

Oromia State University

School of Leadership and Governance



**Challenges and Opportunities of Business Process Reengineering in
Enhancing Public Service Delivery: Case of East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts**

By: DesalegnWakjira

**A Research Proposal Submitted in the Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Art in Leadership and Change
Management**

Advisor: Hagerbigegn H/Meskel (Asst. Professor)

**March, 2019
Adama**

Oromia State University

School of Leadership and Governance



Challenges and Opportunities of Business Process Reengineering in Enhancing Public Service Delivery: Case of East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts

By:DesalegnWakjira

School Of Leadership and Governance

Department of Leadership and Change Management

DECLARATION

I, Desalegn Wakjira declare that this research proposal Challenges and Opportunities of BPR in Enhancing Service Delivery: Case of East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts; is my original work and that all sources of the materials in the research paper have been duly acknowledged. The matter embodied in this research work has not submitted earlier for award of any degree or diploma to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Name: **Desalegn Wakjira**

Signature: _____

Date: **March, 2019**

This research proposal has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name of Advisor: _____  _____

Signature: _____  _____

Date: _____

Approved by:

Advisor

Signature

Examiner

Signature

Chairperson

Signature

Abbreviations

BPR	Business Process Re-engineering
CSFs	Critical Success Factors
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IT	Information Technology
PSIP	Performance and Service Delivery Improvement Policy
SPSS	Statistical Program for the Social Sciences
TQM	Total Quality Management
PBMIG	-performance based management interest group

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	iii
Abbreviations	iv
Table of Contents	v
Chapter One	1
Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of Problem	4
1.3. Research Questions	6
1.3.1 General Research Question	6
1.3.2. Specific Research Questions	6
1.4. Objectives of the Study	7
1.4.1. General objective	7
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	7
1.5. Significance of the Study	7
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	8
1.7. Organization of the Study	8
Chapter two	9
Review of Related Literature	9
2.1. Concept of Organizational Change and Change management.....	9
2.1.1. Meaning of Change and Organizational Change.....	9
2.1.2. Types of Changes in Organization	9
2.1.3. Meaning of Change management	10
2.2. Meaning of Business Process Re-engineering	11
2.3. Purpose of BPR in in Enhancing Service Delivery.....	13
2.4. Steps of Implementation of Business Process Re-engineering	16

2.5. Emergence of Business Process Re-engineering	17
2.6. Areas of Change in Business Process Re-engineering.....	19
2.6.1 Technology	20
2.6.2. Strategy	20
2.6.3. People	21
2.6.4. Organization	22
2.7. Challenges of Business Process Re-engineering.....	22
2.8. Opportunities for Implementation of Business Process Re-engineering	24
2.8.1. Information communication and technology	25
2.8.2. Effective Leadership.....	25
2.8.3. Change of Attitude.....	26
2.8.4. Collaborative working environment.	26
2.8.5. Top management commitment.	27
Chapter Three.....	28
Research Methodology	28
3.1. Research Design.....	28
3.2. Sources of Data	28
3.2.1. Primary data collection.....	28
3.2.2. Secondary data collection.....	29
3.3. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques	29
3.4. Methods of Data Collection	30
3.5. Pilot Testing	30
3.6. Methods of Data Analysis	31
3.7. Ethical Consideration	32
References	33
Time Table for the Study	43
Budget Breakdown.....	44

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

The advancement in new technology forces organizations to modernize their processes, thereby fostering their competitive advantages (Laudon & Laudon, 2006). Also, the customers' demands have been the factor that causes organization to change. Organizational failure to meet customers' demand and/or expectations forces customers to shift to other service providers (Heizer & Render, 2011). Therefore, organizations have been working hard to improve their business processes in order to improve or maintain their services for retaining and/or attracting more customers. Organizations have to re-invent their business processes. There are several techniques that can be used by organizations to reinvent their business processes. The techniques include Six Sigma, Lean, Total Quality Management (TQM) and Business Process Re-engineering (BPR), to mention the few (Slack, et al., 2007). Among these techniques, BPR is considered as the most appropriate in today's business environment because it improves organizational performance (OP) (Hammer & Champy, 1993).

According to Hammer (2001) business process reengineering is 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. The concept of Business Process Reengineering (BPR) is emerged in America during the 1980s and early 1990s. From the time when the term "Reengineering" was known by different organizations in different countries have been attempting to put the concept in to practice.

In order to survive in this dynamic and ever changing world, Organizations needs to adjust themselves with their environment and customer needs. In light of this, Walker and Black (as expressed in Balaji, 2004) have identified three reasons for justice sector to adopt BPR initiatives – to face the challenges of the industry thereby responding to the demands of the customers, to achieve efficiency, flexibility, and to have an understanding of all variables that directly affect organizational or individual performance. Because of these reasons, dramatic change is a

necessity to cope up with this competitive world. In doing so, some institutions have succeeded and got a tremendous result while some others failed to implement BPR properly including courts.

BPR does not only mean change, but rather dramatic change. The constituents of this drastic change include the overhaul of organizational structures, management systems, employee responsibilities and performance measurements, incentive systems, skills development, and the use of IT (Debela, 2010). Al-Mashari and Zairi (1999) suggest that BPR involves changes in people behavior and culture, processes, and technology. As a result, there are many factors that prevent the effective implementation of BPR and hence restrict innovation and continuous improvement.

Ahmad et al (2007) estimated that as many as 70 percent of organizations do not achieve the dramatic results they seek by implementing BPR initiatives. As a result, the implementation process is complex, and needs to be checked against several success/failure factors to ensure successful implementation, as well as to avoid implementation pitfalls. The various dimensions of the critical success factors (CSFs) for BPR have been highlighted by Al-Mashari and Zairi (2000), including change management, management competency and support, organization structure, project planning and management, and information technology infrastructure. Leadership and top management support have been viewed as the drivers for BPR (Ahmad, 2007); top management is considered as interrelated and necessary in all CSF factors for BPR.

According to Adeyemi and Aremu (2008), BPR became useful weapon for organizations that seek improvement in current OP. For instance, mechanizing business processes removes and/or combines some business processes hitherto done by workers, and the net effect is reduced number of employees and reduced operational costs (Hartigh & Segveld, 2011; Wölfl, 2011). BPR technique focuses on how work is organized presently, not how it had been done for the past years, given the today' s technologies and demand of customers (Hesson, 2007; Banham, 2010). Furthermore, the today' s competitive environment compels organizations to re-engineer their business processes to effect perfect service delivering for customer satisfaction (Mothobi, 2002). Therefore, organizations are forced to improve their business processes in order to cope

with business competition while meeting customers' demands, need and desire (Heizer & Render, 2011).

According to Ranganathan & Dhaliwal (2001), BPR is a popular management tool for dealing with rapid technological and business changes. As per AlMashari & Zairi (2000), BPR creates changes in people, processes and technology. It tries to integrate stakeholders and get a better way of doing things, Siha & Saad (2008) and Cheng et al. (2006). Shin & Jemella (2002) stated that Successful BPR implementation enables organizations to improve their performances. As per Remenyi & Heafield (1996), the failure of BPR projects is costly, because of the resources invested, the disruption it brings to the organizations and the adverse effect to the morale of the workers. This effect will be more adverse to justice institution including courts like Ethiopia's where the economic and human resources are limited and underdeveloped.

In Ethiopia, the most recent reform phase began in 2001 was the launch of the public-sector capacity building support program, which included the CSRP. The government has rapidly prepared the CSRP for its full implementation across all regions and different levels of government institutions. Pilot studies and special programs on performance and service delivery improvements in selected ministries, agencies, and Bureaus have been initiated. These include the establishment of focal bodies responsible for reform implementation across tiers of the government; series of workshops were undertaken to sensitize the political leadership and civil servants across the country; and the launch of a special program of Performance and Service Delivery Improvement Policy (PSIP) in priority ministries, agencies, and Bureaus were designed to deepen the implementation of performance management. PSIP, along with other reform program areas, have promoted Business Process Reengineering (BPR) as a key management initiative, particularly in those ministries that interface directly with the private sector (Getachew and Common, 2006).

East Showa zone is one of the eighteen zones of Oromia regional state which has 32 sector offices and ten woredas. The majority of sector offices at zonal level have their branch at woreda levels. Courts as one of the sector office of the zone, is currently implementing BPR from zonal level to Woreda level. This research aims to assess the opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery in case of East Shoa Court and recommend necessary remedial actions.

1.2. Statement of Problem

In order to create a dramatic increase in efficiency, productivity, or profitability, a drastic change in the design of the organization's processes is required. That is why Graham says reengineering is a useful tool that has been adopted by and hailed as one of the current major drivers of change within many organizations (Graham, 2010). Business Process Reengineering is playing a vital role in the enhancement of productivity and efficiency of many organizations. A crowd of interrelated tasks that creates value is called a business process (Habib & Wazir, 2012). According to Al-Mashara, et al (2001), most organizations, knowingly or otherwise, are involved in BPR. The pressure for survival in the market and the need to prevent complacency has prompted them to adapt BPR technique. Also, the motivation of adapting BPR technique comes from the desire of organizations to close competitive gaps and achieving superior performance standards.

However, not all BPR projects have been successful in achieving dramatic performance gains (Shin and Donald, 2002). As lack of dramatic change is one of the major problems facing organizations now a days, reengineering has become an alternative mechanism for providing new working conditions to the organization and its employees who are previously not much actively participating to overcome the problem. Reasons for such a problem can be due to the fact that; senior management does not always have a clear vision of what the BPR effort intends to achieve, or how to gauge or monitor the success of the programmed objectives and lack of commitment and support (Graham, 2010).

Attaran (2004) states that the barriers to implementing BPR include misunderstanding of the concept, unrealistic objectives, management failure to change, misapplication of the term of BPR, lack of proper strategy, and failing to recognize the importance of people. Furthermore, Klijn and Koppenjan (2012) state that the major drawback of new public management did not deal with the complexities, interdependencies and dynamics of public problems solving and service delivery. According to Stemberger et al (2007) there are change-inhibiting factors in the public sector: the constraints imposed by bureaucracy (that is, red tape), the greater levels of interdependence across organizational boundaries, more frequent turnover of top-level administrators, greater resistance to change from employees, and management having less

authority than do their private sector counterparts. These factors as well as the lessons from Thong et al need to be considered to improve the implementation of BPR. Oberi (2013) states that among the factors that are challenging for BPR implementation is lack of knowledge and skill in change management and lack of the requisite knowledge and skill to properly plan and manage BPR projects. These two factors are closely linked on the strategy used to implement the BPR in the public sector organization.

The Ethiopian civil service, though over a century old, does not have a culture of performance and service delivery improvement yet. The problem of service delivery, organization and management, work culture and system are the major ones in most of our civil service institutions. These deep-rooted problems cannot be alleviated at one time incremental change. Over time, it was believed that an important condition to undertake the reforms was to implement BPR. It was identified that to solve the problems of hierarchical bureaucracy with many non-value adding works (staffs) positions, etc; BPR is seriously implemented in almost all public institutions gradually. Situations disclose that services delivered by the public institutions were characterized by long time taking, costly, not up to the needs of customers, not responsive, and not dynamic. Therefore, the Ethiopian government adopted BPR in the assumption that the current system had to be completely changed and redesigned (Berihu, 2009). The reasons mentioned for these unsatisfactory results were: inadequate technical know-how of BPR due to insufficient training on the concept, low level of employee participation and reluctance of employee due to resistance to the change, lack of top management commitment, dalliance and taking longer time of service provision process than planned (FDRE, 2001).

Moreover, retraining of officials and BPR teams was conducted by different researchers on the concept of BPR and key areas of BPR could not alleviate the problem. For instance problem of process identification, taking longer time than required, lack of timely communication have created fear on employees (MoCB, 2006). Likewise, Muktar (2008) identified the problems of BPR implementation in Oromia regional state public sectors as lack of adequate skill of employees, failure to take risks, absence of appropriate incentive mechanisms, lack of coordination between top and front line managers, prevalence of competing agendas, failure to adhere to the newly designed processes and lack of well-designed change management strategy. In addition to this, there is a problem of mainstreaming public services from end-to-end in all

regional civil service institutions. Mahtebu (2008) also noted that lack of previous experience, inadequate understanding of BPR principles, lack of benchmarking of partners and world class practice, lack of necessary competence and skills, and resistance to change as the major challenges. The challenges identified by different researchers may be similar and one may be the cause for the other problem. However, with all of these challenges, BPR is being practiced as a key institutional practice by almost all public institutions in our country including courts of East Shoa Zone.

Furthermore, the specific challenging factors that faced East Shoa zone courts to implement BPR and magnitudes of various factors on the implementation of BPR not addressed on prior studies. Therefore, this study attempted to assess the opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery in case of East Shoa Zone Courts.

1.3. Research Questions

1.3.1 General Research Question

What are the opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery in case of East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts?

1.3.2. Specific Research Questions

Therefore, the researcher plans this study to seek out answer for the following major research questions.

1. To what extent is the BPR implemented in East Shoa Zone Courts?
2. What are the major challenges of BPR implementation in East Shoa Zone Courts?
3. What opportunities are in place to facilitate the implementation of BPR in East Shoa Zone Courts?

4. What strategies should be done for better practices of BPR in order to enhance service delivery in case of East Shoa Zone Courts

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1. General objective

The general objectives of this thesis is to assess the opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery in case of East Shoa Zone Courts.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this thesis are:

1. To identify to what extent is the BPR implemented in East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts.
2. To distinguish the major challenges of BPR implementation in East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts.
3. To identify the opportunities are in place to facilitate the implementation of BPR in East Shoa Zone Courts.
4. To find out strategies should be done for better practices of BPR in order to enhance service delivery in case of East Shoa Zone Courts.

1.5. Significance of the Study

Delivering remarkable service for the general public as per the BPR principle and indoctrination is very much challenging. Thus, it would have been very important if the researcher could cover all the offices implementing the BPR reform and present the scenario existing. However, due to the time, finance, capacity and other problems the researcher is forced to delimit the scope of the study only to be on the East Shoa Zone Woreda Courts. However, this research has the following significance. Firstly, this study is expected to show major existing challenges and appreciate

achievements. Secondly, it is expected to shade light on the practice of BPR implementation due to the initiatives taken by the court throughout the Zone. Thirdly, it will also be expected to serve as the base line to inspire other interested researchers on this study area. Furthermore, it is expected to give an insight to policy makers and policy advisers of the region on the applicability of BPR reality.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This study intends to assess the opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery in case of East Shoa Zone Courts of Oromia Regional State. This sector will be selected for its exercise and relative longer period in BPR implementation, and suitability for the purpose of the study. The study will assess the extent of implementation, opportunities and challenges faced during the implementation of the BPR. In assessing the status of the implementation phase, the research focused on discovering the extent of the designed processes realization, the factors that affect the implementation of BPR and how they are tackling for enhancing services. The study will be delimited on the core business processes of the sector under study. It focused more on the implementation of BPR at the *Woreda* level found in East Shoa Zone.

1.7. Organization of the Study

The study report will be structured as follows. Chapter one introduction, Chapter two presents literature review with respect to the theoretical perspective of BPR. Chapter three provides the research design, in which it comprises the main principles of research methodology and the adopted research design for the study. Chapter five presents both the quantitative and qualitative features of mixed method results and analysis of findings. Finally, chapter five presents summaries of major findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter two

Review of Related Literature

2.1. Concept of Organizational Change and Change management

2.1.1. Meaning of Change and Organizational Change

Change is inevitable for all organizations operating in a changing environment in order to survive in this very competitive world. Change is a fact of organizational life, just as it is in human life. An organization that does not change cannot survive - long much less thrive- in an unpredictable world (Anon, 2000). According to Stewart (1983), no organization can stay the same forever. Changes occur inside and outside, which can force the organization to alter the way its affairs are managed. Organizations undergo change for a variety of reasons. Change may take place due to external forces driven from the organization's general environment and by internal forces like the decision of management to alter a certain aspect of the organization or a shift in socio-cultural values.

Change in organizations always involves human beings. Ideas of change come from and develop in the minds of people. On the other hand, people regard change as an enemy and try to avoid or they resist it. Different authors agree on the fact that resistance to change is natural and inevitable even though the change has significant merits (Hammer, 2001; Patching and Waitley, 1999). It, therefore, becomes necessary to understand resistance for the sake of effective management of change. Unless resistance is properly addressed, it can hamper successful implementation of the designed change.

2.1.2. Types of Changes in Organization

Redesign can be achieved in two modes: incremental and radical. Incremental change can be classified methodologies for improvement and simplification. These methodologies aim at improving what already exists in the organization usually by eliminating non value added

activities in order to achieve lower throughput times and best re-allocation of resources (Grover et al, 1993). In the latter case the redesign or rebuilding of the processes will usually emerge from the application of “best practices” that is achieved with the use of benchmarking. In radical change redesign will challenge the existing organizational framework and might request the introduction of new technology regardless of the impact this might have on the personnel’s behaviors and attitudes (Grover et al, 1993).

2.1.3. Meaning of Change management

Change management is the application of many different ideas from the engineering, business and psychology fields. To understand change management it needs to consider two converging and predominant fields of thought: an engineer's approach to improving business performance including business strategy, processes, systems, organizational structures and a psychologist's approach to managing the human-side of change on how humans react to their environment, and how an individual thinks and behaves in a particular situation. The extreme application of either of these two approaches, in isolation, will be unsuccessful. Contributions from both the engineering and psychology fields are crucial for successful design and implementation of business change (Jeff and Tim, 2012). According to Attong and Metz (2012) change management is a very important tool as it is used to assist organizations to deal with resistance to change, fear and cultural shifts, empowering employees and creating the sense of ownership with them.

Hence, currently besides BPR a number of process improvement approaches such as benchmarking, TQM or continuous process improvement, and Six-Sigma are in use either as an alternative or a supplement to BPR (US Performance Based Management Interest Group (PBMIG, 2001); Jatson and Nelis, 2006; Cartin, 2004).

Benchmarking

According to Curtin (2004, p.217), benchmarking is “considered by many as the most valuable method for achieving improvement.” In terms of process improvement use, benchmarking is about searching for and adapting or adopting the best in class process to an organization’s operation. It is about systematically learning from the best practice owners and surpassing them,

not mere copying and transplanting (GOA, 1997; Bennis and Mische, 1995). Besides providing a real world model for the BPR projects, benchmarking can stand on its own as a process improvement approach and can result in break through improvement in processes' performance (Goetisch and Davis, 2000).

Six-Sigma

Six-Sigma is also another process improvement approach that has emerged in the 1980' s and popularized in 1990's. "It typically involves a return to focusing on a relatively a small work process and presumes incremental rather than radical improvements." Furthermore, "its improvement techniques have been employed on an episodic basis rather than continuously." (Davenport in Jatison and Nelis, 2006). Regarding the current utility of these approaches, Cartin (2004:103) noted that "most experts and practitioners believe that all of these approaches are needed." Their major differences lie in the magnitude of improvement they may achieve (PBMIG, 2001).

Total Quality Management

Total Quality Management (TQM) is another process improvement approach organizations have adapted as an alternative to BPR. According to PBMIG (2001), "TQM basically is a continuous improvement, which is, continuously making small incremental changes to a process that will eventually lead to making it a world class process." In contrary to this, BPR is a radical approach to process improvement. It aims to achieve quantum results in terms of reduction in cycle time and cost, and by so doing to achieve a higher level of customer satisfaction (PBMIG, 2001; Cartin, 2004). It is a one time, radical change (PBMIG, 2001). TQM initial ideas were developed by William Edwards Deming, Joseph Duran and Kaoru Ishikawa in the 1940s. But it was not until the 1980s that the high market pressure, particularly coming from Japanese enterprises, led to a widespread use of TQM (Chang, 2012:47).

2.2. Meaning of Business Process Re-engineering

Regardless of differences in definition of the BPR concept, Grover et al (1995) identified the following as common features of all BPR programs: Involves the radical redesign of business

processes; typically employs Information Technology as an enabler of new business processes; Attempts to achieve organizational level strategic outcomes and tends to be inter-functional in its efforts. Business process re-engineering is a process design, process management, and process innovation. Re-engineering involves revising organizational processes. That means, designing the core business process instead of analyzing the current one. It involves re-configuration of works to serve customers better. Re-engineering forces organizations to challenge the way they run and redesign organizations around the desired outcomes rather than functions or departments. It also forces a new way of thinking (Attaran, 2004). BPR is a technique about dramatic process improvement. According to Chen (2001), BPR is known by many names, such as, core process redesign, new industrial engineering and working smarter. All of them imply the same concept which focuses on integrating both business process redesign and IT use to support the reengineering work. BPR is been seen as crowd of interconnected which creates value through integration of firms processes (Habib & Wazir, 2012).

According to Hammer and Champy (1993), BPR 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*. In any organization, business processes are characterized by three elements: inputs (data, such as customer inquiries or materials), processes (where customers or materials go through several stages which may be time and money consuming) and output (delivery of expected results). In this system, a problematic part is processing of what is required by a customer. To deliver what is required by customers on time, organizations need to perfect their business processes. In this case, BPR is the technique that can be used to perfect the business processes. In the intervention, BPR involves discovering how business processes currently operates, how to redesign these processes to eliminate the wasted or redundant effort and improve efficiency and how to implement the process change in order to gain competitiveness (Chen, 2001).

Business Process Reengineering is the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service, and speed to achieve substantial gains in the overall organizational performance (Sturdy, 2010). It is a business management strategy focusing on the analysis and design of workflows and processes within an organization. BPR relies upon questioning,

challenging, evaluating, and redesigning every element of an institution's operational process (Goksoy et al, 2012). BPR is defined 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 to achieve substantial gains in the overall organizational performance (Ghannouchi, Mabrouk & Ghannouchi, 2010).

2.3. Purpose of BPR in in Enhancing Service Delivery

From literature review, it has been identified that BPR is the technique that enables organizations to improve business processes. The improved business processes facilitated organizations to minimize the time taken to service a customer (Heizer & Render, 2011). In improving service delivering speed, BPR plays important roles of making succession or continuity of progression of work activities (Shin & Jemella, 2009; Debela, 2009), automating business processes (Laudon & Laudon, 2006), keeping the sections with high to-from movement close (Magutu, et al., 2010), linking different section which are far apart (Zygiaris, 2000) and facilitating the communication between employees or employees and customers (Attaran, 2004).

Employees play critical role as they serve as a link between the organization and its customers. Employees' ability to embrace the re-engineering process will in the long run affect its implementation and the way it will be translated to serve customers as time has become important in the competitive business environment. Tarokh, et al. (2006) reveal time is full of changes, transformation, and unrest where all the rich suddenly emerge and collapse hence all organizations that desire sustainability need to respond for all forms of change in the environment accordingly. BPR is therefore a management tool, in which businesses process are examined to improve cost efficiency and service effectiveness (Abdolvald, et al., 2008).

Studies have shown that "BPR can create higher customer satisfaction, increase productivity build flexibility in business processes and improve organizational integrity, which shall lead to competitive advantage for the firm"(Smith, Meade, Wolf and Song 2013:48). Although BPR application is more prominent in the private sector, it does add value to service delivery in the public sector. Public sector organizations' focus is on improving efficiency and effectiveness,

and finding the means to redesign outdated public sector processes (Rinaldi, Motanari and Botani 2015: 419), making BPR a valuable reform tool.

In any BPR project, technology plays an important role in supporting BPR. Among other roles, technology allows the rapid development of various ready-to use best-practice templates that suits most needed business processes, automate business processes, linking section and facilitates the smooth flow of information between sections to mention few. All this shortens the transition phase and minimizes the impact and duration of transition, and so accelerates the time to benefit, till reaching the quality levels (Sungau & Msanjila, 2012). Furthermore, BPR improves service quality via delivering speed, such that BPR improves delivering speed (Slack, et al., 2007) by shortening cycle time in serving a customer, minimizing delays in serving a customer, speed up communication, fastening decision making and shortening the period taken to deliver a service since its request (Al-Mashara, et al., 2001).

Implementation of BPR insists the entire organizational structure changes; from the hierarchical to process-centered structure (Sisay & Birnberg, 2012). Its major output is achieving an organization's objective and to satisfy customers requirements. It involves cost and time reduction and overall organizational restructuring, including the facility location, capacity, types of products, technology and people, and changes in employees' behavior through training, education, job enrichment, job enlargement and employee empowerment (Bertolini et al, 2011). Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) has therefore become a competitive tool that firms are employing with the purpose of helping organizations to build themselves with contemporary technologies business solution and innovations (Sharma, 2006). For the firm to experience increased efficiency, enhance productivity and as well realized profitability, there should be a dramatic change with respect to the design of firms processes (Graham, 2010).

Reengineering primary goals aimed at to reduce wastage, improve efficiency and ultimately reduce costs (Lotfollah et al., 2012). And an increase in consumer requirements for both product and service efficiency and effectiveness has resulted in Business Process Reengineering (Al-Mashir et al., 2001). Reengineering also helps organizations to throw away their old fashioned processes to achieve new heights of success (Jemal et al., 2011). According to Balasubramanian, (2010), BPR means not only change but dramatic change. What constitutes dramatic change is the overhaul of organizational structures, management systems, employee responsibilities and

performance measurements, incentive systems, skill development, and the use of information technology. BPR can potentially impact every aspect of how to conduct business today. Change on this scale can cause results ranging from enviable success to complete failure (Khuzaimah, 2011).

In reducing operational costs and improving delivering speed, BPR supports the linking of customers with service organizations through improving business processes; often by adjusting, combining and networking business processes (Hesson, 2007). The contribution of BPR in increased/improved productivity and service quality and in lowered operational cost and cycle time is on the rise for many organizations (Adeyemi & Aremu, 2008; Xiaoli, 2011). Some Ethiopia researchers such as Assefa, (2009), Debela and Hagos (2011) and Mengesha, (2007) also states in their research findings, because of proper implementation of BPR organizations have shown encouraging achievements in terms of efficiency, mission effectiveness, transparency, and minimizing costs and corruption attest.

Successful implementation of BPR brings many benefits to the organization and it increases customer satisfaction, increased productivity, higher flexibility, increased employees satisfaction 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). According to Berihu Assefas' (2009) work, Business Process Reengineering began as a private sector technique to help organizations fundamentally rethink how they do their work in order to dramatically improve customer service, cut operational costs, and become world-class competitors. According to Al- Mashari, (2001) an increase in consumer requirements for both product and service efficiency and effectiveness has resulted in BPR.

New organizational structures, which are more suitable to today's environment in which enterprises can understand their current activities and find potential problems, are needed. Hence, BPR has become a management tool in which a business process is examined and redesigned to improve cost efficiency and service effectiveness (Abdolvand et al., 2008). It has been noticed that developments of inter-organizational relationships and significant increases in the business integration have paid special attention to 'processes'. Also, BPR has become more important for facilitating processes across the boundaries of organizations and for integrating

back and forth office processes (Faddel and Tanniru, 2005). According to Proctor and Gray (2006:84), BPR in the public sector “can be a very effective tool for introducing cost effective changes into an organization to the benefit of the organization and its customers.”

This claim is supported by Fragaso (2015: 283), who states that “reforms aim to reverse well-known deficiencies, especially the quality of services, their effectiveness and management efficiency.” Consequently, BPR’s goal is to gain a competitive advantage in organizations, irrespective of which sector it is applied to, as BPR intends to aid organizations to achieve their goals and objectives. According to Attong and Metz (2012:19) said the need for change is important, because as an organization moves forward to achieve its vision and goals, it plans, prioritizes and affects actions.

2.4. Steps of Implementation of Business Process Re-engineering

BPR project requires specific steps to succeed to a positive outcome. The process begins with defining the scope and objectives of the reengineering project (Mohapatra, 2013). The second step of the methodology is to understand and evaluate the existing process and performance of the organization which is known as the “As-Is mapping” and the commitment of senior management to implement the project (Eftekhari & Akhavan 2013). This step involves development of executive consensus on the need of the BPR, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the organization, identifying the processes to be reengineered, defining the ultimate benefit, and clarifying who is needed and what will be their role (Chiarini, 2011). Accomplishing all of these activities require a team consisting of managers and experts of the organization and external consultants.

The third step in BPR is designing the new process, known as “To-Be process”, based on the data obtained from the “As-Is” mapping, thereby implementing the To Be process (Mohapatra, 2013). The implementation phase requires initiating culture change program, developing a transition plan and piloting the new process, providing training for the implementers, and executing the new process in full scale (Kumar & Bhatia, 2012). As per Furey & Timothy (1993), the implementation stage is where reengineering efforts meet the most resistance and by far the most difficult stage. According to Obolensky & Nick (1994), it would indeed be sensible

to run a culture change program simultaneously while analyzing, redesigning, and planning the migration. Moreover corporate culture, change management and government and organizational policies had significant roles in BPR acceptance in various organizations and countries, Huang & Palvia (2001) and Sheu et al. (2003).

Once BPR is implemented, it requires monitoring the progress of action and the results. The progress of action is monitored by measuring how much more informed the people feel, how much more commitment the management shows and how well the new teams are accepted in the broader perspective of the organization (Nisar, Ahmad & Ahmad, 2014). While the result is monitored by measuring employees' attitudes, customers' perceptions, and suppliers' responsiveness (Salimi, 2011).

More broadly, another types of implementation was Linden (1998) mentioned appropriate sets of steps to be followed during implementation phase. The steps include: (i) developing a charter; (ii) establishing communication strategies; (iii) hold an all hand meeting to review the model; (iv) prepare a detailed implementation plan; (v) run pilot tests, revise the redesigned processes if needed; (vi) implement short-term changes; (vii) phase in long-term changes; and (viii) measure the performance of the new process. These steps of Linden (1998) stressed that an implementation plan should be developed to spells out the work that needs to be done, with timeframes, decision points, and resource allocations. Pilot testing provides a method for refining the process and building support for the full implementation. In addition, training and workforce issues are important for effective implementation plan. Moreover, the steps stressed the importance of ongoing performance measurement and feedback to continually improve the new processes once it is in place.

2.5. Emergence of Business Process Re-engineering

Long ago people have founded and built organization to achieve their common purposes. According to Robbins (1990), organization is a consciously coordinated social entity, with a relatively identifiable boundary, that functions on a relatively continuous basis to achieve a common goal or set of goals. BPR is described in variety of names by different authors such as core process redesign, process innovation, business process redesign, organizational

reengineering, breakpoint business process redesign and business restructuring. Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) is not a new management tool, it was emerged in United States during the 1980s and early 1990s, first in the private sector and later in the public sector (McQueen and Baker, 1996).

The new features of organizations such as responsiveness flexibility and customer focus should be achieved in new perspective shifts from on task based approach to process based thinking. Thus, in a world of rapid flux, organization must change their priorities from a traditional focus on planning, controlling and managed growth to fundamental rethinking of speed, innovation, flexibility, quality and costs. This implies, it is virtually impossible for an organization to retrofit them in this new reality without reengineering (Hammer and Stanton, 1993). According to Hammer and Champy (1993), reengineering is 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. The concept of business process reengineering (BPR) was emerged in American during the 1980s and early 1990s. From the time when the term “reengineering” was known by different organizations in different country have been attempting to put the concept into practice. In doing so, some have succeeded and got a tremendous result for instance, GTE United States largest provider of local telephone service carrying out its maintenance and repair service with a large number of handoffs and long hours in traditional way of doing work. Desiring this period, customer complain was very high parallel to this, the performance of the company was decreasing at a steady state. Due to this and other relevant factor the company has decided to reengineer the process. After reengineering, maintenance and repair service have been handled from end to end by one person, repair service that took hours before completed in minutes, moreover, the company was able to resolve over 40 percent of customer problem. Finally, the company’s performance has improved dramatically.

In today’s ever-changing world, the only thing that doesn’t change is ‘change’ itself. In a world increasingly driven by the three Cs (Customer, Competition and Change) companies are on the lookout for new solutions for their business problems (Hammer and Champy, 1993). Faced with intensified competition, ever changing customer requirements and increased new environmental regulations, business organizations need to make drastic changes for future success and economic survival by looking for new management approaches and techniques.

Since the 1990's and the late eighties, particularly the service industries have experienced unprecedented substantial changes. Consequently, organizations are forced to develop new customer-oriented processes and to redesign existing ones (Heckel and Moormann, 2007). Many studies have been done and showed that the business world has become aware of the potential of re-engineering in planning and designing processes and organizations based on the principles of business process re-engineering (Kuwaiti and Kay, 2000). It has been commonly agreed that Business process re-engineering (BPR) first became known in the late 1980s and developed into one of the important management concepts discussed by organizations and by the mid-1990s attracted strategic management or senior managers (Rigby, 2001).

The concept of BPR has attracted academic and industrial attention in the 1990s mainly as a result of two papers by Michael Hammer (on reengineering, see Hammer, 1990) and Thomas Davenport (on business process redesign, see Davenport and Short, 1990). In 1993 they further published two key books (Hammer and Champy, 1993 and Davenport, 1993) which brought widespread attention to the emerging field of BPR. It is possible to identify several approaches to BPR, which approximate “generations” and which serve to illustrate the changing views over time. The first approach viewed BPR as “radical restructuring”, as shown in the following definitions: 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 (Hammer and Champy, 1993).

2.6. Areas of Change in Business Process Re-engineering

There are various areas of concern that every organization seeks to bring radical change in order to be competitive. The organization itself, people who are the employees, technology that is required for effective performance and the strategy that the firm seeks to adopt in order to achieve its aim. Davenport (1993) is of the view that, complex technological, human, and organizational dimensions are critical area that always need change and hence must be paid much attention to in order to enhance firms performance. The four areas of technology, people, strategy and organization itself that need change are explained below.

2.6.1 Technology

One prominent type of organizational reengineering is the use of technology in the BPR. The growth and success of every organization depends on how it embraces and implement technology in its business processes. Hammer and Champy (1990) said the use of information technology is to challenge the assumption inherent in the work processes that have existed since before the advent of modern computer and communication technology. They argued that at the heart of reengineering there is the idea of discontinuous thinking and discontinues thinking is a way to recognize and break away from obsolete rules and fundamental assumptions that underlie operations. Deeper understanding of technologies and its application in redesigning of the work within the organization is much important. Adequate understanding of technologies in redesigning business process is essential for proper selection of IT plate forms (Shin & Jemalla 2002).

Largely effective system architecture, flexible IT infrastructure and proper installation of IT components contributed to build a valuable information technology for better employee performance. Successful application of IT contributes a lot for fruitful BPR project and employee performance in the organization and technology is viewed as the central implementation vehicle of desired employee performance (Motwani, et al. 2005). Davenport and Short (1990) attributed this problem to a lack of understanding of the deeper issues of technology.

Technology plays a crucial role in reshaping and improving employees and organizational performance and BPR as well as technology form an integral system in improving the performance of employees and companies (Gunasekaran & Nath 1997). Basically, technology can save time, improve accuracy, can be used in transferring and exchanging information, reduces or remove errors while performing tasks and gives many more values.

2.6.2. Strategy

Organizations can make a tremendous strive if proper strategies are put in place. This strategies and policies may include the management, employees, and the various stakeholders within the organization. Change in management system is one major strategy for organizational

Reengineering. Change as a strategy is crucial for the attainment of organizational goals and excellence performance through the introduction of new ideas and innovations (Tower, 1994). Pamela, et al. (1995) underscored the need for radical change in organizations which leads to new ideas, technology, innovation and improvement. Organizations should recognize the need for change and learn to manage the process effectively. Again, organizational development and performance look at the firms' level of efficiency and ways to improve its current employee performance in order to meet up standards. Another prominent strategy organizations adopt in recent time in order to survive in the competitive business environment is to encourage training and development by building creative working environment for the employees within the organization (Ezigbo, 2003).

2.6.3. People

The people element in organization is so critical because they serve as a middleman between the firm and its customers. Grant (2002) has shown role of human in organizational process improvement and has attest to the fact that they are the primary decision makers and essential ingredients of any human activity. Again, human resource should be given needed attention as stated by emphasized human resources architecture should be reengineered to support information sharing and compose better decision (Mansar, et al. 2003).

In particular, orientation programs and seminars assist employees to perform creditably in their works. Crow, et al. (2002) believed employees should be assisted in the transition period to make acquainted with the new working environment. Change in management system affect the attitude of employees and the entire structure of every organization. Carr and Johanson (1995) suggested change management involves human and social related changes needed to facilitate the insertion of newly designed processes and structures in to working practice. Adapting appropriate reward system, performance measurement scheme, employee empowerment and provision of timely training & education are strategies for organizational re-engineering. Under reward system, individual employees and staff need to be motivated. Staff and employees motivation through a reward system has a crucial role in facilitating employee efforts and smoothing new processes (Tower et al 1994). Reward system must be adjusted to suit a particular working environment at a particular point in time. Existing reward systems are no longer appropriate for the new work

environment and employee performance. Again, reward system should be revised and new incentive system should be widespread, fair and encourage performance among employees (Stow 1993).

2.6.4. Organization

Organization that embrace information technology in redesigning business processes will have comparative advantage over others since the flow of information within and outside the organization vital for both employees and the management (Ezigbo 2003). Frequent communication with BPR team and users help position the organization strategically. And as a stakeholder, members should be informed about what is expected of them, why they are to perform a specific task and when exactly to undertake the specified role and issues related to business process reengineering and communication is needed throughout the change process at all levels and for all audiences even with those who do not involve directly (Dixon, et al. 1994).

2.7. Challenges of Business Process Re-engineering

Bhat (2007), who classified based on risk factors. These risks factors are: Financial Risks, Technical Risks, General Project Risks, Functional Risks, and Political Risks. Many authors also highlighted some failure factors in implementing BPR. According to Aggarwal (1998), managers' arrogant behavior, rigid resistance, vision; Hammer & Champy (1993), failure to have a process perspective, flexible and responsive condition. Additionally, Ranganathan & Dhaliwal (2001) said lack of support from organization members and strategic vision; Al-Mashari & Zairi (1999), lack of top management support and financial resources; Mumford (1999) and Ranganathan & Dhaliwal, (2001), people resistance; Ranganathan & Dhaliwal (2001), Smith (2003), IT related problems; and Al-Mashari & Zairi (1999) and Smith (2003), lack of project management systems are some of the critical failure factors.

Additionally, failure to have a process perspective, fixed process which is not flexible enough to be responsive to needs and requirements, not involving employees in decision making, assigning someone who does not aware of BPR, technology limitation, designing a project but with weak

team and tricky communication (Hammer and Champy (1993). Management fear of losing authority, employee fear of losing job, skepticism about project result and uncomfortable feeling with the new working environment by Davenport (1994) and Uncomfortable feeling with the new working environment by Aggarwal (1998).

Hammer and Stanton (1994) noted the reason for failure are: To say you are reengineering without actually doing it; Trying to apply BPR where it cannot fit; To spend too much time analyzing the existing processes; To attempt the reengineering without the requisite leadership; Difficulty in coming up with new ideas; The attempt to go directly from process redesign to implementation; Not reengineering quickly; Limiting the range of reengineering effort, To adopt the wrong style of implementation; and failure to attend the concerns of the people.

Attaran and Wood (1999) identified five primary challenges to make effective BPR implementation. These include misunderstanding of the concept, misapplication of the term, lack of proper strategy, management failure to change, and failing to recognize the importance of people, and Attaran, alone add the remaining three factors „lack of flexibility, lack of organizational communication, failure to test the process.

Reyes (2001) reviewed challenging factors of BPR implementation to public organizations are: government activities are often so interrelated, bureaucratic behavior and action as often based on laws and a series of incremental changes in rules derived from policies or legislation, which is reengineering fundamentals of “breaking away from the past”, as a major obstacle, substantial investments requirements of BPR in developing or even upgrading IT fear of the cost. Additionally, Atakilt (2008), stated the problems based on the implementation stages as: Misconceptions about Business Process Reengineering (at early stages) and existing Organizational culture, Limited Commitment among Some Organizational Leaders (at early stages), Poor communication, Technical problems).

According to McNulty & Ferlie (2004), the factors that contributed to failure included the existence of powerful professionals, who reinterpreted the BPR program to suit their interests, and the lack of the BPR change agents’ capability to manage the BPR project properly. Lenk (1997) also stresses the number of risks implying BPR in the public sector: As a focus on top-down design at the expense of employee participation and concerns about implementation. Less

meaningful interaction of organization members and a loss of organizational culture, A danger of increased organizational rigidity, inadvertent deflation of the knowledge asset which is central to public sector organizations. Moreover, Archer & Bowker (1995) lack of communication and lack of a clear vision of the project, lack of staff participation and ownership, lack of involvement from staff at different levels, failure to instil a re-engineering culture, and lack of project organization and planning.

Employees resistance for change can be explained in different ways: Based on Robert and Angelo (2000), in acceptance(enthusiastic, cooperation, acceptance), indifference(passive resignation, apathy, doing only what is ordered), passive resistance(regressive behavior, non-learning, protests, working to rule) and active resistance (doing as little as possible, slowing down, personal withdrawal, committing errors, spoilage, deliberate sabotage). Egan and Fjermestad (2005) and Kamran and Masood (2008) tried to state that the general views of factors that initiates resistance to change under their publications as: why most change doesn't succeed or get implemented; the presence of strong resistance to change and How is organization-Wide Change Best Carried Out?

Naturally, BPR fosters change and human being resists change. This resistance is the most common barrier of BPR and renders success difficult (Schniederjans and Kim, 2003). Employees resist changes because of uncertain future initiated by BPR changes including job loss, authority loss, and getting anxious (Palmer, 2004). To clarify the challenges Attaran (2004) has identified six key obstacles to BPR implementation: misunderstanding of the concept, unrealistic objectives, management failure to change, misapplication of the term of BPR, lack of proper strategy, and failing to recognize the importance of people.

2.8. Opportunities for Implementation of Business Process Re-engineering

According to Peppard & Fitzgerald (1997), ambitious objectives, creative teams, process based approach and integration of IT are among the main success factors. Ascari et al. (1995) had also added culture, processes, structure, and technology as success factors. According to Al-Mashari & Zairi (1999), the dimensions of the CSFs for BPR includes: change management, competency

and support in management, information infrastructure, and project planning and management system. Since the CSFs may differ based on the type of organization, it is indispensable to understand the nature of organization.

Al-Mashari and Zairi (2001) suggests that successful BPR implementation is highly dependent on an effective BPR program management which includes: adequate strategic alignment; effective planning and project management techniques; identification of performance measures; adequate resources; appropriate use of methodology; external orientation and learning; effective use of consultants; building process vision; effective process redesign; integrating BPR with other improvement techniques and adequate identification of the BPR value.

2.8.1. Information communication and technology

Information communication and technology (ICT) is also critical to the implementation of BPR initiatives. Based on the findings of their case study Wu and Du (2010) emphasized the importance of retaining the reengineering team until completion; the reengineering team's competency in change management, the role of IT in BPR and those functions of the organization to be redesigned; empowering employees; and continuously monitoring and improving the BPR outcome.

The deployment of technological assets and resources by organizations in order to achieve differentiation makes the difference in whether an organization remains competitive or obsolete, organizations need to be technology enabled in order to survive or prosper (Akhavan et al, 2006). IT is introduced as a critical component and even a natural partner of BPR, which has a continuous and important role in BPR projects (Attaran, 2003). Many authors have described that successful application of IT is effective in BPR success. Contrarily, overlooking the role of IT can result in failure (Motwani et al., 2005).

2.8.2. Effective Leadership

Reyes (2001) noted success factors of BPR implementation to public organizations are: commitment and support of top management who have real power to change. McAdam and Donaghy (1999) also found that top management support, commitment and understanding of

BPR and the selection of a knowledgeable and skilled reengineering team were critical for public sector BPR project success. According to Jackson (1997) during the implementation phase, leaders must be in the forefront in dealing with the social, psychological and political challenges to change the way work is done. Leaders must also recognize that their own roles and responsibilities may need to undergo change as well.

Some key constructs in managements are employee involvement, communication, and leadership nature (Motwani et al., 2005). Top managers should drive the changes by providing vision (shared vision). Employees should become more responsive. Other members in the BPR team should understand and cooperate in a new system and top management should establish inter- and intra-organizational confidence and trust. The chains' interactions reflect the organizational ability in adapting changes (Crowe et al., 2002). Egalitarian culture makes the positive changes take place with little resistance (Crowe et al., 2002).

2.8.3. Change of Attitude

The ultimate success of BPR depends on the people who do it and on how well they can be motivated to be creative and to apply their detailed knowledge to the redesign of business processes (Klein and Knight, 2005), so the attitude of the employees towards change has a great contribution. Authors like Attaran and Wood (1999), Revenaugh, (1994); Terziiovskia et al.(2003), indicated numerous organizations like Ford Motor, Wal-Mart, IBM Credit Co., and so forth which achieved larger cost reduction, higher profits, improved quality and productivity, faster response to market and customer service through BPR.

2.8.4. Collaborative working environment.

Closely related to the egalitarian culture, cooperation (cooperative environment) is one of the critical success factors in BPR projects (Crowe et al., 2002). In order to work in a cooperative environment, and interact in a friendly way, employees should trust each other, and be assured that the top management recognizes their role (recognition among employees) (Maull et al., 2003). A cooperative environment with a friendly interaction, in which employees work in teams, has a chance of improving performance (Marir and Mansar, 2004).

2.8.5. Top management commitment.

A clearly defined strategic mission is necessary for reengineering (Maull et al., 2003). Strategic management is the highest level of management where top officials determine the strategic direction of the company (Grant, 2002). Top management should have a clear knowledge about the current situation of the organization. In addition, it is necessary to have a “sufficient knowledge about the BPR projects” and “realistic expectation of BPR results.” In order to have a successful BPR, top management should communicate with employees in order to motivate the movement, control the BPR team and users (Crowe et al., 2002).

There are elements of co-production in new public governance, as managers are expected to manage and guide the various stakeholders, manage resources for network build trust among stakeholders and develop a steady partnership. According to Klijn and Koppenjan (2012) network management activities include facilitating interactions, exploring (new) content and organizing interaction between actors. The horizontal nature of network management implies that it is a different activity compared to traditional intra organizational management.

Generally, success factors of BPR are highlighted as organization-wide commitment, BPR team composition, business needs analysis, adequate IT infrastructure, effective change management and ongoing continuous improvement (Hussein, Bazzi, Dayekh and Hassan 2013).

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The research design will be descriptive survey. The purpose of the survey is to describe existing conditions, identify the standards against which existing conditions can be compared, and investigate the relationships that may exist between events, (Creswell, 2009). Descriptive survey method involves asking a large population questions about a particular issue. Information will be collected from a sample population as proposed to the whole population at a particular point in time. The descriptive survey design is used in order to establish opinions and knowledge about how to assess opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery in East Shoa Zone Courts. The reasons for mixing methods includes to triangulate data source for the sake of convergence across quantitative and qualitative methods; to integrate or combine the quantitative and qualitative data to identify participants or questions to ask for the other method or to reinforce each other. Mixed methods research is an approach that combines or associates both quantitative and qualitative designs to inquire an issue (Creswell 2009).

3.2. Sources of Data

In conducting this research the researcher will use both primary and secondary sources of data.

3.2.1. Primary data collection

The primary data are collected through questionnaire, focus group discussion and interview from process owners and judges.

3.2.2. Secondary data collection

Regarding secondary source, annual plans and performance reports and BPR documents will be reviewed.

3.3. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

According to the data obtained from East Shoa Zone courts, there are 11 Woredas and one Zonal level court in the Zone. Among these woredas the researcher will take as sample 5 of them through simple random sampling techniques. Among these Woreda Courts Boset, Modjo, Adea, Bishoftu city and Liben Chukala of them are selected for this study by using simple random sampling technique from each woreda and 80 workers from the Zonal court level will be included in the research. In addition, the data obtained from the East Shoa Zone courts showed there are 5 presidents, 20 team leaders, 42 judges and 74 supportive staffs in the five sample worada's courts and 1 president, 4 process owners, 10 judges and 63 sportive workers are at zonal level. Hence, total of 220 sample population will be selected as a sample population.

Since this study will focus on opportunities and challenges of BPR in enhancing service delivery, 6 presidents and 24 team leaders of the six courts will be selected using purposive sampling technique and included in the study to respond the interview. In this regard Kothari (2004) suggested that; usually if the population number is too small and important for the study the researcher can include all members of the population (absolute sample).

Moreover, out of total judges and of the sample supportive staffs, 110 (50%) will be selected for this study using simple random sampling technique to respond to the questionnaire. This sampling technique gives each possible sample combination an equal probability of being picked up and each item in the entire population to have an equal chance of being included in the sample (Cohen et.al, 2007).

3.4. Methods of Data Collection

The data collection methods include the use of questionnaires and interview guide for employees and management respectively

3.4.1 Questionnaires

The primary sources of data required information from employees through filling questionnaires concerning the research under study. Questionnaires will be administered to process owner and judges. The questionnaires will be closed ended in nature on a 5 point likert scale with the 5 been strongly agree and 1 been strongly disagree. The questionnaires focused on assessing BPR practices, opportunities as well as challenges that confronts employees as a result of implementing BPR. The questionnaires will be filled by judges and non-judges.

3.4.2 Interviews

There will be an interview guide that collected information from presidents of Woreda courts and Team leaders on BPR practice, challenges facing with respected to BPR practices and the effect of BPR on enhancing service delivery. The researcher will conduct face to face interview in accomplishing the objectives of the study. Interview will be done with presidents and head of human resource department. The discussion will be held in Afan Oromo and Amharic to get detail and genuine data. This valuable data will be recorded and described qualitatively.

3.5. Reliability and Validity Testing

The researcher will carry out a pilot study before the actual administration of the instruments. It will be done to test reliability and validity of the instruments. Checking the validity and reliability of data collection instruments before embarking on the actual study is the core to assure the quality of the data. To ensure validity of instruments, initially the instruments are prepared by the researcher and developed under close guidance of the researcher's advisor, who will involve in providing his inputs for validity of the instruments. Moreover, the questionnaires

will pilot tested at Lume Woreda Court. The respondents of the pilot test will not include in the main study. Based on respondent's responses additional, omission and modification of questions will be undertaken. The study will use cronbach alpha to check the reliability of the study. It is recommended that, the cronbach alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.70 (DeVellis 2003).

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

Quantitative data will be obtained from the questionnaire which will be tabulated around the subtopics related to the research questions and descriptive statistics like arithmetic mean, standard deviation and percentages will be used to indicate the extent of response or frequency per each item. Advanced statistical tools namely independent two samples t-test will be employed to see whether or not there existed a difference between the responses given by process owners and judges and those relationships were statistically significant or not. The questionnaire will be coded and analyzed by using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) program. The category of respondents in analysis is used as leaders (Woreda level Process Owners) and judges (at Woreda courts). Besides, the decision rules used in the analysis is average mean less than 3 low, average mean equal to 3 medium and average mean greater than 3 throughout the study.

The qualitative data obtained from the documents, focus group discussion and semi-structured interview will be transcribed, edited and organized around the subtopics derived from the research questions. Furthermore, the data from the interview, focus group discussions, open-ended questions, and documents will be triangulated, checked against the quantitative ones and discussed. Besides, the findings will be discussed and interpreted in relation to the relevant literature.

3.7. Ethical Consideration

Research ethics refers to the type of agreement that the researcher enters into with his or her research participants. Ethical consideration plays a role in all research studies and all researchers must be aware of and attend to the ethical considerations related to their studies. Therefore the researcher will communicate with all preparatory schools legally. The purpose of the study will be made clear and understandable for all participants. Any communication with the concerned bodies will be accomplished at their voluntarily agreement without harming and threatening their personal and institutional wellbeing. The identity of the respondent will be kept confidential.

References

- Abdolvand, N. (2008). Assessing readiness for business process reengineering, *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol. 14 Iss: 4 pp. 497 - 511
- Abdolvand, N., Albadvi, A., and Ferdowsi, Z., (2008). Assessing readiness for business process reengineering. *Business Process Management Journal*, Vol.14(No.4), pp.497-511.
- Abolo, E. N. (1998). Team Building and Reengineering. First Bank of Nigeria BiAnnual Review, Vol. 6, No. 13. P 40.
- Adeyemi, S. & Aremu, M.A. (2008). Impact Assessment of business process reengineering on organizational performance. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, (7), (1).
- Al-mashara, M.; Iran, Z. & Zairi, M. (2001). Business process re-engineering: A survey of international experience. *Business Process Management Journal*, v. 7, n. 5, 437-455.
- Al-Mashari, M., & Zairi, M. (1 999). BPR implementation process: an analysis of key success and failure factors. *Business Process Management Journal*, 5(1), 87-112.
- Al-Mashari, M., Zahir, I., & Mohamed, Z., (2001). Business process reengineering: A survey of international experience. *Business Process Management Journal*. [13]
- Anon.R, (2000). Organizational Change Anon.,
- Archer R. & Bowker P., (1995), BPR consulting: an evaluation of the methods employed, in: *Business Process Re-engineering & Management*, V.1, No.2, pp.28-46
- Ascari, A., Rock, M., & Dutta, S. (1995). Reengineering and organizational change: lessons from a comparative analysis of company experience. *European Management Journal*, 13(1), 1-30.
- Assefa B. (2009), Business Process Re-engineering in Ethiopia: Available at, http://www.grips.ac.jp/forum/afgrowth/support_ethiopia/document/
- Atakilt Hagos, (2008). BPR: Concepts, Practices and Challenges in the Public Sector of Ethiopia, Ethiopia Management Professionals Association (EMPA).Symposium on BPR, Challenges and Opportunities in Ethiopia.
- Attaran M. and Wood G. (1999). How to Succeed at Reengineering: *Journal of Management Decision*, Vol3, pp.752-757, Available at <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?issn=00251747&volume37&issue=10&articleid=865108&how=pdf>.

- Attaran, M. (2000), "Why does reengineering fail? A practical guide for successful implementation", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 19 No. 9, pp. 794to801. Available at<<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/html/Output/0260190904.pdf>.
- Attaran, M. (2004). Exploring the relationship between information technology and business process reengineering. *Information & Management*, 41, 585-596.
- Attong, M. & Metz, T. 2012. *Change or Die: Business Process Improvement Manual*. Hoboken: CRC Press.
- Balaji, M. (2004). Reengineering an Educational Institute: a Case Study in NewZealand: from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/insight>.
- Balasubramanian, S., (2010). Successful reengineering implementation strategy: Hindustan College of engineering.
- Banham, H. C. (2010). Extenal environmental analysis for small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *Journal of Business & Economics Research*. V. 8, n. 10, 19-26.
- Berihu, Assefa, (May 2009).Business process reengineering in Ethiopia. A short note on 'Business Process Re-engineering in Ethiopia's as per the request of Prof. Keinichi Ohno.
- Bertolini, M, Bevilacqua, M, Ciarapica, FE & Giacchetta, G. (2011). Business process re-engineering in healthcare management: a case study. *Business Process Management Journal* 17(1):42-66.
- Bhatt.G, (2007 p. 129), Enterprise information systems integration and business process improvement initiative: an empirical study", Management Department at the Southern Illinois University, Available at: [<http://hsb.baylor.edu/ramsower/acis/papers/bhatt.htm>].
- Carr, D., & Johanson P, (1995). Best practices in Reengineering: What works and what doesn't in the reengineering process, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Chang, J. F. 2012. Basic Principles of Business Process Management. *Business Process Management Systems*, (6): 47-55.
- Chen, Y. (2001). *Empirical modeling for participative business process reengineering*. Thesis. University of Warwick.
- Cheng, M.Y., Tsai, M.H., & Xiao, Z.X. (2006). Construction management process reengineering: Organizational human resource planning for multiple projects. *Automation in Construction*, 15(3), 785–799.

- Chiarini, A. (2011). Japanese total quality control, TQM, Deming's system of profound knowledge, BPR, Lean and Six Sigma Comparison and discussion. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma* 2(4):332-355.
- Creswell, J. 2009, Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches, third edition, SAGE Publication Inc., United State of America.
- Crowe,T.J., Fong,P.M., & Zayas-Castro,J.L., (2002). Quantitative risk level estimation of business Process reengineering efforts. *Business Process Management Journal*, 5 (1): 141 – 150.
- Davenport, T. H. (1993). Need radical innovation and continuous improvement? Integrate process reengineering and TQM. *Planning Review*, 21(3), 6-12.
- Davenport, T.H. (1993). Process Innovation, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.'
- Davenport, TH (1994), Process innovation: reengineering work through information technology, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Debela and Hagos (2011). The Design and Implementation of Business Process Reengineering in the Ethiopian Public Sector: An Assessment of Four Organizations.
- Debela, T. (2009). Business process reengineering in Ethiopian public organizations: The relationship between theory and practice. **JBAS**, v. 1, n. 2.
- DeVellis R,F. (2003). Scale Development: Theory and Application, Sage Publication.
- Dixon, J., Arnold, P., Kim,J., & Mulligan, P.,(1994). Business process reengineering: improving in new strategic directions, California management review,
- Eftekhari, N & Akhavan, P. (2013). Developing a comprehensive methodology for BPR projects by employing IT tools. *Business Process Management Journal* 19(1):4-29.
- Egan, R. and J. Fjermestad (2005). Change and Resistance Help for the Pratictioner of Change. 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii
- Ezigbo, C.A.,(2003). Advanced management theory immaculate pub, Enugu,
- FDRE. (2001). Service Delivery Policy in the Civil Service. Addis Ababa: Artistic Printers.
- Fragoso, J. 2015. Business process re-engineering in government agencies: lessons from an experience in Mexico. *Journal of Service Science Management*, 8: 382-392.
- Furey, T.R. (1993). A six step guide to process reengineering. *Planning Review*, 21(2), 20-23.

- Getachew Hailemariam and Richard, C. (2006). Civil Service Reform in Ethiopia: Success in two Ministries. Hull: University of Hull.
- Getachew, H. & Common, R. (2006). Civil Service Reform in Ethiopia: Success in two ministries. Hull: University of Hull.
- Ghannouchi, SA, Mabrouk, K & Ghannouchi, S. (2010). Proposal of data warehouse in the context of healthcare process reengineering. *Business Process Management Journal* 16(4):688-712.
- Goksoy, A, Ozsoy, B & Vayvay, O. (2012). Business Process Reengineering: Strategic tool for managing organizational change an application in a multinational company. *International Journal of Business and Management* 7(2):89-112.
- Graham, R. S., (2010). *Business process reengineering: strategies for occupational health and safety*.
- Grant,D.,(2002). A wider view of business process reengineering. *Communications of the ACM*
- Grover, V., Teng, J.T.C. & Fiedler, K.D. (1993). Information technology enabled business process redesign: an integrated planning framework. *Omega* 21 (4).
- Guimaraes,T.,(1999). Field testing of the proposed predictors of BPR success in manufacturing firms. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, Vol.18 (No.1), PP.53-65.
- Gunasekaran, A., & Nath, B. (1997). The role of information technology in business process reengineering. *International journal of production economics*, 50(2), 91- 104.
- Habib, N. M., & Wazir, I. M. (2012). Role of Education and Training in the Successful Implementation of Business Process Reengineering: A case of Public Sector of Khyber PakhtunKhwa (KPK).[Research Paper]. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 172-185.
- Hammer M. & Champy, J., (1995). Reengineering the corporation. Harper Collins publishers. USA.
- Hammer, M. (1990). Reengineering Work: Don't Automate, Obliterate. *Harvard Business Review*. 68(4): 104-12.
- Hammer, M. (2001). Reengineering Work: Don't Automate, Obliterate. *Harvard Business Review*. 104-112.
- Hammer, M. and Champy, J. (1993). Reengineering the Corporation. New York: Harper Collins Publishers,

- Hammer, M. and Stanton, S. (1995). *The Reengineering Revolution: A Handbook*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Hammer, M., & Champy, J., (1993). *Reengineering the corporation: a manifesto for business revolution*. Nicholas Brearey Publishing, London.
- Hartigh, E. D. & Segveld, M. (2011). *Service Productivity: How to measure and improve it?* Springer Science and Business Media, Research and Innovations in the Service Economy, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-7904-9_11.
- Heizer, J. & Render, B. (2011). *Operations Management*, 10 ed. Printice Hall. New Jersey. U.S.A.
- Hesson, M. (2007), Business process reengineering in UAE public sector: A naturalization and residency case study, *Business Process management Journal*, v. 13, (5):707-727.
- Holland, D., & Kumar, S. (1995). Getting past the obstacles to successful reengineering business horizons.
- Huang, Z., & Palvia, P. (2001). ERP implementation issues in advanced and developing countries. *Business Process Management Journal*, 7(3), 276-284.
- Humphreys, P. K., & Day, P. (2001). An inter-organizational information system for supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 70(3), 245-255.
- Hussein, B., Bazzi, H., Dayekh, A. & Hassan, W. 2013. Critical analysis of existing business process reengineering models: towards the development of a comprehensive integrated model. *Journal of Project, Program and Portfolio Management*, 4(1): 30-40.
- Hutton, G. (1996). *Business Process Reengineering a Public Sector View*. Armistead & Rowland (eds), *Managing Business Processes BPR and Beyond*; New York..
- Jackson, N. (1997). "Business Process Reengineering 96", Management Services. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Jeffrey Hiatt, Timothy Creasey (2012) *Change Management: The People Side of Change*.
- Khuzaimah, A. (2011). The impact of business process reengineering on organizational Performance: Unpublished master thesis, university utara Malaysia
- Klein, K. and Knight, A. 2005, Innovation Implementation: Overcoming the Challenge, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol. 14, No. 5 (Oct., 2005), pp. 243- 246, Available at, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20183036>
- Koppenjan, J. & Klijn, E. 2012. Governance Network Theory: Past, Present and Future. *Policy and Politics*, 40(4): 187 -206.

- Kumar, D & Bhatia, A. (2012). BPR - organization culture, best practices and future trends. *International Journal of Computer Applications* 44(23):1 -6.
- Laudon, K. C. & Laudon, J. P. (2006). *Management information system: Managing the digital firm*. 10 ed). Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River. New Jersey.
- Lenk K., (1997), "Business Process Re-engineering in the public sector, in: Taylor J., Snellen I. & Zuurmond A. (eds.), 1997, Beyond BPR in public administration, Amsterdam, IOS Press, pp. 151 -163.
- Linden, M. (1998), „Workbook for Seamless Government“, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, California.
- Linden, R. M. (1994) Seamless Government: A Practical Guide to Re-Engineering in the public Sector. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Lotfollah N., Ziaul H., Seyed M.A., and Saeedreza H. (2012). Impact of IT on process improvement: Journal of emerging trends in computing and information sciences.
- MacIntosh, R. (2003). BPR: alive and well in the public sector. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 23 No. 3, MCB UP Limited
- Magutu, P. O.; Nyamwange, S. O. & Kaptoge, G. K. (2010). Business process reengineering for competitive advantage: Key factors that may lead to the success or failure of the BPR implementation (The Wrigley Company), *African Journal of Business & Management*, v. 1: 135-150.
- Mahtebu Yenehun. (2008). The Practice of Business Process Reengineering in Selected Ministries of Ethiopia and Bureaus of Amhara Region. Addis Ababa: MA Thesis Graduate School of Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
- Mansar,S.L., Marir, F., & Reijers,H.A.,(2003). Case-based reasoning as a technique for Knowledge management in business process redesign. *Electronic Journal on Knowledge Management*, 70(3), 245-255.
- McAdam and J. Donaghy, (1999) "Business process re-engineering in the public sector - A study of staff perceptions and critical success factors," *Business Process Management Journal*, vol. 5, , pp. 33- 49.
- McNulty, T & Ferlie, E (2004), „Process transformation: limitations to radical organizational change within public service organizations“, *Organization Studies*, vol. 25, p. 1389.
- Ministry of Capacity Building (MoCB). (2006). Business Process Reengineering. Unpublished.
- Mohapatra, S. 2013. *Business Process Reengineering: automation decision points in process reengineering*. Springer Science and Media. New York: United States.

- Mothobi, M. (2002). Business process re-engineering: Improving business operations. Dissertation. The University of Wales.
- Motwani, J., Kumar, A. & Jiang, J. (2005). Business Process Re-engineering: A theoretical framework and an integrated model. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 18(9/10): 964-977.
- Motwani, J., Subramanian, R., & Gopalakrishna, P., (2005). Critical factors for successful ERP implementation: Exploratory findings from four case studies. *Computers in Industry*, 2(2), 172-185.
- Muktar Kedir (2008). The leadership Challenges and prospects in implementing business process reengineering in the Oromia Civil Service. Addis Ababa: MA Thesis Azuza Pacific University (Unpublished).
- Muthu, S.; Whitman, L. & Cheraghi, H. (1999), Business Process ReEngineering: A Consolidated Methodology, **Proceedings** of The 4th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering Theory, San Antonio, Texas, USA, Retrieved from a World Wide Web: <http://webs.twsu.edu/whitman/papers/ijii99muthu.pdf>.
- Nisar, QA, Ahmad, S & Ahmad, U. 2014. Exploring Factors that Contribute to Success of Business Process Reengineering and Impact of Business Process Reengineering on Organizational Performance: A Qualitative Descriptive study on Banking Sector at Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* 2(6):219-224.
- Oberoi, R. 2016. Applying Business Process Re-engineering to the Public Sectors as New Public Management Strategy: Understanding Views and Limits. *Journal of Governance and Politics*, 4(2): 291 – 304.
- Obolensky, N. (1994). Practical business reengineering. Gulf Publishing Company, Houston.
- Pamela S. L., and Stephen H.G., (1995). Management Challenges in the 21st Century, West Pub. Company, St. Paul, Minnesota. PP. 375 – 376. Quality Press, Milwaukee. *Revolution*. New York: Harper Business.
- Patching, A. and Waitleg, D. (1999). The Future Proof Organization: Practical Lessons in Leadership and Innovation for the 21st Century. Singapore: KHL Printing Co.
- Peppard, J., & Fitzgerald, D. (1997). The transfer of culturally-grounded management techniques: The case of business process reengineering in Germany. *European Management Journal*, 15(4), 446-60.
- Poldiano, C., (1999). The new public management in developing countries. Institute for development and policy, university of Manchester, UK.

- Proctor, L. & Gray, L. 2006. Business process re-engineering in the public sector: A Case Study. *Euromed Journal of Business*, 1(1):84-97.
- Ranganathan, C., & Dhaliwal, J.S. (2001). A survey of business process reengineering practices in Singapore. *Information and Management*, 39(2), 125-34.
- Remenyi, D., & Heafield, A. (1996). Business process re-engineering: Some aspects of how to evaluate and manage the risk exposure. *International Journal of Project Management*, 14(6), 349-357.
- Revenaugh, D. (1994). „Business Process Re-engineering”: The Unavoidable Challenge, *Management Decision*, Vol. 32 pp.16 27, Available at, <<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?>.
- Reyes, D. (2001). Public Sector Reengineering: Practice, Problems and Prospects; Asian Review of Public Administration, College of Public Administration University of Philippines: Philippines.
- Rigby, D. (2001). Management Tools and Techniques: A Survey, *California Management Review*, 139-160 No2.
- Rinaldi, M., Montari, R. & Botani, E. 2015. Improving the efficiency of public administrations through business process re-engineering and simulation: a case study. *Business Process Management*, 21(2): 419-462.
- Salimi, MP. 2011. A Descriptive-Correlation Research to Explain Potential of BPR. *Chinese Business Review* 10(7):516-525.
- Sharma M. (2006). Business Process Reengineering: A Tool to further Bank Strategic Goals.
- Sheu, C., Yen, H., & Krumwiede, D.W. (2003). The effect of national differences on multinational ERP implementation: an exploratory study. *TQM and Business Excellence*, 14(6), 641 -657.
- Shin, N. & Jemella, D. (2002). Business process re-engineering and performance improvement: The case of Chase Manhattan Bank. *Business Process Management Journal*, v. 8, n. 4, p. 351-363.
- Siha, S.M., & Saad, G.H. (2008). Business process improvement: Empirical assessment and extensions. *Business Process Management Journal*, 14(6), 778-802.
- Sisaye, S & Birnberg, JG. 2012. *Organizational Development (OD) and Organizational Transformation (OT) Process Innovation Strategies*, Chapter 5, in Sisaye, S, Jacob, G & Birnberg, JG (ed.).

- Slack, N.; Chambers, S. & Johnston, R. (2007). *Operation Management*. 5ed. Prentice Hall. UK.
- Smith, A., Meade, M., Wolf, D. & Song, J. 2013. The CSF's, quality governance, BPR performance and gaining competitive advantage. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(24): 48 - 63.
- Smith, M. (2003). Business process design: Correlates of success and failure. *The Quality Management Journal*, 10(2), 38-49.
- Stemberger, M. I., Koviak, A. & Jaklic, J. 2007. A methodology for increasing business process maturity in the public sector. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge and Management*, 2: 119 -133.
- Stewart, V. (1983). *Change: The Challenge for Management*. New York: MC Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Stow, R. P. (1993). Reengineering by objectives. *Planning Review*, 21(3), 14-16. Sage publication.
- Sturdy, GR. 2010. *Business Process Reengineering: Strategies for Occupational Health and Safety*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Newcastle: United Kingdom.
- Sungau, J. & Msanjila, S. S. (2012). On IT enabling of business process reengineering in Organizations. *Advanced Materials research*, p. 404-408. P. 5177-5181.
- Tarokh, M.F., Sherif, E., and Nazemi, E.,(2006). Survey of BPR experiences in Iran: Reasons for Success and Failure. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 23 (No.5), pp.350-362.
- Terziovski, P. Fitzpatrick, and P. O'Neill, (Apr. 2003, pp. 35-50). "Successful predictors of business process reengineering (BPR) in financial services," *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 84.
- Towers, S., (1994). *Business process Reengineering: a practical Handbook for Executives*, Stanley Thomas Ltd, Cheltenham.
- Underdahl, B. 2011. *Business Process Management for Dummies: IBM LIMITED EDITION*. Indianapolis: Wiley Publishing Inc.
- Wölfl, A. (2011). Productivity growth in service industries: An assessment of recent patterns and the role of measurement. Economic Analysis and Statistics Division, OECD Publications, Paris.
- Wu, Y. and Du, J. 2010, The analysis of Business Process Reengineering applicability and process of implementation, Available at, <<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=5575862s>>

- Xiaoli, L. (2011). Correlation between business process reengineering and operation performance of National Commercial Banks. *Journal of Innovation and Management*, n. 7. P. 981-985.
- Zygiaris, S. (2000). *Business process reengineering BPR*: Report produced for the EC funded project, INNOREGIO: dissemination of Innovation and knowledge management techniques, HELLAS SA.

Time Table for the Study

No	Activities	Time
1	Preparing Proposal	January 2019
2	Defense of the MA thesis Proposal	February 2019
3	Questionnaire preparation and Interview schedule design and preparation	February 2019
4	Literature review gathering	February 2019
5	Data collection	March 2019
6	Data coding, processing and analysis of results	April 2019
7	Data editing and coding progress report	April 2019
8	Data analysis and draft thesis writing	April 2019
9	First Draft thesis submission	May 2019
10	Final thesis submission	June 2019

Budget Breakdown

1.1. Stationery Expenses

No	Item	Unit	Quantity	Unit price (Br.)	Total price (Br.)
1	Printing paper	Pakt	4	200.00	800.00
2	Pen	Pcs	14	5.00	70.00
3	Note book	Pcs	3	50.00	150.00
4	Toner	Pcs	1	1650.00	1650.00
5	Flash Disk	Pcs	1(8GB)	250.00	250.00
6	Compact Disk (CD-RW)	Pcs	14	20.00	280.00
7	Pocket tape recorder	Pcs	1	530.00	530.00
8	Cassette	Pcs	6	10.00	60.00
	Sub-total				3,790.00

4.2. Personal Expenses

No	Title	Purpose	Unit	No. of Days	Rate /Days	Total Expense
1	Supervision Fee	-	-	-	-	3000.00
2	Researcher per diem days	To and from data collection place, during data collection, Literature review and Data analysis	Per day			6000.00
	Sub-total					9000.00

4.3. Transport Expenses

No	Person	Destination	Departure	Purpose	Cost/trip (Br.)	Total cost (Br.)
1	Researcher	Adama	Oromia State university	For advisor advice and Draft submission	2	240
2	Researcher	Adama	Oromia State university	Draft submission	2	240
Sub-Total						480

4.4. Miscellaneous Expense

No	Description	Total cost (Br.)
1	Photo copying service	570.00
2	Printing and binding draft	460.00
3	Thesis binding	700.00
Sub-Total		1730.00

5.5 Budget Summary

No	Title	Expense summary
1	Stationery Expenses	3790.00
2	Personnel Expenses	9000.00
3	Transport Expenses	480
4	Miscellaneous Expenses	1730.00
Total		15,000.00

Budget Source: Personal