

Full Length Research

Staffs' perception towards the implementation of business process re-engineering (BPR): The case of Mekelle University

Alemt Abay

Aksum University, P.O. Box 1010. Aksum, Tigray, Ethiopia. Email: alemat_abay@yahoo.com

Accepted 17 November 2015

The purpose of this study was to assess staffs' perception regarding BPR implementation at MU. Specifically, it was intended to explore the staffs' perceived awareness of BPR, perceived potential benefits of BPR, perceived values of BPR measurement and reward systems, perceived level of importance of BPR success factors, and finally the staffs' overall satisfaction with the new world of work. To address these research problems, a quantitative descriptive survey method was employed. Samples were selected using simple random sampling preceded with stratified sampling technique. This was done to maintain higher probability of gathering a wide range of views from the participants. As a result, 156 samples out of 2450 target population were taken. The data were collected using primarily close-ended questionnaire which was validated through suggestions of experts and its reliability was maintained by conducting pilot study and computing Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics: percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Finally, the result of the analysis was found to reveal that: Favorable awareness of BPR implementation regarding its nature, requirement, and purpose; BPR potential benefits were observed to unfavorably be perceived, i.e., low level of perception is observed regarding the potential benefits of BPR; BPR measurement and reward system was perceived as valuable by many of the participants; Higher number of participants believed on the selected BPR success factors to be important at MU; and finally Low satisfaction level with the new work environment was observed among the participants.

Key words: Perception, staff, BPR, Mekelle University.

Cite This Article As: Abay A (2015). Staffs' perception towards the implementation of business process re-engineering (BPR): The case of Mekelle University. *Inter. J. Acad. Res. Educ. Rev.* 3(10): 261-281

INTRODUCTION

Background of the study

Business process reengineering (BPR) evolved from the experiences of the US-based companies in the 1980s. These companies radically changed their processes by applying modern information technology innovatively in pursuit of change management and improved

performance. Since its inception three decades ago, BPR has become a buzz word to bring about innovative initiatives and cultural changes in the business world. The rise of BPR is attributed to the needs of companies to confront old ways of organizing-division of labor, which does not work anymore, so as to address the flexible needs of customers and achieve competitive advantages

in the global marketplace (Hammer and Champy, 1993).

Moreover, as indicated by Hammer, Champy, and Johnson, 1993; Harrington 1991; Davenport 1990, BPR emerges with the following central tenets: radical change and assumption challenging, process and goal orientation, organizational re-structuring, radical improvement in performance, and the exploitation of enabling technology, particularly information technology. In addition, BPR has been found to enable organizations to take advantage of the more highly developed education and capabilities of the staffs employed (Beckford, 1998). It is found that a number of interrelated pressures: expansion of higher education, changing student profile, pressures from industry, increased competition, and information technology (IT) capability have created the need for change in Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) (Armstrong *et al.*, 1997; Ford *et al.*, 1997; Slowey, 1995). As a result, the adoption of such management tool, BPR, has been identified as a means by which universities can meet these pressures for change and maintain, in common with other public institutions, the three 'Es' of efficiency, effectiveness and economy (Penrod and Dolence, 1992; Dougherty, 1994; Casey, 1995).

Following the introduction of BPR, assessments of reengineering practices in the west have been reported as consisting of both success and failure stories (Hammer and Champy, 1993; Linden, 1994). Accordingly, top management commitment was believed to be the most important factor for successful BPR efforts (Johnson and Davenport, 1993). They argue that BPR never happen bottom-up and re-engineered processes alone will not change the way people work. Besides, Champy and Arnouldse (1992) have added that the role, vision, attitude, skill or knowledge of leaders is necessary for the success of BPR. On the other hand, the main reason for the high rate of failure of BPR programmes was attributed to BPR's failure to successfully take account of people in the reengineering process (Grint, 1995). In addition, as indicated by Geus (1997), private companies that were successful revealed that their success has been built on recognition that people are an organization's main asset, which encourage active involvement of employees.

Bashein and her associates (1994) suggest more concrete success factors of successful BPR projects. These include: sound financial condition, an appropriate number of BPR projects under way, and information system and human resource specialist involvement. Johnson (1993) added that Sharing information and emphasizing the employee concerns is important to the success of BPR since this can help minimize resistance and increase commitment. Similarly, Hammer and Champy (1993) have also mentioned some failure factors like failure to have a process perspective, a fixed process which is not flexible enough to be responsive to the needs and requirements, and not involving employees

(i.e. bottom-up) in decision making, assigning someone who does not understand BPR, technology limitations, designing a project which focus on cost reduction and downsizing, having a weak team, and problems with communication.

Moreover, as to Johnson (1992), Re-engineering was criticized for failing to adequately link organizational culture with business culture-which is the core set of beliefs and attitudes held by employees. This was also supplemented by the ideas of Martinsons and Hempel (1998) that argues that the ability to adopt new management tool depends on various social, economic, and political factors. Among the most important of these factors is the existing culture - a deep and deterministic aspect of human life.

From the previously reported BPR impact assessment results, effective organizational change is likely to be achieved when it is in line with the organizational "paradigm" and the cultural, social and political norms of the organization. Here, the problem begins when the change is radical which attempts to take people away from the "core beliefs". Moreover, it was found that the situation is less problematic in companies, where the executive define the mission and everyone is expected to work towards that mission; but, the mission of HEIs is complicated by a tradition of academic freedom. Taylor (1995) highlighted that a university is a highly complex organization where there are many different ideas about what the university is trying to achieve. However, to this effect, Smith (2003) suggested the importance of assessing individual's perception of any change attempt by stating that people are the real source of, and the vehicle for, change because they are the ones who will either embrace or resist change. Furthermore, from the research done by Barrington and Oblich (1995), it was noted that the people issue rather than the technology issue is important to be dealt with and managed in order to make the change effort successful.

Since most recent (towards the end of 1990s) reengineering as a management tool extended to developing nations' public sector reform efforts. According to Reyes (1998), reengineering have been used in various developing countries as an expression of continuing initiatives to redefine administrative values, philosophy, methods and systems of government bureaucracies.

As it was indicated in the research memorandum on the Ethiopian civil service reform by Getachew and Richard (2006), BPR has emerged as a key management initiative, particularly in those ministries that interface with the private sector, following the launch of Public Sector Capacity Building Support Program in 2001 as the country strives for the fundamental of poverty reduction and democracy development including responsive service delivery, citizen empowerment, and good governance. From then on wards, formally, little is known

about the contribution and the challenges that the new project had brought and faced; but, it is reported that some organizations brought incremental change while most failed to implement BPR project appropriately (Belete, 2007). BPR is introduced in to the Ethiopian civil service organizations with the intention of ensuring the primary mission of the civil service: building good governance, democracy, economic development and improves the citizen's living standard (Ministry of Capacity Building, 2007; cited in Belete, 2007). It is also believed to be an important prerequisite to increase the potential capabilities of institutions and individuals within the provision of efficient public services along with combating the malpractices and poor efficiencies. In addition, it can aid in the attainment of development goals that the government set to reduce poverty and pull the country towards the middle income countries. Such fundamental trends of changes serve as catalysts for positive changes and raise the standards of accountability and productivity in the country.

Overall, the Ethiopian public organization transformation effort through civil service reform program is still ongoing undertaking since 1996. The reason to initiate the reform were attributed to the deficiency in the public sector systems and performance, the traditional management practices coupled with its culture, as well as traditional bureaucracy established over years were found to be incompatible to the needs of the policy environment of the country (<http://www.ethiopiaemb.org.cn/bulletin/05-01-02.htm>). Currently, in Ethiopia, According to the report of the Ethiopian news agency, walta reported by Getaneh Kibret on May 4, 2009, referring the Ministry of Capacity Building, many of the government-owned organizations have been processing to execute BPR since the past few years.

As one can understand from the above presentation of research findings of the general nature, success and failure factors of BPR, clearly, these imply the need to give emphasis to the human and organizational context of the institution while implementing BPR, more particularly in higher educational institutions. This is because, as indicated in Martinsons (2004), different organizations are found to experience change differently due to their variations in the prevailing organizational culture. Furthermore, it is important, other factors being constant, to rely on how the staffs or participants view or understand the change in order to achieve success by establishing consensus among practitioners. There exists a gap in practicing BPR implementations on the basis of staffs' perception of the change within the specific organizational context. Little is also known about how to implement BPR in universities generally, and particularly in relation to the organizational context and staffs' perspectives (Allen and Kern, 2001; Beekhuyzen, Good and Nielsen, 2002; Von Hellenes *et al.*, 2005). Similarly, in

Ethiopia, since it is a new concept, there are no previously well established research findings regarding the success and failure factors of BPR in the public institutions in general, and higher institutions in particular. So, to enable the great potential that BPR has for increasing productivity through reduced process time and cost, improved quality, and greater customer satisfaction, there should be a study in order to make its implementation and management in the best interest of customers, employees, and the organization. This could be possibly obtained through the exploration of staff's perception of BPR implementation within the organizational context. By now, as far as the information the researcher has, among the Ethiopian higher educational institutions, Mekelle University has shown a far progress in doing organizational transformation through the introduction of BPR. Consequently, the research will be bound to this University since the researcher believes that better and reliable information can be obtained from employees who experience change for relatively longer period of time.

As alluded to the aforementioned, considerable BPR literature exists on issues relating to the adoption of BPR. However, since people are found to be the primary agents for organizational transformation, it is imperative to know the employees perception regarding the changes. This is because, as indicated by Ashford (1998), employees' perception of a change matters their commitment and job satisfaction which in turn affects their contribution in the change endeavors. On the other hand, the issue of culture becomes an important factor for BPR, which was further emphasized by Peppard and Fitzgerald (1997) who examined the transfer of culturally grounded management techniques, namely BPR. Employees as the target of change are central to the success of the change efforts because their attitudes, skills, motivations and basic knowledge form a significant component of the environment in which change is to be attempted (Smith, 2005). Similarly, Lewis *et al.* (2005) highlighted that Perception influences employees' attitudes, behavior and intention in facing the impending change. This implies the importance of maintaining a clear understanding of the prevailing practice of BPR within the University context through the assessment of the staffs' perception regarding the organizational transformation in order to intervene appropriately and maximize the realization of BPR objectives.

As many of the other Ethiopian higher educational institutions, Mekelle University has a golden mission and objective towards the attainment of the long run socio-economic development goals of the country in general and satisfying the specific societal and community level capacity building needs in particular. As it is noted by MU' reform team (institutional transformation team), the university is diving towards center of excellence in academic, research and community service areas. To

this effect, by using the new management technique-BPR, MU has introduced a new working environment, of course, after identifying the existing core problems. However, the University is conducting BPR without having domestic research findings concerning BPR applicability to the Ethiopian business environment in general, a business culture which is sufficiently different from the American, in order to justify this undertaking organizational transformation. This shows deficiency or gap in the current research and practices regarding the implementation of BPR in the higher education field generally and at MU in particular.

It is, therefore, necessary to have a knowledge based guidelines to ensure that higher education institutions can carefully implement and manage the institutional impact which accompany this fundamental and radical change within the organization. Hence, this research focuses on examining BPR implementation issues from the perception of staffs at MU. This will further benefit future implementation and upgrade of BPR to carefully manage the prevailing contextual issues as perceived by the staffs. Thus, the contribution to knowledge of this research will be to provide information regarding the real experience of BPR at the University.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to explore MU's staffs' perceptions towards the implementation of BPR within the organizational setting. Specifically, it is intended to identify the staffs' perceived awareness of BPR, Perceived benefits of BPR, perceived values of BPR measurement and reward system, perceived importance of selected BPR success factors, and their overall satisfaction with the new working environment. A year ago, it was the researcher's first experience to participate in a training program concerning concepts, strategies, and tools of BPR implementation, which really impressed him to question the applicability of BPR in the Ethiopian higher educational institutions which have lived long with the culture of academic freedom and bounded functional interest of employees. As a result of these existing situations, the organization would likely to conflict with the new paradigm shift, which, mainly focuses on the essence of team work and process oriented organizational structures that cross functional boundaries of the organization. To this effect, in this study it is proposed that effective implementation of BPR in the Ethiopian Universities, specifically at MU, requires particular consideration of organizational influence related to their context through the perception of staffs involved in the implementation.

As it is documented in the Ministry of capacity building of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, currently, the country is striving for building good governance,

democracy, economic development and improving the citizen's living standard. It is also indicated that in the last few years of experience in building democracy and economic development was seen as promising. And now ahead the government is seriously in charged to ensure good governance, democracy, and socioeconomic development. In so doing, transforming the civil service system, which is believed to be one of the primary and key tools in achieving these objectives, is the primary issue that the government has been undertaking. This is because it is believed that living with the old bureaucratic system of the civil service will not lead the effort to be fruitful. It is also believed that BPR will have a great potential in increasing productivity, improve quality, and increase customer satisfaction which will ultimately lead to the realization of the primary mission of the Ethiopian civil service. As a result, this reality has brought about the need for the introduction of Business Process reengineering (BPR) in to the Ethiopian civil service organizations.

Realizing this fact, currently, Mekelle University is introducing BPR in to its two core processes and the support process. Accordingly, the institutional transformation team has identified the rationale for the introduction of BPR in to MU as: lack of University autonomy, highly centralized internal system, lack of shared vision with the university community, non-empowered and task specific frontline employees, lagging infrastructures and capacity expansion to meet increased demand for higher education, and poor team work and inappropriate values and beliefs. At the same time, although BPR is believed to be an appropriate management endeavor to the realization of the civil service development agenda, MU is implementing the reform paradigm-BPR without having adequate research findings concerning the applicability of BPR in the Ethiopian higher education institutions (HEIs) due to the fact that BPR is a new experience to public institutions in general and HEIs in particular. Clearly, these may create a big challenge in the organizational transformation mainly for two reasons: First, although it is common for people to experience resistance when confronted with a certain change, but here the challenge is two fold for the change paradigm is radical-which results a change in employees status quo, and even may result in employees reduction, resistance will be higher. Second, the need for trained man power, funding, infrastructures development, and the need for demotic organizations for benchmarking could be a challenge or hinder the achievement of BPR goals.

In fact, many literatures suggested that people are one of the key factors supporting BPR implementation. Specifically, it is noted that successful implementation of BPR is supported by: Commitment and visible involvement of top managements, team work approach adopted by everybody, and participation of all staffs within the organization. This has clearly placed the importance of

employees at all levels in the organization to support the initiatives above others in order to ensure the success of its implementation. Similarly, it is found that employees' engagement or participation is highly relied on the perception they hold about the change that they are facing. Thus, understanding employees' perception towards the implementation of the change would be able to facilitate smooth adoption of such management tool; since human resources are the most valuable asset held by any higher learning institutions. As such, priority should be given to gauge the staffs' perception regarding the implementation of BPR by the organization; since such organizational wide initiative demands everybody in the organization to have a shared organizational vision, and mission by holding the same and appropriate values and beliefs.

Hence, it will be helpful to explore the staffs' perception towards BPR implementation within the context of MU. This is because, establishing an understanding of how the participants experience and perceive the change and introducing appropriate confrontation is a prime importance for making staffs fully engaged, motivated, committed and thereby ensures the likelihood of successful implementation of the change-BPR. Therefore, this study is intended to determine the perceptions held by MU's Staffs regarding BPR implementation which in turn is believed to provide valuable input to the successful implementation of BPR in the University.

Research questions

The foregoing research aims will be addressed by the following research questions:

1. Do MU's staffs acquainted with the appropriate information about the nature, requirement, and purpose of BPR implementation at the University?
2. Do MU's staffs believe that the adoption of BPR will benefit them and the University as well?
3. Are the measurement and reward systems of BPR valued as important by the MU's staffs?
4. What is the perceived level of importance of BPR success factors at MU?
5. What is MU's staffs level of satisfaction with the new world of work?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The major objective of this study is to assess MU's staffs' perceptions regarding the implementation of BPR at their organization. Specifically, this study is intended to:

- i. Identify MU's staffs' perceived awareness of BPR implementation.

- ii. Explore MU's staffs' perceived level of benefits the University and the staffs can gain as a result of BPR implementation.
- iii. Judge the value of measurement and reward systems of BPR as perceived by the staffs.
- iv. Identify the perceived level of importance of BPR success factors at MU.
- v. Examine the overall staffs' satisfaction regarding the changes encountered as a result of BPR implementation.
- vi. Provide research based information to interested researchers in the area.

Significance of the study

The result of this study is expected to have a paramount input to different bodies concerning MU's staffs' perceptions regarding BPR implementation. Specifically, this study is significant due to the following reasons:

- i. It will help the management body of the University to get insight in to the existing or the real practice of BPR. Then, based on this information the University management will be able to develop appropriate and relevant strategies either to reinforce a promising progress or to take improvement measures so as to enhance the realization of BPR goals at MU.
- ii. It will provide the University staff with the opportunity to get necessary support and feedback, understand BPR realities at MU, and then smoothly discharge their contributions based on the directions of the University's reform plan which ultimately lead them realize and gain BPR benefits.
- iii. It will provide the MoE with information about BPR implementation Realities with in the University context and make necessary provisions to MU and to other Universities that are preparing to undertake the implementation of BPR.
- iv. The results from this study will provide an additional insight in to the issues impacting on BPR implementation in universities. In addition, the results from this study may be used for developing a practical set of guidelines that may supplement the MU's BPR working plan. Furthermore, the findings from this study will give an impetus for conducting similar research at other higher educational institutions.

Delimitation or scope of the studies

This study is delimited to Mekelle University due to the following reasons.

- i. At the time of this study, MU was noted as a pioneer in introducing BPR among the known Universities of the country. Hence, the researcher believed that conducting an assessment of staffs' perception where the change is more experienced by the staffs will yield an acceptable image of the change endeavors with the staffs' perspective. In addition, since the researcher is familiar with the culture of the town where the University is found, it will not be problematic for him to get access to information during his stay in the field.
- ii. Due to time and financial constraint, and geographical disparities among the existing Universities. Moreover, in order for the study to be manageable the study was confined with the University's staffs of 156 sample size. To select the sample population, stratified sampling followed by simple random sampling technique was employed. This was done in order to maintain the proportion of participants from different units such as colleges, and staffs (academic and support) which, the researcher believes, allows to get a range of information from the respondents.

Primarily, close-ended questionnaire was employed to collect the data for the study aims to assess the perception of staffs across a range of constructs from relatively large sample size which, in this case, suites to the use of survey method. Finally, descriptive statistics: percentage, mean, and standard deviation accompanied with appropriate interpretation and discussion were employed to analyze the responses obtained.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

In going through this research the researcher has encountered and identified the following points which should have been overcome to be the major limitations of this study. Accordingly, the first and major limitation was lack of domestic research findings and available literatures concerning the problem under investigation. The second limitation was that since the study was confined only to one University, making inference to other Universities will not be appropriate, i.e., generalization is limited. The third limitation was also related to the inconvenience to use relatively larger sample size so as to maximize the representativeness of the samples and, as a result, minimize generalization errors. Finally, lack of adequate finance support was found as a major contributing factor, more specifically, to the second and third limitations mentioned above.

Definition of key terms

The terminologies of most commonly used words in this study so as to avoid ambiguity among readers were

presented as thus:

- i. Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) - is defined as the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business process to achieve dramatic improvement in contemporary measure of performance such as cost, quality, and service and speed (Hammer and Champy, 1993).
- ii. Perception - is an idea or opinion, belief or an image that an individual has as a result of how he/she views or understands something (i.e., object, process, change, event ...).
- iii. Staff- refers to full time employees of the University (both academic and support)

RESEARCH METHODS

As it was mentioned in the introduction part of this paper, the primary focus of this study was to assess the perceptions of Mekelle University's (MU) staffs regarding BPR implementation. More specifically, this study was intended to assess the staffs' perceived awareness BPR, perceived benefits of BPR, perceived value of BPR measurement and reward systems, perceived importance of BPR success factors, and over all staffs' satisfaction as a result of BPR implementation at MU.

Research design

Since the aim of this research was to assess the perception of staffs regarding BPR implementation from relatively large sample size, the researcher believed that descriptive survey research method was appropriate. As a result, quantitative descriptive survey method was used.

Target population

This study was conducted at Mekelle University (MU). The target population of this study was MU's both academic and support staffs which accounts about 2450.

Sample selection procedure

Participants for the research were selected from the target population- MU's academic and support staffs. Colleges were used as a base for selecting the sample population of the study that is to mean stratified sampling technique was employed. This was done to maintain the proportion of participants from each college. Then, the samples were randomly selected from each college; of course, consideration was given to the proportion of academic and support staffs within each colleges. This was also

done, although the primary purpose of this study was not to investigate perception differences among colleges, and between support and academic staffs, to ensure collecting a range of views from each of the above categories, which may consist of different sub-cultures, in order to strengthen the representativeness of the samples to the target population. Samples were not include new employees (less than 6 months of work experience at MU).

Data gathering Instruments

To gather the data from the participants, questionnaire was used. Due to the dearth of empirical study conducted on this matter, the researcher could not successfully find any suitable instruments to be used in the local context. Therefore, based on the review of literatures on BPR implementations, the instruments for the data collection were developed by the researcher. But, items for the construct staffs' overall satisfaction with the new work environment were adopted from the works of Brooke *et al.* (1988) with considerable and necessary amendments. Items in the questionnaire were primarily close-ended and are prepared in a continuous scale. Respondents were also given an opportunity to give more information by providing them with open-ended items to constructs where the researcher believes necessary. The questionnaire consists of five major parts corresponding to each of the constructs (variables). Items for the awareness construct consist of a three-point Likert's type scale where as items for the rest constructs are prepared on a five-point Likert's type scale. Table 1

To minimize the effect of communication barrier, items in the scale were written in English language since the participants are found to be at least diploma holders. Moreover, the researcher believe that the participants get familiar with the English version of the reform material since the manuals and training material are most available written in English language.

Experts from research and Management were asked to review the items for face and construct validity and their suggestions were incorporated in to the questionnaire items before the administration. To ensure reliability, the items were pre-tested with thirty samples of the staffs. From the result Cronbach's alpha analysis was done for each constructs (Awareness, benefit, measurement and reward system, success factors, staffs' satisfaction) and showed that the developed scale was confirmed to be a reliable instrument since the coefficients lay within the acceptable range, with an alpha coefficient of 0.72, 0.76, 0.73, 0.82, and 0.83 corresponding to the above listed constructs or variables respectively.

Procedures for administration of the Instruments

The administration of the questionnaire was conducted

by the researcher and four assistants who are fulltime employees of the University (MU). By introducing the purpose of the study, an attempt was done to make participants be sure that their answers are confidential and only be used for the research purpose by the researcher and this was confirmed by not demanding them to write their name on the question paper. The questionnaire was distributed to the respondents at their work place and offices. The respondents were given time as per to their consent to complete the questionnaire for about 1- 8 days. After the administration of the questionnaire a continuous follow up was made by the researcher and his assistants to collect and give additional questionnaire for any lose. Finally, out of the 164 question papers distributed only 156 question papers were returned with complete answers to the close-ended questions. Open-ended items were not completed by most of the participants. However, the researcher believe that this may have resulted from the fact that since every item in the close-ended questions were developed and modified based on the comments abstained from the pilot study and evaluation of experts, participants may not think important to add more. This can be also assured from the responses given by few of the respondents since the responses were seen by the researcher as being more related to simple paraphrase of items in the close-ended part. Accordingly, only those items which are fully completed by 156 participants were collected, checked, and prepared for analysis.

Data analysis procedures

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as, percentage, mean and standard deviation. The scores of the individual items in the scale for the constructs: perceived awareness of BPR, perceived benefits of BPR, the staffs' overall satisfaction with the new work environment, perceived values of BPR measurement and reward system, and perceived importance of BPR success factors were computed and expressed in and percentage (for the first three constructs in this order) and mean and standard deviation (for the last two in this order). In addition, the scores for the categories or components with in each of these constructs were also determined by summing up the scores of the individual items in the categories and taking the average. Furthermore, the scores of the whole scale for each of these constructs were determined by summing all the items in the category and taking the average. Consequently, the outcome of the analysis of these constructs (variables) would reveal the individual scores, the average scores for the components, and the constructs as well. Finally, based on the results of the descriptive statistics, interpretation and thorough discussion was made to see how and in what extent the research questions are addressed.

Table 1. MU's Target population and sample size statistics.

Population Size		Sample size							
Academic staff		Support staff		Academic staff		Support staff			
S/no	Colleges	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1	COE	187	15	83	97	14	1	6	6
2	CODANR	240	23	56	33	17	1	3	2
3	COHS	258	28	160	71	17	2	10	4
4	COSSL	156	11	70	37	10	1	5	2
5	CONCS	144	12	52	21	10	1	4	1
6	COBE	240	55	33	64	16	4	2	4
7	COLG	172	15	9	6	12	1	-	1
8	COVS	54	9	21	14	4	1	1	1
9	Total	1452	168	484	343	87	12	31	20

Note: Target Population Size = 2450; Total Sample Size = 164

Source: Taken from MU's human resource office

RESULTS

The statistical results of the data collected were presented beginning with the participants' general demographic characteristics. The responses are categorized into five major constructs (variables) as per the direction of the research questions. The statistics used are percentage (to express the amount of response rate laying in the specific position of the scales for each item) for three of the constructs. The results for the remaining two constructs (perceived value of BPR measurement and reward system, and the perceived importance of BPR success factors), are expressed using mean and standard deviation.

As displayed in Table 2, the demographic characteristics of the samples revealed that the participants were taken from eight colleges of the University. Accordingly, as indicated in this table, 20.5% (32) of the participants were taken from College of Health Science (COHS) which consists of 18 from academic staffs and the remaining 14 support staffs. Similarly, samples from the rest seven colleges include: 16.7% (26), 14.1% (22), 10.9% (17), 9.6% (15), 16% (25), 8.3% (13), and 3.8% (6) corresponding to COE, CODANR, COSSL, CONCS, COBE, COLG, and COVS, respectively. Table 3 depicts the frequency and percentage distribution of responses in the scale for each awareness measuring item. This table shows only the combined percentage distribution of the participants' responses for the components (nature of BPR, requirements for BPR, and the purpose of BPR) of BPR awareness measures. Moreover, the participants' general awareness rate is also indicated.

Similarly, In Table 3, it is indicated that 69.1% of the

participants were found to respond imperatively which is to mean that such amount of the participants are clear with the nature, requirement, and purpose of BPR in their organization. On the contrary, 31.9% of the participants were seen to relegate to the remaining positions in the scale. That is, 15.2% of the participants respond negatively where as the rest, 16.7%, lay in the middle of the scale for the position 'not sure'.

Specifically, as displayed in Table 4, 75.7%, 71.4%, and 60.3% of the participants were found to be aware of the purpose, requirement, and nature of BPR in their organization, respectively. This clearly shows, comparatively speaking, greater numbers of participants have responded favorably, of course, the response for the component purpose being the highest among the other two.

The remaining percent: 24.3%, 29.6%, and 39.7% of the participants for the Components: purpose, requirement, and nature of BPR, respectively relegated to the rest scale for the positions 'No', and 'Not sure' by approximately contributing equal share to the specified percentage in each of the three components, respectively. Moreover, it can be said that majority of the participants are acquainted with the necessary or appropriate information concerning BPR implementation in the University and, as a result, they are clear with the nature, requirement, and purpose of the organizational transformation. On the other hand, although comparatively small percent is covered by those participants who responded negatively, and those who are not sure about the prevailing organizational transformation, this indicates the existence of certain number of participants who either lacking clarity with or demanding further orientation or training. Generally speaking, MU has maintained a

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of participants.

S/no	Colleges	Academic		Support			
		N	Percent	Male	Female	Male	Female
1	COE	26	16.7	13	1	6	6
2	CODANR	22	14.1	16	1	3	2
3	COHS	32	20.5	16	2	10	4
4	COSSL	17	10.9	9	1	5	2
5	CONCS	15	9.6	9	1	4	1
6	COBE	25	16	15	4	2	4
7	COLG	13	8.3	11	1	-	1
8	COVS	6	3.8	3	1	1	1
9	Total	156	100	79	12	31	20

Table 3. The staffs' perceived awareness of business process re-engineering.

S/n	Items	Percent			
		No	Not Sure	Yes	Total
1	i. Nature	21.4	21.3	60.3	100
	Re-engineering is downsizing i.e., doing less with less.	35.9	29.5	34.6	100
	Re-engineering focuses on process structures(team) that cross the organization's functional boundaries.	14.7	17.3	67.9	100
	Is radical redesign of business process to achieve dramatic improvement in performance	15.4	19.2	65.4	100
4	It focuses on activities that add value to the customer.	16	16	67.9	100
5	ii. Requirement	13.8	14.8	71.4	100
	The need to seek greater responsiveness to the flexible needs of customers	14.7	13.5	71.8	100
	The need to cope up with the fierce competition and rapidly changing environment	16	15.4	68.6	100
7	iii. Purpose	10.3	14	75.4	100
	To secure competitive advantage and for ensuring MU adapt to the changing demands placed up on it.	10.9	15.4	73.7	100
	To enable MU to realize its mission and objectives towards the attainment of the long-run socio-economic development goals of the country	11.5	13.5	75	100
	To satisfy the specific societal and community level capacity building needs	8.3	12.8	78.8	100
10	Total perceived Awareness rate	15.2	16.7	69.1	100

Note: The value for item number 1 was reversed

favorable condition concerning its staffs' awareness of BPR introduction in to the University. For more understanding, you may refer table 3, in which the Statistical value of every item is presented.

Table 4 presents the participants' response distribution statistics for the items measuring BPR benefits to the staffs and Table 5 depicts the statistical distribution of the responses for the items measuring BPR

benefits to the University. Similarly, table 6 shows the combined percentage distribution for all the items measuring perceived benefits of BPR to the staffs and the University as well. Accordingly, as indicated in table 6, 18.1% of the participants have shown strong agreement to the intended benefits of BPR to both the staffs and the University. Similarly, 29.4% of the respondents have revealed an agreement with these

Table 4. The Staffs' perceived Benefits of Business process Re-engineering to the staff.

S/no	Items	Percent					Total
		SDA	DA	UND	AG	SAG	
1	Seamless access to support services and resources	16.7	29.5	18.6	20.5	14.7	100
2	Transparent staff recruitment and evaluation system	12.2	17.9	19.2	30.8	19.9	100
3	Sufficient ICT and library support	15.4	25.4	24.4	19.9	15.4	100
4	Conducive working environment	15.4	23.1	25	21.2	15.4	100
5	High opportunities for staff development	14.1	18.6	19.9	28.2	19.2	100
6	Being paid on performance basis	22.4	28.8	20.5	17.9	10.3	100
7	World class researchers/problem solvers	11.5	22.4	26.3	25	14.7	100
8	Rich research facilities and community centers	16.7	31.4	17.3	23.7	10.9	100
9	Sufficient time to do research and community	11.5	17.3	16.7	32.1	22.4	100
10	Empowered in carrying out teaching, and research	8.3	14.1	16	37.8	23.7	100

N.B.: SDA = Strongly disagree, DA = Disagree, UND = Undecided, AG = Agree, SAG=strongly agree

Table 5. The staffs' perceived benefits of business process re-engineering to the University**Percent**

S/no	Items	SDA	DA	UND	AG	SAG	Total
1	Vision and mission shared among all	8.3	14.7	16	36.5	24.4	100
2	Autonomy in program initiation and	10.3	14.7	19.2	37.2	18.6	100
3	Excellence in education	9.6	14.1	18.6	37.2	20.5	100
4	Efficient governance in teaching and learning	9.6	16.7	20.5	32.1	21.2	100
5	Enhanced ICT infrastructure	10.3	16.7	26.9	26.9	19.2	100
6	Institutionalized quality assurance system	9	16.7	17.3	38.5	18.6	100
7	Effective and efficient use of resources	10.9	21.8	23.1	28.8	15.4	100
8	Enhanced research and community service culture	11.5	18.6	17.3	34	18.6	100
9	Diversified income generation system	13.5	16	18.6	32.1	19.9	100
10	Develop organizational infrastructure	10.1	20.5	19.9	28.8	20.5	100

N.B.: SDA = Strongly disagree, DA = Disagree, UND = Undecided, AG = Agree, SAG=strongly agree

Table 6. Summary of statistics on the Staffs' Perceived benefits of Business process Re-engineering.

S/no.	Response categories	Percent					total
		SDA	DA	UND	AG	SAG	
1	Benefit to the staffs	14.4	22.9	20.3	25.7	16.6	100
2	Benefit to the university	10.4	17.2	19.7	33.2	19.5	100
3	Total perceived Benefit rate	12.4	20.1	20	29.4	18.1	100

N.B.: SDA = Strongly disagree, DA = Disagree, UND = Undecided, AG = Agree, SAG=strongly agree

benefit measuring items. On the contrary, 20.1%, 12.4% of the participants were found to show disagreement and strong disagreement respectively to these BPR benefit measuring items. The remaining 20% of the participants are also observed to refrain from showing either

agreement or disagreement.

Moreover, higher percentage of favorable response is observed for the items measuring BPR benefits for the University as compared to the response rates for the items measuring BPR benefits to the staffs (52.7%, and

Table 7. Mean and Standard Deviation on perceived values of BPR Measurement and Reward system

S/no	Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Measuring performance by the value created to the customer	3.66	1.127
2	Paying employees based on their performance	3.49	1.231
3	Transparent and market oriented remuneration system.	3.48	1.231
4	Consideration of Employees' character other than education & skills	3.29	1.311
5	Team based measurement and reward system	3.51	1.221
6	Promoting employees based on their ability, not performance	3.32	1.249
7	Empowering workers to make decisions needed to get the work done.	3.56	1.199
8	Demanding employees to strictly follow rules and procedures to work their Jobs.	1.38	1.178
9	Benefits are joint accountability of MU and the employees.	3.52	1.226
10	Compensation based on contribution and performance	3.44	1.192
11	Rewarding an entire teams for the process performance	3.54	1.241
12	Higher pay honored to senior people, not to the most productive	1.6	1.289
	Means Average score	3.48	1.22

N.B. 1 2 3 4 5
Less Valuable Most Valuable

Note: The values for item numbers 8 and 12 were reversed before the total items were computed to give the means average score for the construct.

Table 8. The Staffs' overall Perception on values of BPR measurement and reward system .

	Percent					Total
	Less valuable	2	3	4	Most valuable	
Average result of perceived	9.5	14.9	23.2	29.8	22.6	100

42.3%), respectively. However, the unfavorable response percentage for the participants laying in the undecided and disagreement position together surplus the response percentage of participants responded favorably to the items measuring BPR benefits to the staff.

Generally, this implies that there is a better favorable belief of the staffs towards the items measuring BPR benefits to the university as compared to the items measuring BPR benefits to the staffs. But, overall, lesser accounts of the participants are found to perceive favorably to the items measuring BPR benefits when it is viewed in total.

Table 7 depicts the participants' responses distribution statistics for the items measuring the perceived value of BPR measurement and reward system. In this table, the results are expressed in mean and standard deviations. As indicated under the Table, the scale ranges from less valuable to most valuable. Consequently, the mean value for the items would lay in the scale from one (lowest mean) to five (highest mean). Accordingly, the mean scores for the items which were stated positively or directly to be rated were found to be ranging from 3.29 (for item number 4) up to 3.66 (for item

number 1) with standard deviation of 1.311 and 1.127, respectively.

On the other hand, the mean scores for item number 8 and 12, which were stated in such a way to be rated indirectly, were also found to be lower, i.e., 1.38 and 1.60 with standard deviation of 1.178 and 1.289, respectively.

Moreover, the means average score for all the items in this construct was found to be 3.48 with standard deviation of 1.225. This clearly indicates that the participants have responded favorably to the whole items measuring the perceived values of BPR measurement and reward system. More specifically, as indicated in Table 8, 75.6% of the participants were found to respond favorably, ranging from average to the most valuable for the whole items in the scale measuring the value of BPR measurement and reward system. In this same Table, the remaining 24.4% of the participants are seen to lay in the scale from below average to less valuable. In addition, 22.6% of the participants rate the items as the most valuable. On the contrary, only 9.5% of the participants have rated the items with less valuable. Moreover, the majority of the respondents (52.4%) are observed to rate the items ranging from above average to

organization is able to overlook the importance of change. However, it is the extent of the changes that is often so hard to make clear and also hard to determine the effect of change on employees. With this in mind, assessing MU's staffs' perceived awareness of BPR implementation at their organization was taken as one purpose of this survey study which the researcher believed important to get insight in to the employees' understanding and beliefs of the changes' nature, requirement, and purpose. As a result, in this part the result obtained from the study is discussed to see to what extent and how the research question: "Do MU's staffs acquainted with the appropriate information about the nature, requirement, and purpose of BPR implementation at the University?" is addressed.

Accordingly, from the result obtained it was found that majority (69.1%) of the participants were found to favorably clear with the introduction of BPR into the University concerning its nature, requirement, and purpose. More specifically, greater number (75.5%) of participants were observed to view the organizational transformation as having the following purposes: securing competitive advantage and ensuring MU adapt to the changing demands placed up on it, enabling MU to realize its mission and objectives towards the attainment of the long-run socio-economic development goals of the country, and satisfying the specific societal and community level capacity building needs. This really coincides with the University's rationale to introduce BPR, and other organizations as indicated by Penrod and Dolence (1992). Similarly, most (71.4%) of the participants of this study show their conformation with the underlying requirement of BPR in their organization. And finally, majorities (60.3%) of the participants were found to be clear with the nature of BPR. This indicates that considerable problems were not obtained with participants' perceived awareness of BPR implementation in the University. So, it may be deduced that MU has obtained an acceptable level of BPR awareness program with its staffs. In addition, this helps that the employees source of resistance not to be strongly attributed to the staffs' inappropriate awareness of the change-BPR. Moreover, this will help the University' management body to devote more energy to the actual practice of BPR and examine other factors contributing to the success of BPR implementation. Further, this will maximize the staffs' readiness to the acceptance of the change in this University with minimum perception differences, which will favorably increase, other factors being constant, the staffs' engagement in the change process, BPR in this context. This is also supported with the idea of Eby, *et al.* (2000) that suggests the importance of the employees' perception to their genuine involvement in the change process endeavors.

Potential benefits of BPR

Obtaining potential benefits is one of the most important motivations of BPR implementation. As documented by the organizational transformation of MU, generally, it can be summarized as having the following central intent: facilitates communication and improves information sharing, helps improve productivity and reduce costs, enhances competitiveness. Thus, as part of this study an attempt was made to explore the staffs' perceived benefits of BPR to the staff and the University as well. So, here the results indicated in Tables 5, 6 and 7 are examined to see to what extent and how the research question: "Do MU's staffs believe that the adoption of BPR will benefit them and the University as well?" As a result, comparatively speaking, small (42.3%) of participants show their agreement with the items reflecting BPR benefits to the staff, and majority (52.7%) of the same participants were found to show agreement with BPR benefits to the University. Generally speaking, most of MU's staffs' hesitate with the benefits that the organization believes to be gained by them as a result of BPR introduction; but, they have shown a favorable believe with the potential benefits of BPR to the University. This may happen as a result of lack of concern to the staffs as per their expectation with the new work environment by MU's management. Of course, this is revealed in the staffs' overall satisfaction examination. Moreover, since employee's perceptions is believed to be affected by their experience of the change, possibly, this result may be attributed to the participants' perception of the degree to which their organization has the flexibility to achieve change, and the extent to which they can actively and genuinely participate in the process, for many reasons indicated in the results for the staffs satisfaction with the new work of environment. Therefore, since a gap is observed between what the staffs perceive and the expected potential benefits of BPR, the researcher believes that MU should re-evaluate the real exercise of BPR in the University against the prescribed benefits of BPR to the staffs and the university as well.

Perceived value of BPR measurement and reward system

In any management tool it is noted that measurement and reward system as the primary shapers of the employees' belief and value system. This is also a given fundamental importance to the success of BPR projects. So, an attempt is made to discuss the results with regard to the research question: "Are the measurement and reward systems of BPR valued as important by the MU's staffs?" to see to what extent and how it was addressed. Accordingly, most (75.6%) of the participants were found to rate the items as valuable. In addition, the means

average score of the whole scale was found to surplus the average value of the scale, i.e., 3.48 with standard deviation of 1.225. This clearly shows that MU's staff do not have great problem with the conceptual view of BPR measurement and reward system. As far as the researcher understands, these different results may happen mainly due to two reasons. One is strong communication network development within the university, for this the participants' higher level of rating to the item measuring their awareness to the vision, mission, and goals of the University can be evidence. The other is that these measurement and reward system may have appropriately inculcated the values that the staffs deserve more. Thus, it may be possible to deduce that MU has secured the staffs' positive perception with its newly introduced measurement and reward system at comparatively acceptable extent.

Perceived level of importance of BPR success factors

“What is the perceived level of importance of BPR success factors?” Accordingly, the discussion is made with respect to organizational culture, organizational structure, management commitment, customer involvement, and resources.

Organizational culture

Most of the respondents believe that an organizational culture characterized with: open communication (clear, honest, and frequent), strong leadership style, shared organizational vision and mission, and employees' participation in decision making as important for the success of BPR in their organization. Specifically, all of these four factors related to organizational culture were perceived as most important success factors of BPR. On the other hand, these factors were rated with higher means, that is, 4.16, 4.09, 4.04, and 3.95 corresponding to open communication, strong leadership style, shared organizational vision and mission, and employees' participation in decision making, respectively. This clearly indicates that these factors were highly believed to be important success factors of BPR. Although all of these factors were seen to be rated as having higher importance to the success of BPR in this at MU, comparatively speaking, open communication takes the first rank and employees' participation in decision making the fourth. However, it should be underlined that all factors are rated higher importance by most of the participants.

As to the staffs' perspective, it can be said that an organization having a culture characterized with open communication, strong leadership style, shared organizational vision and mission, and employees' participation in decision making would create favorable

condition to the success of BPR implementation in the organization. The evidence here and elsewhere is that a strong and appropriate culture, which is characterized by open communication, strong leadership style, shared organizational vision and mission, and involvement of employees in decision making, should be developed in the organization. This supports the idea of Grover *et al.* (1995), cited in Hamid Reza Ahadi (2004). They have identified the importance of egalitarian culture—where cooperation, coordination, empowerment of employees are supported as important standards of innovative organizational environment. Moreover, they have indicated that an egalitarian culture has positively associated with successful implementation of BPR which was also noted to be characterized with the aforementioned success factors. Authors like Alavi and Yoo (1995) and Lee Asllani (1997) stressed the importance of organizational culture to ensure success in incremental or radical change. Underlining the result of this study, I have the same opinion as Murray and Lyan (1997) who highlighted innovativeness, which in turn is thought to be supported by an egalitarian culture, as a vital for large scale process change, which is BPR in this context. Therefore, parallel to what has been found in this survey study, the organization should have to develop an organizational culture that fosters cooperation, coordination, and mutual trust, empowerment of employees, and innovative environment for majority of the participants perceived the factors as highly important to contribute to the success of BPR implementation. This also goes with the idea of Johns and Saks (1997) that indicated the significance of employees' perception in determining engagement or disengagement of employees in a change process. Employees as the target of change are central to the success of the change efforts because their attitudes, skills, motivations and basic knowledge form a significant component of the environment in which change is to be attempted (Smith, 2005). At the same time, as highlighted by Lewis, *et al.* (2005), Perception influences employees' attitudes and behavior intention in facing the impending change.

Thus, the researcher believes that it will be the right way to adapt and adopt appropriate culture as to the staffs' perspective in order to ensure the success of BPR implementation in this organization. This is because employees' perception is identified as a critical soft criterion that plays an important role in determining the prevailing quality culture of the organization (Black and Porter, 1996).

Organizational structure

It was found that the participants believe that Job integration, less bureaucracy to encourage innovativeness, and employees' empowerment as important factor

to the success of BPR implementation at the University. More specifically, these factors are rated as most important by most of the participants. That is, these factors were found to be identified with higher mean scores of 4.00, 3.97, and 3.92 with standard deviation of 1.010, 1.016, and 1.044 corresponding to less bureaucracy to encourage innovativeness, job integration, and employees' empowerment, respectively.

Moreover, it was found that 90.5% of the participants believed on the importance of having organizational structure characterized with the aforementioned factors for the success of BPR implementation. This implies the importance of developing an organizational structure that supports employees' empowerment, job integration, and less bureaucracy to encourage innovativeness. In addition, organizational structure should enable BPR in terms of its encouraging creativity and innovativeness in the organization. Therefore, the need for less bureaucracy, and more participation and empowerment in the organization becomes mandatory. A cross-functional integration, which is found to be supported by the participants in this study, especially through teamwork, should be implemented in the organization to promote successful process change, which goes in line with the ideas of Peppard and Fitzgerald (1997) and McAdam (2003).

Furthermore, since "innovativeness" is essential for BPR to happen successfully, McAdam (2003) suggested that organizations should implement less bureaucracy, to encourage innovativeness. Similarly, what is found in this survey study supports this idea.

This evidence seems to suggest that the top management should re-evaluate their organizational structure as to whether it is appropriate for today's situation, with a rapid changing environment, tight competition in the market, and the emerging of new HEIs and new technology. Besides, this may create a good opportunity for the success of BPR implementation since the result of this study shows participants' favorable perception to the factors considered by many research finding as fundamental to the success of BPR.

Moreover, it was found that less bureaucracy would encourage innovativeness in an organization to move ahead and to implement BPR successfully. Similarly, the practice of cross-functional teams opens up widely the opportunity to have a more process perspective, which is parallel to the BPR concept. And, also if empowerment is practiced it would make the organization faster to respond to customer needs, and therefore the organization will get benefits from it. Therefore, for the participants' perception of the importance of factors to the success of BPR implementation in the University coincides with previous research result in the area, it will be important for the University to take account of these factors in order to ensure the success of BPR implementation.

Management commitment

Another essential element of developing an innovative organizational environment for successful BPR implementation is management commitment which includes: top management support, and change management (Hammer, 1990). Parallel to this concept, this study has considered some basic elements that reflect management commitment and the participants were made to reflect their perception regarding the factors contribution to the success of BPR implementation at MU. Accordingly, as indicated in Table 9, majority (88.9%) of the participants have given their favorable responses to the importance of the factors to the success of BPR implementation. More specifically, it was found that the elements in the management commitment were rated with mean scores that surplus the average mean in the scale. That is, 3.94, 3.92, 3.88, 3.88, 3.83, and 3.83 with standard deviation of 1.027, 1.032, 1.041, 1.119, 1.042, and 1.065 corresponding to performance measurement, top management support and commitment, Training and education of employees, employees' empowerment, communication, and reward system, respectively. This clearly implies that the need to have an organization that supports enrichment of these factors for its successful BPR endeavor, in this context MU. Of course, this goes with the works of Hall *et al.* (1993)

Moreover, regarding the importance of top management support and commitment, employees' empowerment, performance measurement, reward system, Training and education of employees, and communication, researchers in organizational development perspective, such as Huber and Glick (1995), Bechtel and Squires (2001) and Senior (2002) highlighted these factors as vital and become crucial when radical change, BPR is involved. Besides, Archer and Bowker's (1995) in their survey with consulting companies specializing in re-engineering have reported that lack of exercising the above factors were indicated as cause for failure of BPR. So, from the evidence obtained in this study, which is also found to be in line with the works of many researchers in the area, favorably, it can be said that MU should adapt a management commitment condition which reflects what the participants have indicated as important success factors for BPR implementation.

Customer involvement

Similar to the components of the construct BPR success factor earlier mentioned, an innovative organizational environment requires customer involvement during BPR implementation (Zirger and Maidique, 1990). This was found to include: considering customers feedback, using as source of information, and satisfying customer needs. In line with this idea, this study has attempted to see the

importance of these factors to the success of BPR implementation at MU's context through the staffs' perception. Accordingly, the result of this study reveals that 91.6% of the participants were found to respond favorably, that is, have rated the factor from important to critical importance in the scale. This implies that the importance of customer involvement is noted by majority of the participants, which is the primary concern of BPR. Therefore, possibly it indicates that MU's staffs do not doubt with introduction of BPR prioritizing the concern to the customer and customers' satisfaction as bases of measure of performance. Thus, this clearly indicates the presence of favorable condition with respect to the participants' perception, which MU should take advantage in its BPR implementation endeavors.

Resource

Organizations use resource management to develop an innovative organizational environment for successful BPR implementation. A lack of resource can prevent BPR from succeeding (Bashein *et al.*, 1994; Venkatraman, 1994). Commonly, resource management mainly involves financial, technologies, human, which are believed to be determinant for the success of BPR projects (Davenport and Short, 1990; Marchand and Stanford, 1995). In this study it was intended to examine the level of importance of resource related factors as earlier mentioned, through the staffs' perception. As a result, participant were provided with factors such as knowledgeable, skilled, and competent people, adequate financial support, and information technology, to see how MU's staff rate the importance of these factors within their organizational context. Consequently, as indicated in Table 9, most (93.2%) of the participants are seen to rate the factors from important to critical importance in the scale. This is to mean that the participants believe in the importance of these resource factors to the success of BPR in their organization. Similarly, it was found that financial resources are obviously important to move the initiatives, since without enough funding any efforts would end meaningless (Stagnan and Kotnour, 2001). Therefore, budget allocations to BPR should be viewed as a long-term investment to get favorable results which would give profit to the organization. Moreover, it was noted that Information Technology (IT) as the key factor in BPR for organization that wants to witness a "radical change" in its operation (Hammer 1990). Of course, the human factor was identified as a core factor facilitated by the other two (Smith and Will cocks, 1995). In line with these, the results in this survey study reveal that the factors:

adequate financial support, knowledgeable, skilled, and competent people, and information technology were found to be rated with higher

mean scores. That is, 4.02, 4.01, and 3.92 with standard deviation of 0.940, 0.957, and 1.019 corresponding to the respective factors listed above. More clearly, although all of these factors are highly believed to be important to the success of BPR, they are also observed to be prioritized as adequate financial support taking the first rank and IT the third.

This evidence may lead us to note the organization to take the aforementioned factors as important BPR success factor. Therefore, the University should give greater attention to the fulfillment of these factors, of course, by paying attention to the priority given by the participants, in order to ensure BPR success in the University. Generally, from the results of all the components, it can be concluded that the research question is addressed to a higher extent for 91.8% of the participants favored the importance of BPR success factors listed, refer Table 10.

Similarly, as indicated in Table 9, the means average score for all of the components in the construct was found higher than the average scale which indicates higher favorable response rate given to the importance of these factors to contribute to the success of BPR implementation in the University. Further, the components were found to be rated from important to critical importance by most of the participants. Specifically, the percentage of the participants' favorable response (from average to critical importance) for each of the components was found to be:

Components (variables)	Favorable response rates
i. Organizational culture	94.50%
ii. Resource	93.20%
iii. Organizational Structure	90.90%
iv. Customer involvement	91.60%
v. Management Commitment	88.90%

Staffs' overall satisfaction

In previous research findings it was found that employees' job satisfaction relate strongly to the perceived work environment in general. Besides, employees' perception of quality of work- life is often assessed using job satisfaction and organizational climate surveys (Krueger, Brazil, Lohfeld, Edward, Lewis, Tjam, 2002). Similarly, in this survey study an attempt was made to examine the staffs' satisfaction with the new world of work environment, specifically, with respect to: organizational commitment, reward and opportunity, managerial competence, Work environment, and work place relationships. As a result, in this part the results of the survey are discussed to see MU' staffs satisfaction level with the new world of work environment, BPR in this context.

Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined as the psychological identification that employees have toward their employing organization (Bishop *et al.*, 2005). Commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and has implication for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization. It is also believed that employees commitment as determinant to the success of any change endeavor, which in part results from the employees' satisfaction with the organization in general (Cohen, Kinnevy and Dichter, 2007). Therefore, in this survey study, the staffs' organizational commitment was assessed so as to imply their satisfaction with the new work environment. Accordingly, the results of the participants' response to the items measuring the staffs' organizational commitment reveal only 41.2% responding favorably. Specifically, 69.9% up to 24.4% of the participants were found to rate the items imperatively corresponding to awareness of the University's vision, mission, and goals, feeling a strong sense of belongingness to the organization, fitness of job to skill and talent, enjoying discussing about the organization with people outside it, actively seeking employment elsewhere, recommending MU to prospective employees, and being very happy to spend the rest of career in this organization, respectively. This in general implies low satisfaction of the staffs. This is because the remaining percentage (58.8%), as indicated in Table 11, is seen to lie from undecided to strongly disagree position in the scale. Majority of the participants have also shown their satisfaction only to two items, awareness of the University's vision, mission, and goals, and fitness of job to the skill and talent, in the construct. But, this may not contribute more to the average satisfaction measure-organizational commitment. As a result, the University needs to re-examine its work condition in order to maintain the staffs' organizational commitment, which the researcher believes vital to the success of the change.

Reward and opportunity

Evidence from previous studies revealed that extrinsic rewards such as performance appraisal, promotion and increased salary are closely tied to employees' performance, Mohamed Zairi *et al.* (2007). In addition, a compensation system that provides merit rewards, adjustments for promotion and educational preparation changes, and addresses longevity and salary equity issues is noted important to be considered (UW-Stout, 2003), cited in Mohamed Zairi *et al.* (2007). In this study, it was found that most of the participants were not satisfied with the reward and opportunity system of the University. As indicated in Table 11, only one-fourth of

the participants were seen to favorably respond, that is, they were satisfied with the reward and opportunity of the University. Specifically, the participants of the University reveal low satisfaction with: opportunity for capacity building and professional development, competitiveness MU's of benefit package, adequacy of recognition and reward for a job well done, and satisfaction with salary. From this result, it can be said that Mekelle University is not adequately dealing with the reward and opportunity system as per the needs of the staffs. Since addressing these issues is believed to be fundamentals for increasing employees' performance, it is important for MU to address these to acceptable extent in order to ensure the success of the organizational transformation being implemented.

Managerial competency

Managerial competency is also seen as one aspect of job satisfaction. In this study, as indicated in Table 11, the participants show low (22%) satisfaction with this variable. More specifically, it was found low managerial supports in learning new skills, less clarity with managerial expectations regarding performance measures, manager with lacking leadership quality, and finally not satisfying with performance feedback provided. In short, this indicates that the relation between manager and the employees is not as such in line with BPR principles. So MU should need to examine this condition in order to really create an environment where BPR principles are seen to be practical.

Work environment

If employees feel badly treated or unhappy in the workplace they are more likely to reveal their discontent to subjects outside the organization. This can have a devastating effect on organizations reputation. In this part, conditions such as: safety, job autonomy, recognition for the importance employees' personal life, equipment and resources provision, feelings of accountability, valuing employees' idea, and satisfaction with MU's compensation, promotion and performance appraisal system were used to examine the staffs' satisfaction with the existing work environment. Accordingly, it was found that only small percentage (19.4%) of the participants have shown imperative response. Consequently, this shows that employees in this organization are not experiencing conducive work environment.

Work place relationship

Similarly, with the above aspects of satisfaction mea-

Table 11. The Staffs' overall satisfaction with the new work environment.

S/no.	Items	Percent					Total
		SDA	DA	UND	AG	SAG	
	i. Organizational Commitment	10.8	22.1	25.9	23.5	17.7	100
1	I am aware of the University's vision, mission, and goals	1.9	6.4	21.8	38.5	31.4	100
2	I do not feel a strong sense of belongingness to my organization	4.5	10.9	25.6	33.3	25.6	100
3	My job is a good fit for my skill and talent	5.8	21.2	28.2	25	19.9	100
4	I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it	12.2	28.2	26.9	17.3	15.4	100
5	I would recommend MU to prospective employees	15.4	31.4	28.2	14.7	10.3	100
6	I am not actively seeking employment else where	14.1	28.2	25.6	19.9	12.2	100
7	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization	21.8	28.2	25.6	15.4	9	100
	i. Reward and Opportunity	16.6	31.5	26.6	15.7	9.6	100
8	High opportunity for capacity building and professional development.	16.7	30.1	26.9	16	10.3	100
9	MU's benefit package is competitive	18.6	32.7	26.3	14.7	7.7	100
10	I receive adequate recognition and reward for a job well done	18.6	30.1	23.1	16	12.2	100
11	I am satisfied with my salary	12.2	33.3	30.1	16	8.3	100
	iii. Managerial competency	20	31.7	26.3	13.8	8.2	100
12	My manager treats me with respect	19.2	30.1	25.6	14.7	10.3	100
13	My manager supports me in learning new skills will be evaluated	19.2	28.8	28.8	14.1	9	100
14	I know what is expected of me and how my performance	20.5	30.1	25	14.7	9.6	100
15	MU keeps employees informed about Key issues.	18.6	32.7	25	15.4	8.3	100
16	My manager is strong, trustworthy leader.	19.2	34	26.3	14.1	6.4	100
17	I receive appropriate feedback on how I am performing my job	21.2	33.3	27.6	11.5	6.4	100
18	MU holds individuals accountable for their productivity	22.4	32.7	25.6	12.2	7.1	100
	iv. Work Environment	20.7	34.3	26.6	12.8	5.6	100
19	I feel safe at my workplace	21.8	32.1	26.9	12.8	6.4	100
20	I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.	21.2	34.6	28.2	11.5	4.5	100
21	MU is concerned for the welfare and safety of employees	20.5	35.9	26.9	11.5	5.1	100
22	I am given the equipment and resources I need to perform my job.	21.8	36.5	25	11.5	5.1	100
23	At MU there is recognition for the importance of my personal life	21.2	35.3	26.9	10.9	5.8	100
24	My ideas are appreciated and seem to count.	19.9	34	25	14.7	6.4	100
25	MU is interested in what employees think about their jobs.	21.2	31.4	26.9	14.1	6.4	100
26	I feel accountable to the success or failure of the process team	19.2	34	25.6	14.7	6.4	100
27	I am satisfied with MU' compensation, promotion and performance appraisal system	19.2	34.6	28.2	13.5	4.5	100
	v. Work place relationships	22.4	34.2	25.8	12.6	4.9	100
28	I like and trust the people with whom I work	21.8	34.6	24.4	14.1	5.1	100
29	I have a mentor/colleagues who are interested in me professionally	21.8	33.3	26.9	12.8	5.1	100
30	I dislike team work approach because there are free riders	23.7	34.6	26.3	10.9	4.5	100

N.B.: SDA = Strongly disagree, DA = Disagree, UND = Undecided, AG = Agree, SAG =strongly agree Note: The value for item numbers 2, 6, and 30 in table 11 above, were reversed

tures, the result for this component reveals a low (17.5%) satisfaction rate of the participants. More clearly, the participants were found to show low satisfaction with trusting people, mutual professional interest, and team work approach. This implies a great challenge to the realization of BPR achievement goals since BPR basically follows team work approach working environment. So, it will be very important, for the organization, to examine the work place relationship

condition of the staffs so as to establish a favorable condition that will facilitate BPR success in the University.

Generally, the result of this study shows the participants' low satisfaction with the existing work environment of the University. Specifically, the percentage of the participants' favorable response (from agree to strongly agree), for each of the components is found to be:

Components (variables)	Favorable response rates
i. Organizational Commitment	41.20%
ii. Managerial Competence	25.30%
iii. Reward and Opportunity	22%
iv. Work Environment	19.40%
v. Work place relationships	24.90%

Generally, the staffs' perception of BPR regarding awareness, benefits, quality of measurement and reward system, importance of selected BPR success factors, and overall satisfaction with the new world of work were found to be favorably supported with correspondingly 69%, 47.5%, 75.6%, 91.8%, and 24.9% of the participants, respectively. Consequently, this implies:

- i. The awareness of MU's staffs regarding the implementation concerning its nature, requirement, and purpose was found to be favorably above average. This is because most of the participants were found to demonstrate imperative response to the intended requirement, purpose, and nature of BPR.
- ii. BPR benefits in general are observed to unfavorably be perceived, i.e., low level of perception is observed regarding the potential benefits of BPR. This indicates that MU is not practicing BPR in a way that guarantees the staffs to gain the intended or expected benefits as a result of BPR introduction in to the University.
- iii. A gap exists between the staffs' perceived value of BPR measurement and reward systems and the participants' satisfaction level with the new world of work environment resulted from the introduction of BPR. Therefore, this indicates that MU is not implementing BPR measurement and reward system in a way that brings an acceptable level of satisfaction among the staffs.
- iv. Similarly, a gap exists between what the participants believe important to the success of BPR implementation and their satisfaction level with the new work environment. Thus, it can be implied that MU is not exercising the determinant factors for the success of BPR in line with the staffs' perspectives at a level that satisfies the staffs.
- v. MU's staffs are experiencing low level of satisfaction with the new world of work environment resulted from the introduction of BPR. More specifically, low level of satisfaction was observed among MU's participants regarding work place relationship, work environment, managerial competence, reward and opportunity, and finally leads to low level of organizational commitment among the staffs. In short, it can be displayed statistically as follows:

Major Constructs (variables)	Favorable response rates
i. Over all MU's staff satisfaction with the new work environment	24.90%
ii. Perceived benefits of BPR	47.50%
iii. Perceived awareness of BPR	69%
Perceived values of BPR measurement reward system	75.60%

Perceived importance of BPR success factor 91.80%

CONCLUSION

Based on the Summary of the findings made, the following conclusions were draws:

1. It is found out that MU's staffs have acquired a good understanding and have favorable views of BPR implementation regarding its nature, requirement, and purpose. In other words, most of the staffs were found to have perceptions regarding BPR implementation that goes in line with what is inherently known of BPR.
2. The findings also indicate that, at MU, BPR is not satisfactorily being practiced in a way that guarantees the staffs to gain the intended benefits resulted from the introduction of BPR in to the University.
3. Similarly, it was found out that MU's staffs have positive perception towards BPR measurement and reward system; but the University is not practicing these valuable measurement and reward system at a satisfactory level.
4. From the findings of the staffs' satisfaction it can be inferred that MU lacks exercising favorable organizational culture, organizational structure, management commitment, customer involvement, resource supports as to the perspectives of the staffs at a satisfactory level.
5. Finally, it was found out that MU's staffs are not satisfied with the new world of work. As it can be understood from the perceptions of the participants with the other variables, this can be attributed to the University's inability to fully implement BPR.

RECOMMENDATION

On the basis of the conclusions made, the following suggestions were made:

1. It will be appropriate and helpful if MU's management body, considering the staffs' perceived awareness of BPR implementation, gives emphasis to the actual practice of BPR principles through appropriate impact assessment procedures.
2. In order to develop and maintain favorable perception of the staffs towards BPR benefits in general, it will be also important for MU to re-examine the actual practice of BPR regarding:
 - a. The measurement and reward system employed.
 - b. Access to services
 - c. Adequacy of provision of equipments and materials
 - d. Research facilities and community service centers available Resource and time availability for doing research

- e. Effective and efficient use of available technologies
- f. Efficiency of governance in the teaching and learning process
- g. Autonomy in program initiation and management

3. It is also important for MU's management body to assure the adoption of a strong and appropriate organizational culture characterized with:

- a. Open communication (clear, honest, and frequent), b. Strong and trust worthy leadership style,
- c. Shared organizational vision and mission, and d. Empowerment of employees

4. In addition, it will be help full if MU holds strict enough to the existence of an organizational structure that encourage Employees' empowerment, job integration (team work), and less bureaucracy so as to enhance innovativeness among the University employees.

5. Finally, it will be good enough if MU works more to enhance the staffs' level of satisfaction with the new world of work resulted from the introduction of BPR by giving emphasis to the staffs' organizational commitment, reward and opportunity, managerial competence, work environment, and work place relationship.

Furthermore, the researcher would like to advises interested researchers to extend this study by include more than one University and see the differences and similarities that may exist among the Universities concerning the issues treated in this study.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, S., Thompson, G., Brown, S. (1997). Facing up to Radical Change in Universities and Colleges. London: Kogan Page.
- Bashein, B., Markus, L., Riley, P. (1994). Precondition for BPR success. *Information Systems Management*, 11(2):7-13.
- Belete, N. (2007). Concepts, Techniques, Tools and Implementing guideline of BPR: unpublished training and coaching material.
- Casey, J.M. (1995). 'A Strategic Business Improvement Model for Higher Education. Move Over TQM - Here Comes BPR', Annual Conference of the South-eastern Regional Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Universities and Colleges
- Champy, J., Arnoudse, D. (1992). The Leadership Challenge of Reengineering. *Insights Quarterly: Executive J. Bus. Reeng.*, 4(2): 17-25.
- Davenport, T.H. (1990). *Process innovation: reengineering work through information technology* Harvard Business School Press, Boston
- Dereje T., Ftwi Y., et.al. (2008). Business process redesign of the Human resources management support process: un published material.
- Dougherty, J.D. (1994). *Business Process Redesign for Higher Education*, Washington DC: National Association of College & University Business Officers.
- Geus, A. (1997). 'The Living Company', *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 1997, 51-59.
- Grint, K. (1995). 'Utopian Re-engineering' In: Burke, G., Peppard, J. (editors)
- Johnson, G. (1992). 'Managing Strategic Change - Strategy, Culture and Action', *Long Range Planning*, 25(1), 28-36.
- Hammer, M., Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*. London: Harper Collins. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/ViewContentServlet?Filename=/...ref..
- Martinsons, M.G., Hempel, P.S. (1998). Chinese Business Process Re-engineering. *Int. J. Info. Manag.*, 18 (6): 393-407.
- Penrod, J.I., Dolence, M.G. (1992). 'Reengineering: A Process for Transforming Higher Education', CAUSE, The Association for the Management of InformationTechnology in Higher Education. (Professional Paper Series #9.)
- Slowey, M. (1995). (editor). *Implementing Change from within Universities and Colleges: 10 Personal Accounts*, London: Kogan Page
- Smith, M. (2003). "Business process design: correlates of success and failure", *The Quality Manag. J.*, 10(2): 38-49.
- Taylor, R. (1995). 'Accessibility and Institutional Change' In: Slowey, M (editor). *Implementing Change from within Universities and Colleges: 10 Personal Accounts*, 61-73. London: Kogan Page.