8	11	13.8	10	12.5	80	100
Q2	3	3.8	28	35.0	14	17.5	13	16.3	22	27.5	80	100
Q3	26	32.5	28	35.0	13	16.3	10	12.5	3	3.8	80	100
Q4	20	25.1	24	30.0	18	22.5	4	5	14	17.5	80	100
Q5	22	27.6	9	11.3	6	7.5	21	26.3	22	27.5	80	100
Q6	26	32.5	6	7.5	24	30.0	6	7.5	18	22.5	80	100

Employees were asked to identify the measurement put into practice to evaluate their performance.

According to Table 5, 33.8% of the respondents are strongly agreed that time is the best measurement to evaluate their performance. Also 28 out of 80, i.e. 35.0% of the respondents, consider that quality could also be one of the measurements for performance evaluation. Also 35.0% and 30.0% respondents are agreed that cost and efficiency could also be one of the measurements for performance evaluation respectively.

The interview made for the interviewee is concerning if process owners established level of performance baseline for the whole processes by calculating different measurement mechanism like cycle time, quality and cost; and according to the opinion of the interviewee there was but no strong performance baseline to evaluate performance. According to the opinion of the interviewee some said it's due to the weakness of BPR implementing team in the bureau and other said it's due to weakness of processes owners. Some of the reasons for the poor performance baseline are less understanding about the program and lack of training before and after BPR.

From respondent, employees and process owners, one can inferred that before and after BPR performance baseline to evaluate performance were weak in BoFED that need improvement in the near future in order to be achieve organizational performance.

RESPONSES BY CUSTOMER:

CHANGES CUSTOMERS DESERVED AFTER BPR IMPLEMENTATION:

Table 6 - Effect of BoFED's BPR on customer's business.

Q1. The improvement of your business on reducing cycle time

Q2. The improvement of your business on reducing cost

Q3. The improvement of your business on improved efficiency

No	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total	
	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%	NR	%
Q1	23	38.3	16	31.4	8	15.7	1	2.0	3	5.9	51	100.0
Q2	19	37.2	18	35.3	5	9.8	4	7.8	5	9.8	51	100.0
Q3	16	31.4	23	45.1	8	15.7	1	2.0	3	5.9	51	100.0

Customers were also requested as to the effect of BoFED's BPR in customers business.

Under this heading different criteria were listed and among these criteria noted in Table 6, 38.3% of the respondents are agreed that the effect was shown on improvement in reducing cycle time, 45.1% of them improve efficiency, and 39.2% meeting of their demand on service and 37.2% on reduce cost.

From this analysis one can deduced that since BPR customers were benefitted in all that above variables

FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS:

FINDINGS:

- Finding related to Employees and Customers expectation after implementation of BPR
The finding from table 1 study was that, after BPR implementation there were major improvements on speed of service provision, cost, quality, efficiency and productivity which may increase customer satisfaction and organizational performance.
- Finding related to major changes after implementation of BPR in the view of both Employees and Customers
From the results of the chi-square tests on table 2 and the data obtained from the interview, one can conclude that since BPR implementation there were major changes regarding behavior, skill, involvement, team work and management system; but regarding radical change in the study area it was seen incrementally improvement.
- The survey revealed that the following major changes after implementation of BPR.
From this study one can summarise that after implementation of BPR employee's personal incentive and reward system was not changed.
Regarding employees gain after BPR, work satisfaction; reduced work load and service time, involvement in the reengineering process, empowered and utilization of information technology are among the opportunities that the employees have gained in their work area. On the other hand employees didn't get salary increment as well as promotion. Besides from the table presented, it has been found out that employees didn't get compensation in their work area.
- Finding related to changes achieved after implementation of BPR.
Majority of respondents are agreed that time and quality are the best measurement to evaluate their performance. But the interviewee responses that included processes owner's opinions and some employees said that still the great weakness was that there is no strong performance evaluation base line in the bureau. Another finding is Employees, customers and stakeholders had received adequate training as a result of the BPR implementation. But it lacks continuity.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Employees' motivation through reward system plays a crucial role in facilitating reengineering efforts. The Organization's incentive & reward system should be changed by considering benefits in respect of salary increment, promotion, empowerment & compensation. Hence organization shall consider reward system which must be widespread, fair and encouraging harmony among employees.
- Organization must facilitate different types of on job as well as off job training for process owners, employees and customers and stakeholders in order to understand that Business Process Reengineering has become useful weapon for any organization that is seeking for improvement in their current organizational performance.
- The researchers recommend that the organization place the customer at the center of the reengineering effort; concentrate on reengineering fragmented processes that lead to negative impacts on customer service.
- The organization shall consider radical change in respect of its employees' overall performance evaluation.
- Finally, the organization shall empower its employee so as to successfully implement BPR.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Al-Mashari, M., (2003). Process orientation through enterprise resource planning: A review of critical issues. *Knowledge and Process Management Journal*, 8(3), 175–185.
- [2] Al-Mashari, M., Zahir, I., & Mohamed, Z., (2001). Business process reengineering: A survey of international experience. *Business Process Management Journal*, 7, (5), 437-455.
- [3] Balasubramanian, S., (2010). *Successful reengineering implementation strategy*: Hindustan college of engineering.
- [4] Berihu, Assefa, (May 2009). Business process reengineering in Ethiopia. A short note on 'Business Process Re-engineering in Ethiopia' as per the request of Prof. Keinichi Ohno.
- [5] Davenport, T., & Short, J., (1990). The new industrial engineering: information technology and business process redesign. *Sloan Management Review*. 31(4), 11-27.
- [6] Diefenbach, E. F., (2011). *Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector: When Middle Managers Create Public Value. 1st Edition*. Gabler Verlag Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH.
- [7] Drucker, F.P., (1993). Drucker on management the five deadly business sins: *Wall Street Journal*; New York Eastern edition ISSN: 00999660
- [8] Graham, R. S., (2010). *Business process reengineering*: strategies for occupational health and safety.
- [9] Grover, V., & Malhotra, M., (1997). "Business process reengineering: a tutorial on the concept, evolution, method, technology and application," *Journal of operations management*, 15(1), 193-213
- [10] Hammer M. & Champy, J., (1995). *Reengineering the corporation*. HarperCollins publishers. USA.
- [11] Hammer, M. & Champy, J., (1993). *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- [12] Hammer, M. (1990). Reengineering work: don't automate! obliterate, *Harvard Business Review*, May 2012, pg. 104-112.
- [13] Holland, D., & Kumar, S. (1995). Getting past the obstacles to successful reengineering in business horizons 38 (3), 79–85.
- [14] Khuzaimah, A. (2011). *The impact of business process reengineering on organizational Performance*: Unpublished master thesis, university utara Malaysia Lilegdon W.R. and Goldsman D. SCS. 55-60.
- [15] Linden, R. M., (1994). *Seamless Government, A Practical Guide to Reengineering in the Public Sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.,
- [16] Lotfollah N., Ziaul H., Seyed M.A., and Saeedreza H. (2012). Impact of IT on process improvement: *Journal of emerging trends in computing and information sciences*. 3, (1). ISSN 2079-8407
- [17] Peter, O., & Sohal, A., (1999). Business process reengineering a review of recent literature: *Technovation* 19,571–581
- [18] Shin, N. & Jemella D. (2002). Business process management: The case of Chase Manhattan.
- [19] Tesfaye, Debela.(2009). Business process reengineering in Ethiopian public organizations: the relationship between theory and practice. *JBAS I(2)* 21.
