

BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED AUTOMOBILE FIRMS IN SOUTHEAST OF NIGERIA

Dr. Orogbu Obiageli Lilian, Dr. Onyeizugbe Chinedu Uzochukwu & Onuzulike Nkechi Francisca
Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka Anambra State
NIGERIA

ABSTRACT

The Federal Government of Nigeria following the poor performance of the automobile industries in Nigeria came up with policy reform 2013 which will create a robust market for locally made vehicle. The broad objective of the study is to determine the extent of business process reengineering in the performance of some automobile firms in the Southeast. The study seeks to find out specifically the extent to which work process innovation influences employee retention, to determine the level of relationship between process redesign and employee satisfaction and to determine to what extent custom excise duties can influence the organizational success. The study is anchored on Business Action theory. Three research questions and hypotheses were formulated in line with the specific objectives. In pursuance of the objectives of the study, the descriptive survey design was adopted. The study worked with sample size of one hundred and twelve persons from the population of Eight hundred and twenty seven, eighty-two was selected using random sampling and complete enumeration method was also used. Pilot study was conducted using a test retest method to establish the reliability of the research instrument. The validity of the instrument was also tested. Pearson's product moment correlation was used for data analysis and Z test was also used to test the significance of the coefficient of correlation at 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed that there is positive relationship between process redesign and employee satisfaction, that work process innovation influences employee retention and that custom excise duties influence organizational success. This implies that well-structured work process activities and effective custom excise duties will enhance organizational performance. The study recommends that the automobile firms in Nigeria need a wave of process redesign that can unfold more flexibly and rapidly to meet the ever changing requirements of an increasingly diverse customer base.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of designing businesses has been around for a long time and structured methods of doing this emerged in the 1980's (Dale, 1994). It was first introduced by Hammer (1990) as a radical redesign of processes in order to gain significant improvements in cost, quality, and services (Ozcelik, 2010). For there to be a striking increase in efficiency, productivity and profitability, a drastic change in the design of the organization's processes is required. Organizational processes today are obviously different than what they were centuries ago. It has been estimated that 100 years ago about nine out of ten workers produced and moved tangible, material items. In 1990s, the ratio was down to one out of five the other four out of the five workers currently produce and deliver intangible products like information and service (Drucker, 1993). In recent days services are dominating the world, the foundation of any organization are the people and 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 and Sohal, 1999) invariably if the business process of the organization is unstructured the organizational performance will definitely be poor. Many organizations have initiated reengineering effort.

BPR is known by many names, such as ‘core process redesign new industrial engineering’ or ‘working smarter’. All of them imply the same concept which focuses on integrating both business process redesign and deploying IT to support the reengineering work. Generally BPR involves discovering how business processes currently operate, how to redesign these processes to eliminate the wasted or redundant effort and improve efficiency, and how to implement the process changes in order to gain competitiveness. The aim of BPR, according to Sherwood-Smith (1994), is “seeking to devise new ways of organizing tasks, organizing people and redesigning IT systems so that the processes support the organization to realize its goals”. Davenport (1993), describes ‘business process redesign as the analysis and design of workflows and processes within and between organizations. Business activities should be viewed as more than a collection of individual or even functional tasks; they should be broken down into processes that can be designed for maximum effectiveness, in both manufacturing and service environment as by Yih-Chang Chan (2001). In a paper presented to the annual meeting of the European Group of Public Administration Parys, (2003) Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) emerged in America during the 1980s and early 1990s, first in the private and later in the public sector.

The rise of BPR is often explained by the reality that organizations have to confront old ways of organizing the divisions of labor do not work anymore (Hammer & Champ, 1993). BPR challenges many of the assumptions which underpin the way organizations have been run for the last two centuries. First, it rejects the idea of reductionism the fragmentation and breaking down of organizations into the simplest tasks. Second, it encourages organizations to capitalize on substantial developments made in technology. Third, BPR enables organizations to take advantage of the more highly developed education and capabilities of the staff they employ (Beckford, 1998).

Task-oriented jobs in today’s world of customers, competition and change are obsolete. Instead, companies must organize work around processes (Hammer & Champ, 1993). BPR insists on the need to restructure processes prior to structuring institutions and hierarchies, and to structure these processes in different ways than before. This is predicted on the assumption that the potential of IT enables innovative designs of how work is being carried out. At least in theory, BPR thus provides the missing link between the layer of strategy and that of the information system design. Moreover, it recommends a holistic perspective which encourages the bringing of objectives, human resources, organization, IT and culture into a coherent perspective (Lenk, 1997).

In the last couple of years, notably since the global economic downturn in 2008, patronage of the grey import market has grown due to its relatively affordable options. The grey market goods are relatively affordable due to the sharp practices of the grey market dealers who act with near impunity. Practices such as an under declaration of goods and other methods to pay lower import duty, have created distortions in the market.

The Nigerian automobile market is mainly divided into two categories “New” and “Used”. Used cars form a sizable portion of total imports. The new car segment’s profit margin is been eroded by the increasing grey import and patronage as the majority of Nigerians have limited means to buy new vehicles from authorized sources. The automobile firms like other organizations are exposed to emerging concerns like fast and unpredictable changes, unstable economic policy, customers' changing taste, expecting a high-quality product and competition across the world. They take different shapes to keep their position in the global market and stay alive. They have to choose either to fail or doing fundamental changes in

many aspects including their processes, Through BPR, they face fundamental innovative changes in order to get dramatic improvement in the critical success factor.

The automobile industry in Nigeria dates back to the early 1960s, when private companies pioneered the establishment of local automobile assembly plants using completely/semi knocked-down parts. The federal government became involved in the local auto-mobile production 10 years later after concluding agreements with automobile manufacturers in Europe. Government however, became involved in the industry between 1970-1980 when it concluded agreements with a number of Automobile Plants in Europe to set up 2 cars and 4 truck/light commercial vehicles assembly plants using Completely Knocked down (CKD) Parts.

The 2 car plants are Peugeot Nigeria Ltd. (PAN), Kaduna, and Volkswagen of Nigeria Ltd. (VWON) Lagos. The 4 truck plants are Anambra Motor Manufacturing Company (ANAMMCO), Enugu, Styer Nigeria Ltd., Bauchi, National Truck Manufacturers (NTM), Kano, and Leyland Nigeria Ltd., Ibadan. These car and truck/light commercial vehicle plants were all privatized by the end of 2007. The initiative made waves at the initial stage as government quickly went into partnership with notable auto companies like Volkswagen, Peugeot, Fiat and Daimler-Benz. Before we knew it, some of those firms starting winding up due to low capacity utilization, lack of infrastructure and other challenges, which confronted the industry at that time following lack of a conducive operating environment for the business to thrive.

In 1982, the Federal Government completed agreements with five manufacturers for the establishment of the following five light commercial vehicle assembly plants: Mitsubishi in Ilorin, Nissan in Minna, Peugeot in Gusau, Isuzu in Maiduguri and Mazda in Umuahia. Given that the industry works at full capacity, it could provide over 300,000 different jobs. However, as the country grew into an oil-dependent economy in the late 1970's, and the government policy on importation became flexible, automobile manufacturing became difficult and local manufacturing plants could not bear the growing high cost of production. As a result, capacity utilization in the automobile industry over the years dropped below expectation with vehicle manufacturing below 10%.

In order to revive the automobile industry, the government introduced several importation policies and established the National Automotive Council (NAC) to ensure the survival and growth of the Nigerian automobile industry using local, human and material resources. The overall goal was to enhance the industry's contribution to the national economy. Vehicle importation however continued to thrive due to the infinite duty evasion techniques by the grey market dealers and sloppy importation policy enforcement, despite the government's efforts to boost local production. The failed state of the local industry gave way to growing importation of global brands. The industry is almost entirely import driven occasioned by the non-existence of local brands, and the desire for personally owned vehicles, due to the poor state of public transportation in the country.

The automobile firms like the Volkswagen have been in a serious turmoil since the 80's and 90's, following the Utomi. Utomi and Volkswagen of Nigeria experiences. He said, at his joining the company in 1986, there was a riot in the factory which weakened commitment of former MD of Volkswagen of Nigeria Klaus von Bothmer and VWAG who had waited years for the government to pay its Second Capital call of less than 80 million Naira. The government not meeting up with its own part of responsibility, in the part of pay up their own

expected debts before embarking on Structural Adjustment Programme, also in the aspect of monitoring the process activities of the automobile firms, Peugeot is one of the most popular marques in the country and the success of the industry ensured that the country enjoyed good returns from the export of Peugeot cars to neighboring countries like Guinea, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Liberia. Unfortunately, due to a number of factors, including the globalization of the automotive market and the impact of the second hand car imports, the capacity utilization in the sub-sector, which was 90% in 1981, is currently 10% in automotive assembly and 40% in components manufacture (Business Day, 29 July 2007). According to the National Automotive Council, in the last decade, total vehicular supply (local product plus imports) was over a million units, about 80% of which were used. There is therefore a scope for new investment in the manufacture of low cost vehicle.

The Anambra Motor Manufacturing Company (ANAMCO) Enugu was a famous producer of 1414 and 1418 Mercedes buses and they were being patronized by many transport companies in the 80s and 90s like EkenediliChukwu Nigeria ltd transport and the Young Shall Grow Motors, and Emenike Transport Motors etc. The organization thrived well in the 1980s and 1990s but recently has experienced a lot of hard times due to globalization, policy inconsistency and government not keeping up to their responsibilities. Although the company equally enjoyed government patronage in those years.

The performance of the Innoson Vehicle Manufacturing Company from the inception has been wonderful due to the company's consistency in the redesigning their work process and technological innovations, being the first indigenous company to make a landmark in the automobile business, it has been recognized all over the country for its good quality product that it can compete globally, having up to 10 vehicle brands and having been enjoying government patronage. According to a recent media report [Business Day, 29 July 2007], the total vehicular demand in Nigeria is considerable owing to the fact that transportation by automotive vehicle remains dominant (Business Day, 29 July, 2007) cited by Ekere, (2007). With a new automotive policy that seeks to encourage and revive local vehicle assembly plants, President Good luck Jonathan has expressed his optimism about Nigeria's capacity to export cars in the nearer future. Though those in the business of vehicle imports have risen against the new auto policy that is perceived as a threat to their business, it is nevertheless certain that the new automotive policy sets Nigeria on the path of being a major vehicle manufacturing hub in Africa South of the Sahara. It is expected that when fully operational the new vehicle manufacturing industry will create 70,000 skilled and semi-skilled jobs along with 210,000 indirect jobs in small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) that will supply the assembly plants. It is remarkable that no sooner had the policy been introduced than Nissan Motor Company announced that its first made-in-Nigeria car would be rolled out this April. According to Carlos Ghosn, chief executive officer of Nissan Motors, the company is willing to set up automobile plant in the country.

While the government's plan to curb this trend is heartening, it would amount to nothing if the government fails to see to the upgrade of critical infrastructure that would facilitate the success of the new auto plan. As NAMA has noted, infrastructural upgrade is paramount to the success of the new auto plan and it must be a continuing process. If basic infrastructural needs such as roads, power and port facilities are adequately addressed, as promised by President Jonathan (2013), it will boost the capacity of local manufacturers and attract more investors to the sector. The question Nigerians are asking is Will the new automobile policy give us affordable made in Nigeria car? And the purpose of this study is to find out to what extent the government has been able to achieve the implementation of these auto policies.

The move by the Federal Government to restrict the importation of fairly used vehicles (Tokunbo) into the country with a new automotive policy through a higher tariff regime is unsettling for many Nigerians, especially low income earners who depend on the vehicles for their daily transportation need as they cannot afford new cars because of high prices. While big car dealers see the policy as a good initiative to resuscitate the local automobile industry, private individuals expressed the fear that prices of imported vehicles may soar once the implementation of the new tariff regime from 35 per cent to 70 per cent begins.

The act of devaluation and deregulation of the country's currency are part of economic policy which is suffered by the local automobile industry in Nigeria. With Federal government in 2013 bent on creating a robust market for locally made vehicles, the Nigeria Customs Service is expected to execute full implementation of the tariff arm of the country's National Automotive Policy which places a whopping 70 percent tariff on fully built cars (FBCs) and used vehicles, while leaving local automobile manufacturers with only 20percent tariff on completely knocked down unit (CKDs). Based on this pronouncement, Alhaji Ibrahim Boyi managing director of PAN stressed that part of PAN come back plan is to maintain robust support center across the country this year. (Echemim, 2015).

The government has failed in its part of responsibility in the aspect of monitoring the process activities of the auto manufacturing firms which has affected the quality of the products being produce by these firms, it is based on the this facts that the Stallion's group managing director, Mr. Parvir Singh said, that the federal government has taken care of certain aspects of the country's new automotive policy with which it seeks to develop production of cars and buses in Nigeria. Assuring of the quality of cars and other vehicles assembled in Nigeria, the Stallion boss said, "government is monitoring every aspect of the process and every progress made gets certification from government. "Manufacturing passenger vehicles is highly complex, unlike commercial vehicles. Vehicle manufacturing is a good process of industrialization and nobody can short-circuit the process. This process is what we are following, "Unfortunately, due to a number of factors, including the globalization of the automotive market and the impact of the second hand car imports, the capacity utilization in the sub-sector, which was 90% in 1981, is currently 10% in automotive assembly and 40% in components manufacture. As a result of the work process not being monitored by the government in Anamco was equally part of the problems being encountered by the company. Innoson being a privately owned organization is always on the checked of its work processes. This is not the first time government is talking about automobile policy in Nigeria. The problem with this government is policy inconsistency and lack of adequate implementation framework, even on important issue that affects national development. This is not affecting the automobile industry alone but other sectors of the economy, because government can just come up and make a policy pronouncement today and tomorrow the same government will say something else or even act differently. Can the government come out to say what exactly happened to the automobile policy initiated over three decades ago in this country? For example, in the 1970s Nigeria government came up with a new policy to build the automobile industry locally. The initiative made waves at the initial stage as government quickly went into partnership with notable auto companies like Volkswagen, Peugeot, Fiat and Daimler-Benz, Before we knew it, some of those firms starting winding up due to low capacity utilization, lack of infrastructure and other challenges like not being innovative which confronted the industry at that time following lack of a conducive operating environment for the business to thrive.

The government did not give a realistic time line for the local automobile industry to be adequately restructured before increasing the tariff on imported Tokunbo vehicles, and this affected many car dealers in the country, especially those operating on a very small scale. Aside from the policy effecting micro auto dealers, a lot of people still depend so much on these vehicles for transportation, as the government did not take everything into account before implementing the new policy. Today, the big car manufacturers are in partnership with only few local companies to distribute their brands in Nigeria while numerous dealers operates on a small scale just trying to survive in the business. It is against this backdrop that the researcher wants to find out to what extent have the government been able to achieve the implementation of these auto policy. The broad objective of the study is to determine the extent of business process reengineering in the performance of some automobile firms in the southeast

The specific objective of this study shall be:-

1. To determine the extent to which work process innovation influences employee retention

RESEARCH QUESTION

The following research questions are designed in an attempt to achieve the objective of the study. They are:-

1. To what extent can work process innovation influence employee retention?

HYPOTHESIS

In order to solve the problem and achieve the purpose of this study, hypotheses was formulated and shall be tested.

H₀ Work process innovation has no significant influence on employee retention.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Business Process Reengineering

The main concern of BPR is rethinking and redesigning the business process for obtaining sustained improvement in quality, cost, service, lead time, flexibility and innovation (Hammer and Champ 1993, Gunasekaran and Kobu, 2002). In BPR large-scale "radical redesign" is considered to gain "dramatic improvements" (Ranganathan and Dhaliwal, 2001). Therefore, BPR is defined as: ... total transformation of a business, an unconstrained reshaping of all business processes, technologies and management systems, as well as organizational structure and values, to achieve quantum leaps in performance throughout the business (Crowe *et al.*, 2002).

Business process reengineering (BPR) is defined as the fundamental rethinking and redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service and speed (Hammer & Champ, 1993). This definition means that BPR requires radical transformation as opposed to incremental change and hence the fundamental question an organization must address before adopting BPR is if there is a compelling business case for change. Business Process Reengineering involves changes in structures and in processes within the business environment. The entire

technological, human, and organizational dimensions may be changed in BPR. Information Technology plays a major role in Business Process Reengineering as it provides office automation; it allows the business to be conducted in different locations, provides flexibility in manufacturing, permits quicker delivery to customers and supports rapid and paperless transactions. In general it allows an efficient and effective change in the manner in which work is performed.

The globalization of the economy and the liberalization of the trade markets have formulated new conditions in the market place which are characterized by instability and intensive competition in the business environment. Competition is continuously increasing with respect to price, quality and selection, service and promptness of delivery. Removal of barriers, international cooperation, technological innovations cause competition to intensify. All these changes impose the need for organizational transformation, where the entire processes and organization climate and organization structure are changed.

As organizations grew, more people were added and procedures were quick fixed, while the organization of work still followed the original logic. According to (Guha, Kettinger and Teng 1993), the localized, incremental approach has created extremely complex processes that contribute little to the overall effectiveness of organizations operating in today's business environment. Due to the global changes in economy, markets are globalized, customer requirements changed and competition is intensified, and new approaches had to be developed for coping with environmental dynamics and the required flexible organizational change, (Kohlbacher 2009). The concept of reengineering traces its roots back to management theories developed in the early 19th century. The purpose of reengineering is to "make all processes the best-in class". Fredrick Taylor suggested it as far back as the 1860's (Sturdy, 2010). But the idea of reengineering was first propounded in an article in Harvard Business Review by Hammer (1990). This method was popularly referred to as business process re-engineering (BPR), and based on an examination of the way information technology was affecting business processes.

Business Process Reengineering (BPR) is the analysis and redesign of workflow within and between enterprises according to (Hammar and Champ 1990 as cited by Mlay, Zlotnikova and Watundu, 2013). BPR can also be defined as a total transformation of a business, an unconstrained reshaping of all business processes, technologies and management systems, as well as organizational structure and values, to achieve quantum jumps in performance throughout the business Mlay, Zlotnikova and Watundu 2013 citing (Crowe, Fong and Zayas-Castro, 2002). Stoica, Chawat and Shin (2004) stressed that BPR is the evaluation and amendment of strategy, process, technology, organization, and culture. This radical process includes plummeting organizational goals that are no longer valid. Cited by Eke and Achilike, (2014)

Business process reengineering builds on total quality management (TQM) and therefore business process reengineering is further defined to illustrate the key components of reengineering, fundamental thinking, radical redesign, processes and dramatic improvements. The definition of business process reengineering and its components are not adequate to fully understand business process reengineering, and therefore the methodologies in business process reengineering are included to provide a greater insight into the concept. The expectations of business process reengineering exceeded what business process reengineering in reality delivered to organizations and this provided an opportunity to further evolve business process reengineering. A total quality organization implementing the TQM

programmed is an organization that operates with certain underlying core values and concepts, including customer driven quality, involved and active leadership, continuous improvement and learning, employee participation and development, fast response, design quality and loss prevention, a long range view, management by fact, partnership development, corporate responsibility and citizenship, and the organization is result-oriented.

BPR is about establishing and defining customer requirements and then aligning horizontal processes, that is, across departments and/or functions, to meet those needs. BPR has the potential to remove all wasted effort in the workplace, thus allowing clear roles and responsibilities to be defined. The result is an optimized process that promotes an environment of continuous improvement through a dedicated and empowered workforce.

(Mckay& Radnor, 1998). Hammer and Champy (1993) have defined reengineering as “the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business process to achieve dramatic improvement in critical contemporary measures of performance such as cost, quality, service, and speed”.

Methodologies in Business Process Reengineering: BPR may be characterized from the definitions, but the definitions do not include a well-defined methodology to show how to perform the actual BPR effort (Choi & Chan, 1997). The methods range from aligning employees possessing certain skills with core competencies within an organization (Horney & Koonce, 1995) to estimating the value of business processes and determining the return on investment for reengineering each process (Housel, Bell, & Kanevsky, 1994, Davenport, 1993; I. Jacobson, Ericcson, & A. Jocabson, 1995; Manganelli, 1993).

Expectations of Business Process: According to Hammer and Champy (1993), the aim of BPR is to achieve a dramatic improvement in performance. But BPR has failed to deliver the expected results (Harrington, 1991). Guidelines for measurement of the degree of dramatic improvement for BPR do not exist. As a result, BPR is incorrectly interpreted as a miracle prescription which can provide a quick-fix solution for all problems (Manganelli, 1993, pp. 7-86). Inflated expectations by top management about the speed, scope or benefits of reengineering exist (Kiely, 1995, p. 15). The unrealistic expectations lead to management disappointment with BPR because of the modest achievement. Although there has been no absolute figure to indicate the success of BPR, a guideline on performance indication is that 30 percent improvement can be a breakthrough in business performance and design (Klien, 1993, pp. 2-40). In order to minimize the chance of process failure owing to inflated expectations, clear process goals and expectations should be set according to specific requirements and conditions. In the progress from BPR to BPM, process goals and expectations should be reviewed and adjusted according to an organizations situation (Choi & Chan, 1997, p. 44). The key elements of BPR have been identified (see Table below).

The Types of Business Processes in an Organization

Finance	Human resources	Operations
(1) Customer/product profitability;	(1) Time and expense processing;	(1) Procurement;
(2) Credit request/authorization;	(2) Payroll processing;	(2) Order management;
(3) Treasury/cash management;	(3) Performance management;	(3) Invoicing;
(4) Property tracking/accounting;	(4) Recruitment;	(4) Shipping/integrated logistics;
(5) Internal audit;	(5) Hiring/orientation;	(5) Order fulfillment;
(6) Collections;	(6) Succession planning;	(6) Manufacturing;
(7) Physical inventory;		(7) Inventory management;

(8) Cheque request processing; (9) Capital expenditures; (10) Asset management	(7) Benefit administration; (8) Performance review	(8) Production scheduling; (9) Advance planning and scheduling; (10) Demand planning; (11) Capacity planning; (12) Timekeeping/reporting
Customer relationship management	Marketing and sales	Specific processes
(1) Service agreement management; (2) Internet customer service; (3) Call centre service; (4) Problem/resolution management; (5) Customer inquiry; (6) Sales channel management; (7) Inventory management; (8) Service fulfillment.	(1) Account management; (2) Market research and analysis; (3) Product/brand marketing; (4) Program management; (5) Sales cycle management; (6) Installation management; (7) Sales commission planning; (8) Customer acquisition; (9) Security fulfillment; (10) Sales planning	(1) Commissions processing; (2) Service provisioning; (3) Proposal preparation; (4) Capacity reservation; (5) Advance planning and scheduling; (6) Product data management; (7) Supply chain planning; (8) Order management and fulfillment; (9) Returns management

Note. Source: Adapted from Smith, 2003

CONCEPT OF BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING

The reengineering concepts involve four dimensions that are stated below:

- a. **Innovative Rethinking:** This is a process that is itself utterly dependent on creativity, inspiration and old-fashioned luck. Drucker (1993) argues that this paradox is apparent only not real most of what happens in successful innovations is not the happy occurrences of a blinding flash of insight but rather, the careful implementation of unspectacular but systematic management discipline.
- b. **Process Function:** Taking a systematic perspective, Hammer and Champy (1993) describes process functions as a collection of activities that take one or more kinds of input and creates an output that is of value to the customer. Typical process of this includes ordering of organizational structure, manufacturing, production, development, delivery and invoicing.
- c. **Radical change:** In radical change, a key business process is the transformation of organizational element; it is essential to an organization survival. Change leads to new ideas, technology, innovation and improvement. Therefore, it is important that organizations recognize the need for change and learns to manage the process effectively (Pamela et al, 1995).
- d. **Organizational Development and Performance:** It takes a look at the firm's level of efficiency and way to improve its current activity level in order to meet up to standards and survive the competitive pressure.

One way to judge the performance of an organization is to compare it with other unit within the company. Comparison with outsiders however can highlight the best industrial practices and promote their adoption. This technique is commonly term "bench making" (Roberts, 1994).

Elements of Reengineering in an Organization: From the work of Abolo (1997) and Thomas (1996) cited by Ezigbo (2003), the essential element or principles of reengineering include the following:

- Rethinking the theory of the business.
- Challenging old assumptions and discharging old rules that are no longer applicable.
- Breaking away from conventional wisdom and the constraints of organizational boundaries.
- Using information technology not to automatic outdated process but to redesign new ones.
- Externally focus on customers and the generation of greater value for customers.
- Internally focus on harnessing more of the potentials of people and applying it to those activities that identify and deliver values to customers.
- Encourages training and development by building creative work environment.
- Think and execute as much activity as possible horizontally, concentrating on flows and processes through the organization.

STEPS INVOLVED IN BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING

Davenport and Short (1990) prescribe a five-step approach to Business Process Reengineering. These are:

- (i) Develop the business vision and process objectives: Business Process Reengineering is driving by a business vision which implies specific business objectives such as cost reduction, time reduction, output quality improvement, quality of work life.
- (ii) Identify the processes to be redesigned: Most firms use high- impacts approach which focuses and most important processes or those that conflict most with the business vision. Few number of firms use the exhaustive approach that attempts to identify all the processes within an organization and the prioritize them in order to redesigned urgency.
- (iii) Understand and measure the existing process: For avoiding the repeating of old mistake and for providing a baseline for future improvements.
- (iv) Identity information technology (IT) levels: Awareness of IT capabilities can and should influence process. This is because IT is a sine qua non to the business process reengineering.
- (v) Design and Build a prototype of New Process: The actual design should not be viewed as the end of the BPR process. Rather, it should be viewed as a prototype, aligns the BPR approach with quick delivery of results and the involvement and satisfaction of customer

Business process reengineering (also termed process innovation, business process redesign, etc.) is an effort to redesign the organization for improved efficiency and effectiveness by focusing on the processes used in daily operations rather than on the traditional functions performed by the business. More precisely, according to Hammer and Champy, "Reengineering is the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance such as cost, quality, service, and speed (1993). Business process reengineering, often cross-functional and always radical, is a one-time project aimed at drastic redesign. The goal of BPR is dramatic improvement in process performance and process improvements in the 50 to 1000 percent range [Davidson, (1993)]. In contrast, Total Quality Management efforts often lead to incremental improvements. Baldrige Award winners demonstrate an average of 5 to 12 percent [Davenport, (1993)].

Important to understanding business process reengineering does understand what it is not. Business process reengineering is not business transformation. Business transformation refers to any effort to redefine or reformulate the organization's strategy or philosophy [Davidson, (1993); Boynton, Victor, and Pine, (1993)]. Business process reengineering focuses on redesigning processes to support strategy and objective attainment rather than on examining or redesigning the strategy or objectives. Business process reengineering is not systems reengineering. Systems reengineering is redesigning the computer architecture upon which the organization's systems are built. Systems reengineering includes downsizing or rightsizing (e.g., migrating to a client/ server architecture from a mainframe architecture), code restructuring, or migrating systems to more efficient languages. As we mentioned before, an organization may have to go through a systems reengineering effort before it can implement business process reengineering. Most importantly, business process reengineering is not Total Quality Management(TQM). BPR is similar to TQM because both take a process view of the organization and both focus on the customer as a major source of process measurement. However, TQM focuses on continuous, incremental improvement of those processes through employee and customer feedback. BPR attempts to totally redesign the process from the ground up. It uses a paradigm of a "clean sheet of paper," or starting over from scratch, rather than improving the existing situation [Hammer and Champy, (1993)]. Further, TQM is a continuous process with strong tools and methods, while BPR is a one-time project with few proven tools and methodologies. Finally, BPR considers information technology and human resources as prime enablers of major changes, while TQM does not rely heavily on IT for its process improvements.

BUSINESS PROCESS (WORK PROCESS)

Over the last decade, the concept of "business process" has entered the business mainstream. Leading organizations in virtually every industry have discovered that by harnessing, managing and redesigning the organization's business processes, organizations can achieve spectacular improvements in business performance and customer service.

Business process is a structured, measured set of activities designed to produce a specified output for a particular customer or market. It implies a strong emphasis on how work is done within an organization. (Davenport 1993). Business processes are characterized by three elements: the inputs, (data such customer inquiries or materials), the processing of the data or materials (which usually go through several stages and may necessary stops that turn out to be time and money consuming), and the outcome (the delivery of the expected result). The problematic part of the process is processing. Business process reengineering mainly intervenes in the processing part, which is reengineered in order to become less time and money consuming (Zygiaris,2000).Cited by Achilike,(2014) Mlay, Zlotnikova and Watundu (2013) citing Ross and Moore (2006) stated that "Business Process is a set of logically related tasks performed to achieve a defined business outcome". A Business Process is designed to add value for the customers and therefore should not include unnecessary activities. It has a goal, specific inputs and outputs, uses the resources, has a number of activities that are performed in some order, may affect more than one organizational unit and creates value for the customer (Meyer et al. as cited in Muthu, Whitman and Cheraghi, 1999 and now cited by Mlay, Zlotnikova and Watundu (2013). Process is not simply the management fad of re-engineering, but a more pervasive issue, requiring serious attention. 'Process thinking has become mainstream' (Grover et al, 2000). Process is not simply the management fad of re-engineering, but a more pervasive issue, requiring serious attention.

REENGINEERING

Reengineering is the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical contemporary measures of performance such as cost, quality, service and speed. Michael Hammer and James Champ the BPR originators maintained that re-engineering had a wider significance than mere processes. It applied to all parts of an organization and it had a lofty purpose (Hindle, 2008). Hammer in 1991 emphasized the need for fundamental organizational change and for the first time using the term Business Process Reengineering. The concept which has widely spread and applied is viewed by Hammer 1993) as the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service and speed. BPR focuses on redesigning work processes to enhance productivity and competitiveness. The demand for a new approach to organization restructuring has been occasioned by the awareness that many of the existing business logic is built on premises of considerable age. These existing processes were first designed as a set of sequential manual procedures, and then automated parallel with the accelerating development of technology. However, this automation did not change the strong efficiency orientation pushing for optimizing functions and a maximum level of control; neither did it address the organizational externalities, such as customer demands.

Reengineering has the potential to elevate information technology to its promised level as a business tool with the ability to have a major impact on the bottom line. Perhaps the greatest contribution of reengineering is that information technology's potential is being recognized (and in some instances, embraced) by those outside its traditional boundaries. Many executives are realizing that organizations that use technology effectively and creatively as the basis for the design of their core operations will outperform those organizations that do not. However, to sustain the current focus on process reengineering through information technology and to ensure a higher probability of success, much needs to be learned about the phenomenon. If the majority of organizations continue to have difficulty attaining the lofty goals of process redesign, they will not continue the BPR effort. Many questions need to be answered to help reengineering become an effective business tool. Important issues of BPR that need to be addressed are identified and discussed in the following sections, reengineering questions:-

(i) When should reengineering be done? (ii) How should a reengineering project be performed? (iii) What should be done to ensure the success of a reengineering project? (iv) How will reengineering affect the relationship between business and society? (v) Identifying when an organization should initiate an effort to redesign its processes is difficult. Measuring process improvement and assessing process health are important issues. Obviously, a poorly performing process should be redesigned. The problem is identifying the poorly performing process. Ambiguous objectives and unclear process metrics often make this assessment difficult. Davidson (1993) suggests five operating performance measures: productivity, velocity, quality, business precision, and customer service. However, determining which measure is the most relevant to the current process and operationalizing the measure for the process is a problem. Hammer and Champy (1993) suggest three criteria for choosing processes to reengineer:

1. Which processes are having the most trouble?
2. Which processes have the greatest impact on customers?
3. Which processes are the most susceptible to redesign?

Again the problem lies in actually assessing a process in these terms. Another issue is the appropriateness of today's technology for redesigning the process. Should the process be

redesigned with the current technology? Should the redesign effort look to near future technologies? Should a premium be paid for the latest and the greatest technology? These issues suggest the need for developing effective process measurement tools and criteria, as well as guidelines for assessing current and future information technologies and their potential impact on business processes. The situation is further complicated because many firms are not process oriented. They think in terms of functional organizations and frequently do not have a process owner who is responsible for a complete process. Before they can decide which process to reengineer, they need to define and map their processes. Davenport (1993) developed a set of generic processes (e.g., research processes, sales processes, manufacturing processes). Some authors suggest that most companies should have between six and fifteen such processes [Hammer and Champy, (1993); Davenport, (1993)].

If there are only a few generic types of processes, should management education focus on process management rather than functional management? What are the characteristics of effective process management? How should process management be taught? Should one restructure into a process environment before attempting to reengineer? These are a few of the questions surfacing due to this new focus on organizational processes as the firm's foundation of core value. The organizational climate also may be an important factor in the decision to redesign a process.

Should reengineering be done at a relatively quiet time in the company's operations? Or, is the chance of success greater when the company faces a crisis and all involved recognize the need for change? Should reengineering be a continuing process in the organization (e.g., each process is reviewed every three years)? Much of the current lack of success of BPR may be the result of an organization reengineering because of the promise of Eden rather than because of a realistic assessment of its needs. Guidelines for timing reengineering projects and for assessing company culture could vastly improve the probability of success of reengineering projects.

Stages of Reengineering

(ii) Once a company has determined that a process needs to be redesigned, it must decide on the correct approach. Unfortunately, few proven and published methods for reengineering are available. The importance of a methodology for obtaining specific objectives is inherent in the many methodologies that have been developed in the information systems arena [e.g., business systems planning, IBM 1975; strategic opportunities, Porter, (1985)]. Many BPR methodologies are very high-level and do not provide detailed guidance. For example, Wilkinson, (1991) provides a simple method:

1. Determine the desired outcome;
2. Design processes to produce the outcome, and
3. Implement the process.

As Wilkinson suggests, the difficulty is in the details of each step. Also, generic methods can be made to fit the project (e.g., one could imagine the traditional Systems Development Life Cycling applied, albeit inappropriately). However, neither method provides specific support for successfully completing a reengineering project. A third option is to hire a consultant. Many consultants are successful at developing and implementing process redesigns. However, this may be expensive and may not be a viable solution for some companies. Using Wilkinson's (1991) model, we can examine the specific support required for each step of a reengineering project.

First, determining the desired outcome requires a method to arrive at that determination. The method should provide support for developing an understanding of the external customer's

needs or desires for the process, and of the internal customer's point of view. It also is important for the method to avoid inherently limiting the assessment of a possible outcome. In reengineering, goals must be well beyond current status to be worth the effort. Methods grounded in the present may not develop appropriate outcomes. Some authors, such as Hammer and Champy (1993), recommend benchmarking; looking for the best practices in your industry, and especially in other industries that have processes similar to your own. Are there standards for the generic processes suggested by Davenport (1993)? What are good benchmarks for product development, order fulfillment, etc.? Second, designing processes to produce the desired outcome must rely on methodology that not only ensures successful design, but also encourages thinking "out of the box." Creativity in applying information technology to process redesign may be the key to better designs. Research on creativity has demonstrated that different approaches to a problem can either facilitate or inhibit creativity [Amabile, (1983)]. Hammer and Champy, (1993) suggest a group problem solving approach. However, this does not provide a strong method and, in terms of creativity, it is unclear whether a group is more innovative than a collection of individuals.

What are successful methods for assuring creativity in redesigning organizational processes while still producing an effective, implementable process? Finally, implementing the new process may require strong guidelines. Because of the radical nature of reengineering and the dramatic effect it may have on the employees and culture of the organization, reengineering projects may push the bounds of implementation knowledge and skills. Reengineering has drastic effects on employees' jobs. Many times people are displaced, moved, or fired because of the new job requirements. Joshi's Equity-Implementation Model (1991) suggests that this may hinder effective implementation because user's attitudes toward change are colored by their perceptions of the effect of the change on themselves, on how favorably or unfavorably changes are distributed among employees, and on themselves compared to other employees. Without careful planning, the employees' perception of reengineering projects may be a major inhibitor to successful implementation.

Reengineering Methods

(iii) Ensuring of the success of a reengineering work process: The potential importance of reengineering projects on the organization's ability to compete suggests that the organization should take every possible step to ensure the success of the work. However, little is known about the critical success factors for BPR projects. Certainly work ownership and management are important issues. Who has responsibility, and who should lead the job? Who is on the reengineering team? Hammer and Champy (1993) suggest that a senior executive must be in charge of the project to provide resources and credibility to the effort, and that there must be a process owner and a reengineering team consisting of the organization's best and brightest people. To give it proper attention, team members should devote at least half time to the project. Is this the best way to organize reengineering efforts? Additionally, training is likely to be an issue for these teams. What should the training consist of, and who should do it? Should the reengineering effort in an organization be managed through a steering committee? In a study of telecommunications, Torkzadeh and Xia (1992) found that management by a steering committee was more likely to lead to organizational support and recognition of the function. Other research also suggests that steering committees are essential management structures. However, Hammer and Champy (1993) suggest that a steering committee is optional; some companies have been successful using it and some have been successful not using it. Is a champion important to the effort? Reich and Benbasat (1990) suggest that having a long-term champion for customer-oriented strategic systems is

related to the success of the system. Many other researchers also suggest that a champion is often the key to successfully implementing an information technology project [Lockett, (1987); Runge,(1988); Vitale and Ives, (1988)]. These findings suggest that BPR efforts may need someone in the company outside the reengineering team to ensure the success of the project. Considerations other than the organization of the BPR effort are related to the success of BPR projects.

Understanding the needs of the users of the process is certainly important. Reich and Benbasat (1990) suggest that awareness of customer (or user) needs is a major factor in the success of customer-oriented strategic systems. However, Davidson (1993) suggests that a company should give the customer (user) what they've never dreamed of, not just what they want. Another interesting complication is the cross-functional nature of most reengineering projects. Does this broad perspective have implications for the factors that require control and coordination in such a project? These issues can have a major impact on the success or failure of a reengineering project. They are extremely important because it is estimated that as many as 70% of all business process reengineering projects fail [Moad, (1993)]. Much knowledge must be gathered on the important success factors for these projects, how these factors can be supported, the most common sources of failure, and how these can be alleviated or avoided.

Research issues for ensuring the success of reengineering

(iv) Reengineering affect the relationship between business and society: Classic studies in MIS deal with the impact of computers on society [Attewell and Rule, (1984)]. Most concluded that computers had both positive and negative effects and the impact of computers on middle management is a function of how centralized decision making is in the organization. If decision making is centralized, computers can be substituted for the communication and information processing done by middle managers. However, if decision making is decentralized, computers may not be substituted as easily for middle managers because the managers serve not only as information processors, but also as decision makers, and their ranks may increase. Successful efforts often lead to a massive reduction in the need for employees. This is not substituting technology for humans in information processing tasks, but eliminating those tasks altogether. What of the individuals that lose jobs to redesigned processes? This does not appear to be a desirable outcome for society. On the other hand, the loss of a few jobs may allow the company to continue to be competitive and provide some level of employment for society. Of even greater significance is if reengineering throughout the country is leading to fewer jobs, what is society going to do with so many displaced workers? Much IS literature suggests that computer technology does both deskilling jobs and enhancing jobs [Attewell and Rule, (1984)].

Research issue regarding impacts of reengineering upon relation between business and society

Redesigned work processes lead to better jobs or to worse jobs: Much of the reengineering literature suggests that jobs are enhanced. Technology enables new work process designs which empower employees [Hammer and Champy, (1993); Davenport, (1993)]. However, if the jobs are better, demanding a high skill set, who ensures that all potential workers get the education they need to move into these positions? Should reengineering focus on new work processes which offer greater worker satisfaction? The organizations will keep on training their staff.

PROCESS REDESIGN

Process reengineering is redesigning or reinventing how we perform our daily work, and it is a concept that is applicable to all industries regardless of size, type, and location. Process reengineering as a body of knowledge or as an improvement initiative, takes the best of the historical management and improvement principles and combines them with more recent philosophies and principles, which make all people in an organization function as process owners and reinvent processes. It is this combination of the old and the new as well as the emphasis on dramatic, rapid reinvention that makes process reengineering an exciting concept.

The first question in process reengineering is: "Why are we doing this at all?" Answering this question is the beginning of the immediate, dramatic change and the application of supporting technical and behavioral concepts and tools that are necessary to implement process reengineering. To accomplish this, organizations must foster an environment that encourages quantum leaps in improvement by throwing out existing systems and processes and inventing new ones.

The intent of process reengineering is to make organizations significantly more flexible, responsive, efficient, and effective for their customers, employees and other stakeholders. According to field experts Michael Hammer and James Champ, process reengineering requires the "fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service, and speed."

If process reengineering is to work, a business's priorities must change in the following ways: (1) from boss to customer focus; (2) from controlled workers to empowered, involved process owners and decision makers; (3) from activity-based work to a results orientation; (4) from scorekeeping to leading and teaching so that people measure their own results, (5) from functional (vertical) to process (horizontal or cross functional) orientation; (6) from serial to concurrent operations; (7) from complex to simple, streamlined processes; (8) from empire building and guarding the status quo to inventing new systems and processes and looking toward the future (i.e., from the caretaker mentality to visionary leadership).

As organizational priorities change, the culture will change as well. As people understand the vision for a better culture with better capabilities and results, they will be able-individually and as members of teams-to contribute positively to make the organizational vision a reality.

REASONS FOR PROCESS REENGINEERING

There are several reasons for organizations to reengineer their business processes: (1) to reinvent the way they do work to satisfy their customers; (2) to be competitive; (3) to cure systemic process and behavioral problems; (4) to enhance their capability to expand to other industries; (5) to accommodate an era of change; (6) to satisfy their customers, employees, and other stakeholders who want them to be dramatically different and/or to produce different results (7) to survive and be successful in the long term; and (8) to invent the "rules of the game."

ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS

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)

Innovation

According to the innovation process the business process redesign has three main phases Ideation, Incubation and Demonstration (Narvekar et al., 2006). New ideas are formed in the ideation phase, grew up in the incubation phase, and then demonstrated in the final phase. These phases are elaborated in six stages:

Recognizing of need for processes innovation the first step is the need for innovation. This is not achievable unless the employees are involved in them inefficient processes that motivate changing the processes. Employees should understand and be convinced that the old processes neither help the organizations to achieve its goals nor satisfies the customers. The organization must provide an innovating environment, and the managers have to trust the employees in thinking about new process, ideas and changes. The employees need to be acquainted with innovation techniques and constitute a creative team. Kettinger et al. (1997) argue that three innovation techniques can be used in the first step of the redesign: Brainstorming, Delphi, and Nominal group. Delphi or good ideas exist about new processes. It is also believe that the Nominal group technique is not suitable at the beginning of the redesign stage. An important innovation technique that can overcome the obstacles of innovation is Lateral thinking, because it helps the employees to create new mental structures. Lateral thinking involves discarding the obvious, leaving behind traditional modes of thought and throwing away preconceptions that are very important in redesigning new processes (de Bono, 1992).

While the purpose of innovation is simply to create business value, the value itself can take many different forms. It can be incremental improvement to existing products, the creation of breakthroughs such as entirely new products and services, cost reductions, efficiency improvements new business models, new ventures and countless other forms as well. The method of creating innovation is to discover, create and develop ideas, to refine them into useful forms and to use them to earn profits.

Governmental Policy and laws

The governmental policies and laws are part of the external environment that motivates the organization to improve their processes. These policies may affect the supply of the raw materials, importation and exportation of the products. The management will keep on brainstorming on how to maintain the status quo in the changing dynamic economy of Nigeria, although sometimes these laws or policies may favors especially the locally manufacturing firms. The squiggling nature of the country's currency is also another source of unstable and unpredictable change in the external environment that causes the organizations to move and find new ways of doing better works.

Nigeria's Automotive Manufacturing Sector

The automotive manufacturing industry in Nigeria is now over 30 years old and according to the Nigerian National Automotive Council (NAC); the industry has the capacity to produce

108,000 cars, 56,000 commercial vehicles, 6,000 tractors, 1.2 million motorcycles and one million bicycles annually. There are over 50 auto component manufacturers some of who are original equipment manufacturers (OEM) and others supply the after sales market. In the late 1970s, Nigeria enjoyed a good boost in the automotive industry. The innovative engineering work in the country then resulted in car assembly plants in the country making more money in export revenue. Peugeot is one of the most popular marques in the country and the success of the industry ensured that the country enjoyed good returns from the export of Peugeot cars to neighboring countries like Guinea, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Liberia.

Unfortunately, due to a number of factors, including the globalization of the automotive market and the impact of the second hand car imports, the capacity utilization in the sub-sector, which was 90% in 198, is currently 10% in automotive assembly and 40% in components manufacture National Automotive Council, in the last decade, total vehicular supply (local product plus imports) was over a million units, about 80% of which were used. There is therefore a scope for new investment in the manufacture of low cost vehicle. According to a recent media report, (Business Day, 2007) the total vehicular demand in Nigeria.

EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Employee Satisfaction means that employees are contented with their work and position that is they likely enjoy much of their work, they feel management is fair and cares about them and they are comfortable in their work environment both with other staffers and with the resources they have available to complete their jobs. It ties in closely with employ turnover since unhappy staffs are more likely to seek position elsewhere. It is expensive to replace employees and so the human resources departments have a goal of keeping employee satisfaction at a high level so turnover stays low. If employees are satisfied it improves their engagement, job satisfaction, productivity and retention. In indirect measurement, management watches the trends in employees leaving the organization and assumes that satisfaction levels are adequate, when turnover levels are at or below industry norms. They may also drill down to watch for specific departments or functions with higher than average or higher than usual turnover. Direct measurement methods involve asking employees about their level of satisfaction with different aspects of their jobs.

EMPLOYEE RETENTION

Employee retention refers to the ability of an organization to retain its employees. Employee retention can be represented by a simple statistic for instance, a retention rate of 80% usually indicates that an organization kept 80% of its employees in a given period). However, many consider employee retention as relating to the efforts by which employers attempt to retain employees in their workforce. In a business setting, the goal of employers is usually to decrease employee turnover, thereby decreasing training costs, recruitment costs and loss of talent and organizational knowledge. Employers can improve retention rates and decrease the associated costs of high turnover. However, this is not always the case. Employers can seek 'positive turnover' whereby they aimed at maintain only those employees whom they consider to be high performers.

Employee retention can also be seen as an effort by a business to maintain a working environment which supports current staff in remaining with the company. Many employee

retention policies are aimed at addressing the various needs of employees to enhance their job satisfaction and reduce the substantial costs involved in hiring and training new staff.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Organizational performance alone could be gauged in many different ways, with financial or non-financial indicators. There are several approaches to organizational performance measurement which include different stakeholders' perspectives. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) is a performance management tool for measuring whether small-scale operational activities of a company are aligned with its large-scale objectives in terms of vision and strategy. (Chen. M, Hung. M, & Cheng Y. (2009) include four perspectives: financial, customer, internal process and innovation and learning perspective. The financial perspective examines if company's implementation and execution of its strategy contributes to bottom-line improvement (Robinson, H.S.et al; 2006) some of the commonly used financial measures are economic value added, revenue growth, costs, profit margins, cash flow, net operating income etc. The customer perspective defines the value proposition that an organization will apply to satisfy customers and generate more sales to the most desired customer groups (Chen.M et al (2009) & Robinson, H.S.et al; (2006).

The measures should cover both the value that is delivered to the customer which may involve time, quality, performance and service, and the outcomes that arise as a result of this value proposition, such as customer satisfaction and market share. The internal process perspective focuses on all the activities and key processes required in order for the company to excel at providing the value expected by the customers (Robinson, H.S.et al; 2006).The clusters for the internal process perspective are operations management(by improving asset utilization, supply chain management),customer management (by expanding and deepening relations),innovation (by new products and services)and regulatory & social (by establishing good relations with external stakeholders). The innovation and learning perspective focuses on the intangible assets of an organization, mainly on the internal skills and capabilities that are required to support the value creating internal processes (Robinson, H.S.et al; 2006).In addition to these four perspectives, some researchers (Robinson, H.S.et al; 2006) include the supplier perspective, which is also important in assessing non-financial performance.

Organizational performance reflects an organization's understanding and knowledge regarding customer needs and expectations (Slater & Narver, 1995). Razalli, (2008) found that hotel performance could be improved through good leadership practice and provision of customized service design for select clientele in the service sector. Hence, business organization can maximize their customer satisfaction for better profitability, increased sales volume, which ultimately improves overall performance benefit (Baker & Sinkula 1999). Generally, organizational performance is assessed by the application of financial or both financial and non-financial measures. There are number of studies in the literature that used non-financial measures to evaluate the effectiveness and performance of organization (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Venkatraman & Ramanujam, 1986). It is suggested that four models i.e. human relations; internal process; open system and rationale goal model could represent the organizational performance (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Wheelen and Hunger (1998) argued that appropriate performance measures depend on the organizations and their objectives i.e. profitability, market share and cost reduction.

Financial indicators, such as return on investment (ROI), earnings per share (EPS) and return on equity (ROE) are used by the number of organizations to measure their progress. Return

on investment is used to reflect the profitability while corporate performance was measured by operating cash flows and return on investment capital (Hasnan, 2006; Sorenson, 2002). Rashid et al., (2003) measured firm's financial performance using the financial indicators, such as return on assets, return on investments and current ratios. Financial ratios reflect the financial performance of the organization by an examination of financial statements, as indicated by profitability, liquidity, leverage, asset utilization and growth ratios (Ho & Wu, 2006). In today's global dynamic and competitive environment, banks could improve and diversify their products and services to meet changing customers' demands and enhance their performance for successful survival.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This theory is anchored on the generic framework:-

It consists of customers and suppliers performing actions of communicative and material character which are related in generic patterns. Goldkuhl (1996, 1997) presented the Business Action Theory (BAT) that describes the generic business action logic. This theory is founded on communicative action theories (Searle 1969, Habermas 1984) and business relationship theories (Axelsson & Easton, 1992, Nermann & Ramirez 1993; Gummesson, 1996).

This generic business framework describes business processes as consisting of six phases. It starts with business prerequisites of customer and supplier and goes through business communication (with e.g. offers, inquiries, negotiation and contract) to fulfillment (through delivery and payment) and ends up with the satisfied usage or discontent and possible claims. The phases are (1) Business prerequisite phase, (2) Exposure and contact search phase, (3) contact establishment and proposal phase (4) contractual phase (5) fulfillment phase (6) completion phase. These different phases were described in Goldkuhl (1996) and have been further developed in Goldkuhl (1997).

The Business Action Theory emphasizes that there are certain business actions which always have to be performed when doing business, as e.g. the communicative actions offer, order, delivery promise, and contract. Such actions always have to be performed in principal, but in simple business situations some of these actions can be implicit or integrated with other actions. The theory also emphasizes that there is a certain principal order between different groups of actions within a business process. The different phase constitutes such groups of actions. The purpose of Business Action Theory is to describe and explain business interactions. This theory can be used as an interpretative framework when reconstructing, evaluating and redesigning different business processes in organizations.

The implication of this theory to this work is that if the automobiles firms will look more into different phase in the business process in reconstructing, evaluating and redesigning of the different business process, then the hope of Nigerians on having a Nigeria own car will not be farfetched.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Magutu, Nyamwange and Kaptoge (2010) investigated on business process reengineering for competitive advantage. The research was conducted by collecting primary data from the employees of the Wrigley Company. Online questionnaires based on the competitive measure and BPR implementation key success factors was used to collect the data from which certain

finding were deduced. The researchers established the Wrigley Company gained competitive by implementing BPR.

Ensermued and Moorthy (2013) carried out a research on assessing the effect of business process reengineering on organizational performance. The purpose of the study was to assess the effect of BPR on organizational performance of Bureau Finance and Economic Development (BOFED). Questionnaires and interview were used for data collection and Likert was used for analyses. Major findings were that the customers of (BOFED) were satisfied with speed of service delivery quality of service, cycle time.

Mohammad and Elaheh (2014) researched on the effect of business process reengineering factors in Organizational Agility in Ports and Maritime Organization in Iran. BPA factors are operationalized by cultural factors, communications, methodology, project management, strategic alignment, information technology, and leadership empowerment and performance management. Questionnaires were developed and were distributed to marine training, assessment, financial and information technology division of Port and Maritime organization. Using path analysis with partial standardized regression coefficient. The result of the result revealed that leadership and empowerment variables had the most effect on organizational agility the other variables.

Abdi, Zarei, Vaisy and Parvin (2011) carried out a conceptual research on innovation models and business process redesign. It was based on the innovation mode using dubin's methodology. This innovation concepts makes a new environment that drives employee the innovate and look forward to new processes where employees should make significant changes in jobs, workflows and IT, and increases the chances of BPR project success.

Sidikat and Ayanda (2008) investigated on the impact assessment of business process reengineering on organizational performance. The bank operation and function which are intend to meet emerging challenges of bank consolidations, slashing operating cost, outsourcing, portfolios investment, payments and settlement system are operationalize through BPR. The data was obtained from primary source and was analyzed through simple percentage analysis and regression reengineering has become useful weapon for any corporate organization that is seeking for improvement in their current organizational performance.

Samuel, Oartey and Lamptey (2013) investigated on quality management system of Unilever Ghana Ltd The study examines Unilever Ghana Limited quality systems, policies, procedures and activities within the company. In other words, finding out whether the company has a well-documented and comprehensive policy on quality performance systems if it does, whether this policy meets international standards. If these quality management policies on quality performance systems meet international standards, then this study would discover whether the policy is being implemented according to industry best practices and also, whether the implementation is yielding the expected or desired results. The project employed a qualitative research methodology based on the case study method. The research project finds that not only are all of the research hypotheses verifiable by scanning the research library, but also, Unilever has some way to go before it can claim a quality crown from other fierce competitors. The recommendation is made based on the four hypotheses in which it is recommended that Unilever Ghana add-on a knowledge management program that would align its quality management strategy with the company's and its management's perspectives and opinions.

Xin James He(2009) investigated on comparative study of business process reengineering in China the research investigated the current status of business process reengineering (BPR) in China by answering the following two questions: How do Chinese business executives view benefits, critical success factors, and major obstacles of BPR implementation? What are the managerial implications of BPR in China? Data were collected by means of survey questionnaires to senior managers in Beijing and Shanghai. Statistical analysis results indicate that while BPR has played an important role in making the enterprises in China more effective and efficient; its implementation has been uneven among various types of business sectors and ownerships. He found out that management support, cross-functional communications, cross-unit project team, and measurable BPR objectives are the top of the list for critical success factors, whereas a culture that resists changes & new ideas, lack of innovation incentives to state-owned enterprises, seniority, not performance, based promotion, and unemployment pressure of process restructuring are the top four obstacles in China.

Ringin, Razalli and Hasnan (2012) carried out a conceptual research on critical success factors for business process management for small and medium banks in Nigeria. They investigated on a large scale survey of organizations in financial sector and applied a rigorous research methodology and carried out five critical success factors of BPM implementation, which are IT investment, volume of financial activities, personal commitment, strong capital base and effective reward system. Among these factors, It investment, personal commitment and volume of financial activities have significant relationship with overall organizational performance (cost reduction, customer service management and operational efficiency performance) while effective reward system is only. The study contributed to research by identifying the success factors by business process management adoption in primary mortgage finance and Microfinance Bank.

Rodriguez (2010) carried out a conceptual research on business process reengineering within the bicycle industry. He found out that bicycle leader brands have shifted production overseas to reduce the cost of labor and to implement new technological way of production based on economics of scale that aims cost per unit reduction. He then proposed solutions to improve the current operational processes:-first, implementation of just-in-time management system and relocation of assembly facilities. Second, to benchmark ikea core methods designing products for supply chain and that customer assemble the furniture themselves.

Mashari, Irani and Zairi (2001) studied business process reengineering, a survey of international experience, they emphasizes on the lack of integrated implementation approach to exploiting BPR and a relative void in literature is the scarcity of suitable models and frameworks that addresses the implementation issues surrounding BPR. A survey was therefore designed to collect data from a sample of organization. The survey assesses the level of importance placed on the essential element of integrated BPR implementation.

Eke and Achilike (2014) studied Business process reengineering in organization performance in Nigeria banking sectors. It was a conceptual research which the objective was to analyze BPR in organizational performance in the Nigeria Banking Sector. The study advocates that Business Process Reengineering, the ultimate solution for increasing productivity and quality while costs at the same time putting the customer first has finally been found.

Ringin, Razalli and Hasnan (2012) investigated on the moderating effect of IT capability on the relationship between business process reengineering factors and organizational performance of banks. The objective of the paper was to investigate the moderating effect of IT capability in the relationship of Business Process Reengineering (BPR) factors and the organizational performance. BPR factors are operationalized by change management, BPR strategy alignment, customer focus, management commitment, IT investment, and adequate financial resources. Data was collected through a hand-delivery method by sending questionnaires to 560 banks (Commercial, Microfinance and Mortgage). The study used stratified random samplings proportionate to the numbers of the banks for sample selection. The findings showed that IT operations, IT objects and IT knowledge are the most important dimensions of IT capability attributes that contribute to higher organization performance.

Bogdanoiu (2012) investigated on business process reengineering method versus Kaizen Method. The study was a conceptual comparative research. He defined BPR by Hammer and Champy as the fundamental reconsideration and radical redesign of organizational processes in order to achieve drastic improvement of current performance, in cost, service and speed, and that Kaizen Method is a management concept for incremental change, the key elements of Kaizen method are quality, effort involvement of all employees' willingness to change and communication. He found out that the both method addresses the entire value system of a process, Kaizen usually start out with a big change and both require a qualified, competent and committed change to have any chance of success. He concluded that BPR is harder to implement, technology-oriented enable radical change; on the other hand, Kaizen Method is easier to implement, is more people oriented and requires long term discipline.

Maarjtje (2009) in measuring employee satisfaction in new office-the wodi toolkit the purpose of the study is to present a toolkit to measure employee satisfaction and perceived labour productivity as affected by different workplace strategies questionnaire was used for data collection. The data from the case studies and cross case analyses was used to explore and test hypotheses about the best possible fit between people, process and place. He concluded that satisfaction about the working environment has a fairly limited effect on the perceived productivity, the result show that employee retention factors like(proper leadership, training and development, good work environment, work-life balance, participation in decision promotion and opportunity for growth, reward and recognition, compensation) exist in the organization, it will not only help to attract new employees into the organization but will also lead to the retention of the existing employees into the organization.

Ramalall (2003) investigated on managing employee retention as a strategy for increasing organizational competitiveness. The aim is to determine the factors that most significantly influence employee's decision to remain employed at a particular organization and possible reasons for choosing to leave, through a series of surveys, observation and interviews. He determined that the location of the company and its compensation package were the most common factors in remaining with the company and the compensation and lack of challenge and opportunity were the most common factors in contemplating leaving the organization.

Aminu, Tella and Mbaya (2012) examined the public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria being a conceptual research, the study analyze the importance problems and factors influencing public policy formulation and implementation. This study revealed that there is lack of full practice of federalism in Nigeria as enshrined in the 1999 constitution rather what is obtained now is synonymous to unitary system of government. The study

recommends the need for government to be proactive, sensitive in formulating and implementation of public policy decision that will have direct impacts on its citizenry.

Das and Baruch(2013) looked at employee retention, a review of literature the study aimed at reviewing the various available literature and research work on employee retention and the factors affecting employee retention and job satisfaction among the employees, the study adopted a descriptive research method and secondary data was used. They concluded that the most difficult task faced by an organization today is retaining as well as satisfying.

Among all the studies reviewed above, none of the authors except one was able to use a questionnaire method, determining the sample size and using four–point Likert scale, to carry out his or her analysis and most of the researches were conceptual and the only one empirical was carried out outside the country in order to fill in the gap with the use of Z- test analysis which will properly clarify the relationship between Business Process Reengineering and organizational performance in the Nigeria context.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

The method that will be employed in this paper is the survey research method. The method was chosen by the researcher because data will be collected directly from the participants. Survey research is the systematic gathering of information from the participants for the purpose of understanding and/or predicting some aspect of the behavior of the population of interest.

The Population of The Study

The total staff 112 of the two automobile industries in South East will constitute the population of this study. Out of the total population Innoson Vehicle Manufacturing Company has 82 staff and Anamco has 30 staff. Complete enumeration method was adopted, as the researcher made use of the entire population of Anamco and random sampling method was used for Innoson company.

Table 3.1: SELECTED AUTOMOBILE FIRMS

Innoson	82
Anamco	30

Method of Data Collection

The research instruments that will be used in this research are formal questionnaires and key informant interviews. Questionnaires will be used as appropriate research tools to reveal sensitive issues which respondents would otherwise feel uncomfortable to talk about in an interview. A pre-test survey will be conducted in order to evaluate the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. Questions that proved to be unclear to the respondents will be modified, rephrased. Edwards (2003) posit that pretesting of instruments in the field can serve as a reality check indicating to the researcher how well conceptualization of the problem matches the actual experience of the practitioner. Interviews also make it possible for the researcher to take note of nonverbal clues from the respondents, for example, frowns and nervous tapping which can be used to determine the final results.

Validity of the Instrument

To ensure that the questionnaire measures what it is supposed to be measuring, a copy of the instrument, with a copy of the study containing statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses was sent out to some experts in the field of management, who looked at it to check the face validity by ensuring all words and items that will not confuse the respondent filling the questionnaire or one that has to do with the instrument are change or removed. They also checked the content validity to ensure that the instrument (questionnaire, interfiled schedule) contain all the aspect of the subject that should be included in the questionnaire.

Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability for the research study will be determined using the test re- test method. The data generated from the two administrations was then correlated using the Spearman Rank-Order correlation formula.

The reliability test used for the research study was determined using the test re test method. The data generated from the two administrations were then correlated. A reliability coefficient of 0.7 was obtained which was considered high enough as a reliability of an instrument.

$$1 - \frac{6(d^2)}{N(N^2 - 1)} =$$

Test	retest	d ²
1. 20	15	5 ²
2. 5	12	3 ²
		34

$$1 - \frac{6(34)}{20(20^2 - 1)} =$$

$$1 - \frac{204}{20(20^2 - 1)20} = 1 - \frac{204}{(400 - 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{204}{7,980}$$

$$1 - 0.0256 = 0.9744 = 0.9$$

Method of Data Analysis

The Z-test will be used in analyzing the data that were generated with the questionnaire to test the hypothesis; it is a statistical tool that is used to test the impact of one event over another.

$$Z_0 = \frac{(x - y)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

Also, data for the research was collected from primary source. Copies of a structured questionnaire were administered, and the participants were placed on objective response for each statement on a five point likert scale. The response scoring weights were Strongly Agree- 5points, Agree-4points, Undecided-3points, Disagree-2points and strongly disagree-1. The scale was calculated using the formula below.

Where $X = \frac{\sum Fx}{N}$

Where $X = \frac{5+4+3+2+1}{5} = \frac{15}{5}$

Decision Rule:

Any item that has a response of 3.0 and above is to be accepted or agreed upon while any response with a mean score below 3.0 is to be rejected or disagreed upon.

Data Presentation and Analyses

This chapter covers the presentation and analyses of data collected from the field. The presentation is divided into two parts; the first part contains descriptive statistics while the second part contains test of hypotheses. A total number of 112 copies of the questionnaire were administered to the respondents but only 78 were retrieved, 20 were invalid.

Table 4.1 Schedule of questionnaire administered and returned

Number of Questionnaire Administered	112
---	------------

Table 4.2: QUESTIONNAIRE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
My organization has made improvement on its process.	28	20	10		
My organization has a system that is open to change in its methods of operation.	20	25	11		
My organization adopts process that adds value to their products.	10	20	20		
My organization maintains a work environment that discourages employees' turnover.	4	4	11	18	6
The management of my organization is concerned about maintaining organizational knowledge.	18	28	2		
My organization makes effort towards ensuring that employees are adequately trained to perform their jobs.	15	30	2	4	

In order to objectively answer the research questions, the relevant responses supplied by the questionnaire that corresponded with each of the research questions were analyzed with the aid of Mean and the decision rule:

Table 4.3 Research Question 1 Result

Section A	Mean	Decision Rule
1 My organization has made improvement on its process.	4.6	3.0
2 My organization has a system that is open to change in its method of operation.	4.3	3.0
3 My organization adopts process that adds value to their products.	4.4	3.0
4 My organization maintains a work environment that discourages employees' turnover.	2.5	3.0
5 The management of my organization is concerned about maintaining organizational knowledge.	4.1	3.0
6 My organization makes effort towards ensuring that employees are adequately trained to perform their jobs.	<u>4.2</u> 6	4.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

Table 4.3 above reveals that the respondents agreed that work process innovation influence employee retention to a greater extent with the mean of mean of 4.0 and the respondents agreed with items numbers 1,2, 3,5 & 6 respectively, while respondents disagreed with the item number 4 with the mean of 2.5.

Test of Hypotheses

The formulated hypotheses were tested with Peason's Product – Moment Correlation as shown below:

Decision rule: Reject Ho if the P-value is less than 0.05 (level of significance) and accept the alternative.

Ho: P = 0

H_A: P ≠ 0

Hypothesis 1

H_o Work process innovation has no significant influence on employee retention.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient- Computation

	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1.	4.5	2.5	11.25	20.25	6.25
2.	4.3	4.2	18.06	18.49	17.64
3.	4.3	4.1	17.63	18.49	16.81
	13.1	10.8	46.94	57.23	40.7

$$r = \frac{n\sum xy - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{(n\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2)(n\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2)}}$$

$$r = \frac{6(46.94) - 13.1 \times 10.8}{\sqrt{(6(57.23) - (13.1)^2)(6(40.7) - (10.8)^2)}}$$

$$r = \frac{281.6 - 141.5}{148.1} = \frac{140.1}{148.1} = 0.946 = 0.95$$

The Correlation Coefficient r is 0.946 and so the critical value for r at N- 2 degrees of freedom is 0.707 where N=6

Decision: the computed r (0.946) is greater than the critical (0.707) value for two – tailed test at 0.05 level of significance. There is a strong reason to reject the null hypothesis, and accept that there is a significant relationship between the two variables that is work process innovation influences employee retention.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion of the Findings

The following findings were made in this study after subjecting the responses elicited from the respondents to statistical analysis.

The researcher found out that out of the total number of 112 studied 96(86%) of the response agreed that the entire organization's business processes are reengineered and that the employees are being trained accordingly to perform the duties. Although 43(38%) of the response agreed that their organization are not maintaining adequate work environment to

reduce employee turnover. Also almost all the responses agreed that government inconsistency in policy formulation and implementation adversely affect their organizations.

This study reveals that business process reengineering enhances the performances of the organization but that the employees are not encouraged so as to reduce their turnover.

This finding is backed by other findings by Bogdanoiu (2012) which posit that the business process reengineering is the redesign of business process and the associated systems and organizational structure to achieve a dramatic improvement in business performance but it must be accompanied by change of method.

Sidikat and Ayanda (2008) posit that business process reengineering has become useful weapon for any corporate organization that seeks to improve in its current organizational performance and intends to achieve cost leadership strategy in its operating industry and environment.

Discussion of Findings from the Test of Hypotheses:

Result from test of Hypothesis 1

The test of this hypothesis revealed that work process innovation has a significant influence on employee retention. This implies that if the work process be structured, flexible, challenging and then if the system is open to change. It will make the work of employee more interesting seeing that the necessary resources needed by the employees are adequately available. This finding is in line with the assertion of Samuel and Chipunza (2009) that intrinsic and extrinsic motivational variable can enhance retention and reduce the high rate of employee turnover in our various organization such variable includes training and development, recognition and reward for good performance.

Das and Baruch (2013) found that one of the important factors in employee retention is investment on employee training and career development organization always invests in the form of training and development on those workers from whom they expect to return and give output on its investment.

Summary of Findings

From the discussion of findings the summary was made

1. Work process innovation has a significant influence on employee retention as the r value of 0.946 is greater than the critical r (0.707) value at 0.05 level of significance.

CONCLUSION

From the discussion of the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:-

Business process reengineering is the redesigning of business processes, the associated system and organizational structures to achieve a dramatic improvement in business performance.

The work process innovation will help the organization to be more structured in their methodology by using teams to streamline their process by training these employees in highly specialized approaches and appropriate working environment, making the work process more challenging, aggressive and interesting, thereby enhancing the employee retention and organizational performance.

The process redesigning focuses on incrementally improving on overall process by improving its individual steps and sub processes. It involves incrementally improving an existing process by reducing the time, complexity and bureaucracy of the individual steps and sub processes, thereby giving more responsibilities and authority to the employee which enhances employee satisfactions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Having discussed the findings extensively and drawn some conclusions therein, the following recommendations are made:-

1. For indigenous automobile firms in Nigeria to bounce back, they need a wave of process redesign that can unfold more flexibly and rapidly to meet the ever changing requirements of an increasingly diverse customer base.
- 2 Management of these organizations should focus their attention on rewarding and recognizing the employees; involving them in decision making process; creating promotion and opportunity for growth while redesigning process will enhance their satisfaction and retention.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, N., Zarei, B., Vaisy, J. and Parvin, B. (2011). Innovation models and Business Process Redesign. CSC anada, International Business and Management. Vol.3, No 2.
- Ayanda, A.M. and Sidikat, A (2008). Impact Assessment of Business Process Reengineering on Organizational Performance. European Journal of Social Science. Vol.7.No1.
- Davenport T.H. (1994). Reengineering: Business Change of Mythic Proportions.
- Davenport T.H. and Beers M.C. (1995). Managing Information About Process. Journal of Management Information System 12(1). Pp. 57 – 80.
- Davenport, T.H. and Short, J.E. (1990). The New Industrial Engineering: Information Technology and Business Process Redesign, Slogan Management Review, pp. 11 – 27.
- Davenport, T. H. (1993a). Process innovation. Harvard Business School Press, 2(1), 3-5.
- Davenport, T. H. (1993b). Process innovation: Reengineering work through Information technology. Boston: Harvard Business School Press
- Drucker, P. (1993). The Discipline of Innovation. Harvard Review.
- Earl M.J, Sampler J.L and Short J.E. (1995). Strategies for Business Process Reengineering Evidence from field studies. Journal of Management Information System 12 (1): 31 – 36.
- Edwards, C., and Peppard, J., (1997). A Critical Issue in Business process Reengineering: Focusing the Initiative: jwp\bpr\articles\bprfocus\crit2.doc.
- Eke, G.J and Achilike, A.N (2014). Business Process Reengineering in Organizational Performance in Nigeria Banking Sector. Academic Journal of interdisciplinary Studied MCSER publishing Rome Italy. Vol.3 No5.
- Elaheh, M. (2014). The Effect of Business Process Reengineering factors on Organizational Agility Using Path Analysis:- Case Study of Ports and

- Maritime Organization in Iran. Asian Economic and Financial Review.
Journal homepage. <http://www.aessweb.com/journal/5002>.
- Goldkuhl G (1996) Generic business frameworks and action modeling,
In proceedings of conference Language/Action Perspective '96,
Springer Verlag.
- Goldkuhl G (1997) The Six Phases of Business Processes - Further Development of
Business Action Theory, CMTO, Linköpings University.
- Hammer, M., and Champy, J. (1993). Re-engineering the corporation:
A manifesto for business revolution. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Harmon, P. (2003). Business process change: A manager's guide to improving,
redesigning, and automating processes. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- Harrington, H. (1991). Business process improvement. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Jacobson I, Ericsson M. and Jacobson A. (1994). The object advantage –
Business Process Reengineering with object technology, Addison-Wesley.
- Jacobson, I, Ericsson, M., and Jacobson, A. (1995). The object advantage:
Business process reengineering with object technology. ACM Press Books: Addison
Wesley
- Jarrar, Y. F. and Aspinwall, E. M. (1999). Integrating total quality management
and business process reengineering: Is it enough? Total Quality Management, 10(4),
584-593.
- Jarrar, Y. F., & Aspinwall, E. M. (1999). Integrating total quality management and
business process reengineering: Is it enough? Total Quality Management,
10(4), 584-593.
- Journal of Service Industry Management, 1(3), 225-243.
- Khan, R. (2005). Ask the expert. Retrieved
from <http://www2.cio.com/ask/expert/2005/questions/questions2026.html>
- Khong, K. W., & Richardson, S. (2003). Business process re-engineering in Malaysian
banks and finance companies. Managing Service Quality, 13(1), 54-71.
- Khan, R. (2005). Ask the expert. Retrieved from
<http://www2.cio.com/ask/expert/2005/questions/questions2026.html>
- Khong, K. W. and Richardson, S. (2003). Business process re-engineering in Malaysian
banks and finance companies. Managing Service Quality, 13(1), 54-71.
- Kiely, T. J. (1995). Managing change: Why reengineering projects fail.
Harvard Business Review, 73(2).
- Kiely, T. J. (1995). Managing change: Why reengineering projects fail.
Harvard Business Review, 73(2).
- Klien, M. M. (1993). IE's fill facilitator role
in benchmarking operations to improve performance. Industrial Engineering, 25(9).
- Klien, M. M. (1993). IE's fill facilitator role in benchmarking operations to improve
performance. Industrial Engineering, 25(9).
- Llewellyn, N., & Armistead, C. (2000). Business process management:
Exploring social capital within processes. International Journal of Service Industry
Management, 1(3), 225-243.
- Llewellyn, N., & Armistead, C. (2000). Business process management:
Exploring social capital within processes. International Journal of Service Industry
Management, 1(3), 225-243.
- Lind M. and Goldkuhl G. (1997). Reconstruction of Different Business Processes,
A Theory and Method Driven Analysis. The Language Action Perspective-
proceedings of the Second, International Workshop on Communication Modeling.
- Magutu, P.O., Nyamwange, S.O. and Kaptoge, G.K (2010). Business Process Reengineering
for Competitive Advantage. AIBUMA Publishing, African Journal of Business and
Management (AJBUMA). <http://www.aibuma.org/journal/index.htm>. Vol.1, 16pages.

- Manganelli, R. L. (1993). Define reengineering. *Computerworld*, 27(29), 7-86.
- Mckay, A., & Radnor, Z. (1998). A characterization of a business process. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 18(9), 924-936.
- Prays, M. (2003). Business Process Reengineering on How to enable bottom-up Participation in a top down reform program. A paper presentation to the annual meeting of the European group of Public Administration.
- Ringim, K.J., Razalli, M.R and Hasnan, N (2012). The Moderating Effect of IT Capability on the Relationship between Business Reengineering Factors and Organizational Performance of Banks. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce* (<http://www.arraydev.com/Commerce/jibc>).
- Ringim, K.J., Razalli, M.R and Hasnan, N. (2012). Critical Success Factors for Business Process Management Banks in Nigeria. *Business and Management Review* Volume.2 (1) <http://www.businessjournalz.org/bmr>.
- Rodriguez, D.B (2010). Business Process Reengineering within the Bicycle Industry. KTH Industrial Engineering and Management.
- Setegn, D., Ensermu, M., and Moorthy, P.K (2013). Assessing the effect of Business Process Reengineering On Organizational Performance. *Researchers World Journal of Arts, Science and Commerce*.
- Suhendra E.S and Oswari T.(2011). Business Process Management in Organization, A Critical Success Factor, *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, Volume 8, No 1, 110-120.
- Zairi, M., and Sinclair, D. (1995). Business process re-engineering and process management: a survey of current practice and future trends in integrated management. *Management Decision*, 33(3), 3-16.
- Zigiaris S. (2000). Business Process Reengineering (Report Produced for the EC funded project) Innoregio, Dissemination of Innovation and Knowledge Management Technique Organization.
- Zucco, N. (1996). Reengineering in Australian banks - achieving a quantum leap in performance. Australia: KPMG.

**Appendix
QUESTIONNAIRES**

Please tick the cadre that applies to you.

Top management level

Middle management level

Lower level managers

Years of Working experience

0 – 10, 11 -20, 21 and above.

SA =Strongly Agreed, A= Agreed, SD= Strongly Disagreed, D=Disagreed,

UD= Undecided

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1	My organization has made improvement on its process.					
2	My organization has a system that is open to change in its methods of operation.					
3	My organization adopts process that adds value to their products.					
4	My organization maintains a work environment that discourages employees' turnover.					
5	The management of my organization is concerned about maintaining organizational knowledge.					
6	My organization makes effort towards ensuring that employees are adequately trained to perform their jobs.					
7	We have reinvented the way we do work to satisfy our customers.					
8	My organization has changed our operations in order to address 'work related' problems.					
9	My organization has been able to simplify its methods towards ensuring that results are achieved.					
10	I am comfortable with/in my work environment.					
11	The management of my organization addresses my varying needs as an employee.					
		SA	A	U	D	SD
12	I enjoy performing my work in my organization.					
13	The new custom excise duties support the production of more affordable cars by my organization.					
14	Government `s inconsistency in policy formulation and implementation usually pose problems to my organization.					
15	Government patronage has been an encouragement to my organization					
16	Improvement in our work processes has resulted to an increase in our customer`s patronage.					
17	We have been able to increase the value of our products by changing our methods.					
18	Improvement in the general business process of our organization has increased the speed of our delivery.					

Source: Field Survey (2015)