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ABSTRACT

The general objective of this research was to assess the business process reengineering at KK Security and its effects on staff turnover. The study sought to achieve the following objectives: to examine the role of BPR at KK Security; to investigate the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security and to determine the tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security.

In order to achieve the above, the study adopted a descriptive research design in order to obtain the data that is necessary, which in essence facilitated the collection of the primary data as a way of getting into the research objectives. The population under study was employees at KK security Company Limited. Simple random sampling technique was used to determine the sample size because of the homogeneity of the population and to reduce high refusal rates. The sample size was 83 respondents of which only 51 responded. The collection of the primary data was done using structured questionnaires that were pilot tested in order to ensure that there was reliability as well as validity. The coding of the data was done with the use of Microsoft Excel as well as SPSS in order to generate the descriptive statistics for instance frequencies and percentages. The presentation of the results was in form of tables and figures, as well as cross tabulations.

The findings on the role of BPR at KK Security revealed that team work has played a major role in BPR implementation, followed by resources, Six Sigma, Information technology & resources (human & capital), Total Quality Management. This implies that indeed the four BPR enablers had played an important role in the BPR implementation.

The findings on the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security revealed that effective communication was rated highest followed by, project planning and Management IT infrastructure organization structure was fourth, Ineffective teamwork & Employees Resistance to Change respectively. Further the study sought to establish the extent of BPR impact at KK security. It was established that increase of hiring of employees in the company and laying off of employees were rated, thus indicating that they were impacted by BPR quite often, on the other hand new organizational shared values and beliefs, new roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees & new customer focused processes were impacted by BPR sometimes.
The findings on tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security revealed that indeed KK security uses Process Model Validation Tool, Urgency theory, Process Verification tool & benchmarking with other companies to mitigate the negative impact of BPR. This shows that they were used sometimes in mitigation of negative impact of BPR on staff turnover. A strategic relationships analysis tool, matrix of change & training and education of the process were rarely used for mitigation.

The study therefore recommends that organizations that are seeking for success in the industry sector in which the company is doing business should conceptualize the concept of BPR. His is because these processes are those that the business strategy has identified as critical to excel at, in order to match or beat the competition. The study further recommends that most companies should be very cautious when re-engineering in order to avoid downsize without figuring out how to reduce the workload. This is beucase legitimate reengineering is a matter of streamlining internal processes and eliminating redundancies. Finally the study recommends that for organizations to be successful, BPR projects need to be top down, taking in the complete organization, and the full end to end processes. It needs to be supported by tools that make processes easy to track and analyze.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPR</td>
<td>Business Process Reengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Closed Circuit Television Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Enterprise Resource Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Local Area Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCs</td>
<td>Personal Computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPR</td>
<td>Systems Applications and Products Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQM</td>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAN</td>
<td>Wide Area Networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

The concept of reengineering traces its origins back to management theories developed as early as the nineteenth century. The purpose of reengineering is to make all processes the best-in-class (Lindsay, Downs & Lunn, 2006). Frederick Taylor suggested in the 1880’s that managers used process reengineering methods to discover the best processes for performing work, and that these processes be reengineered to optimize productivity (Hammer & Champy, 2008). Business Process Reengineering (BPR) echoes the classical belief that there is one best way to conduct tasks. In Taylor’s time, technology did not allow large companies to design processes in a cross-functional or cross-departmental manner (Maull, Tranfield & Maull, 2008).

According to Zigiaris (2008) the globalization of the economy and the liberalization of the trade markets have formulated new conditions in the market place which are characterized by instability and intensive competition in the business environment. He further states that competition is continuously increasing with respect to price, quality and selection, service and promptness of delivery. Removal of barriers, international cooperation, technological innovations cause competition to intensify. All these changes impose the need for organizational transformation, where the entire processes of organization climate and organization structure are changed. BPR therefore comes in to seek to help companies radically restructure their organizations by focusing on the ground-up design of their business processes and re-design their work flows and processes in an organization, in line with the organization’s business strategy (Maull et al., 2008).

BPR is used to implement an organizational structure that focuses on team building operations around processes and building company mentality to personnel. The objective of the technique is to build customer-oriented effective organizations and to apply a company’s strategic goal to provide customer oriented services (Lindsay et al., 2006). A good example would be the British Telecom when they announced their Business Plan, all competitors were eager to find out who would be the new Chief Executive Officer.
(CEO) of the organization. To the surprise of all, the new CEO was the customer. The company had decided to transform all the operations of the organization the way customers wanted them to operate (Zigiaris, 2008).

According to Neidhart (2007) some companies jump on the reengineering bandwagon when the economy slows down and fear of overspending sets in. American Expresses did just that in 2001 when the company’s earnings dropped 76% from the previous year. The then CEO Kenneth Chenault said that the company was making substantial progress in the reengineering efforts announced earlier that year. He further stated that the company was moving some stuff to the Internet to reduce support staff and that the company was also moving more rapidly to scale back its bank’s infrastructure in overseas markets. According to Ring (2005) American Express cut 6,000 jobs by the end of the year, and moved customer service departments online. This quick attempt to fix the company’s losses once again equated “downsizing” to the definition of reengineering. With this as the main approach, reengineering may not entirely be done successfully and may be met with a lot of resistance by the organization’s employees (Sheridan, 2007).

However, Al-Mashari and Zairi (2009) found out that many organizations have reported dramatic benefits gained from the successful implementation of BPR. Companies like Ford Motor Co., CIGNA, and Wal-Mart are all recognized as having successfully implemented BPR. However, despite the significant growth of the BPR concept, not all organisations embarking on BPR projects achieve their intended result. Hammer and Champy (2008) estimate that as many as 70 percent do not achieve the dramatic results they seek. According to Al-Mashari & Zairi (2009) this mixture of results makes the issue of BPR implementation very important. BPR has great potential for increasing productivity through reduced process time and cost, improved quality, and greater customer satisfaction, but it often requires a fundamental organizational change. 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 (Maull et al., 2008).

Sheridan (2007) writes that manufacturers, who applied the basic concepts of reengineering sensibly to become leaner and more competitive, will then shift gears from a cost-cutting mode to a growth mode. The IBM Corporation cut 154,000 employees in 1989, only to hire more employees totaling a net increase of 16,000. Even though the
corporation focused on reducing cost by streamlining jobs, they also planned for growth under the process of reengineering. Chairman and CEO Louis Gerstner Jr. pointed out that, “Even as we grow, we are relentlessly continuing to fine-tune our operations to improve our efficiency and productivity, mostly through our reengineering efforts.”

According to Magutu, Nyamwange and Kaptoge (2010) Kenya and also all over the world, very often if an organization implements BPR, all the other organizations want to do the same and BPR has become a buzzword in the business environments. The term is sometimes even used when organizations plan to undertake routine cost cutting measures such closing down non-profitable branches, reduce excess staff, and change the organization structure. However, it is found out that different organizations adopt the term without analyzing their internal and external business environments in order to justify that they are reengineering and to fit in the trend that other business are also undertaking BPR. This can be explained as what Adhola (2007) argues to be competition in the present globalized business environment. In most cases companies like KK Security and Wrigley Company in the region have explored ways of structuring not only, their products and services to meet the needs of the consumers beyond the traditional geographical borders, but also their internal processes to efficiently deliver the required outcomes.

According to Magutu et al. (2010) at the turn of the millennium, Wrigley Company made a management decision to implement BPR in all its subsidiaries globally in order to adopt its business operations to rising pressure of global competition. The Organization decided to change the way it conducted business globally by adopting the supply chain concept and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) technology namely Systems Applications and Products Release (SAPR). Through this the company was able to implement BPR explained by the fact that competitive advantage measures of cost management, customer service, quality, productivity and people management were not neglected. Problem comes when these factors are not looked at when adopting BPR and trying to implement it.

KK Security is one of the fastest growing Security Companies in Africa. It began its operations in Kenya in 1967 and started as a Guard Company in Mombasa. Over the last decade, it has expanded geographically from its base in Kenya to become a regional force in six countries. KK currently has operations in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Burundi. With its expansion the company has also embarked on broadening its business scope by offering more than just the typical
guard services but also cash in transit, alarm response, car tracking services, fleet management, Closed Circuit Television Monitoring (CCTV), remote off-site monitoring and recording, event safety and security, guard/tracker dog services and close protection operatives (KK Security, 2012).

According to KK Security (2012) KK provides residential and commercial security in Africa. Their mission is to provide safe and secure environments through honest engagements and respect for people. Its focus tends to remain with large corporate clients who are tired of being neglected by their security supplier. Its focus has moved towards large Agricultural, Industrial and Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)/Embassy contracts needing a dedicated management team and a motivated trained guard force. KK recognizes that customers want a ‘hands-on’ approach by management. They want advice and recommendations, they want to reduce their dependence on manned-guarding, and they want a management team that can motivate their Guard Force through training and reward.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

McCormick (2007) argues that BPR is a three-step method of increasing an organization’s efficiency by analyzing how information flows and how decisions are made. He says that the three steps that need to be followed include: determining the status quo, deciding what changes are needed and making those changes. According to Johnson et al. (2003), reengineer promises to overhaul an organization and everything that makes an organization run changes. Jobs certainly change as do the people that fill them this is because the job, people, managers, processes and values are linked together.

As a result of this, Hammer and Champy (2008) argue that retaining employees remains a primary concern for many organizations in the 21st century this is due to the changes that come after undertaking business process reengineering. According to Abdolvand, Albadv and Ferdowsi (2008) carrying out extensive and intensive staff training in an organization and soon after undertaking BPR has a component that eventually oversees massive staff layoffs which may include newly trained staff and this becomes a very expensive exercise in an organization in terms of revenue loss, opportunity cost, losing out trained employees to competition and negative impact on morale of employees.
BPR is a re-design of work flows and processes in an organization, in line with the organization’s business strategy (Brown, 2004). Any organization undertaking BPR does so with the objective of doing it successfully to ensure customer satisfaction, carry out its processes efficiently and being cost effective (Carter, 2005; Palmer, 2004; Crowe, Fong & Zayas-Castro, 2009; Johnson et al., 2003). The management of a security firm undertaking this exercise has the unenviable task of getting rid of “dead weight” in the form of processes and people who do not add value to the value chain (Rouse, 2009). This leads to high staff turnover. Staff turnover in security firms is a very serious issue due to the sensitive nature of the organization’s mandate and line of business. Recruitments and layoffs have to be conducted in a way that does not compromise effectiveness of the firm in carrying out its activities. The human resource department of any security firm has to be meticulous and professional when exercising its mandate while recruiting (Davenport, 2006).

As a result corporations; security firms included, see value in streamlining jobs by investing in technology instead of employees. The advance of technology free up task-oriented jobs previously held by personnel (Davenport & Stoddard, 2005). However, changing the structure of a business from employees to business strategies can have a disadvantageous impact for example employees resisting to change if attempted without a systems approach to change (Brandenburg & Binder, 2009).

According to Pawlewski and Cempel (2010) resistance to change is one of the basic factors contributing to the failed implementation of reengineering changes in an organization. Seven basic factors that can contribute to this resistance include; loss of control; lack of information of why change should take place; too much uncertainty and ambiguity; fear of admitting that what has been done so far was “bad” (fear of “losing face”); sudden surprises; fear of the unknown and extra work anticipated after the change takes place.

Being in the security business over the years, KK Security have come to realize that their clients prefer unmanned solutions to security issues hence their need to embrace technology. The company has come up with, Access control systems, CCTV, vehicle tracking and immobilization all of which rely heavily on technology and are not manpower intensive. KK Security therefore has invested heavily on information technology, modern security equipment and training. As a result the company
experienced high staff turnover in the recent past and also faced a lot of resistance to this change by their employees.

1.3 General Objective

The general objective of this research was to assess the business process reengineering at KK Security and its effects on staff turnover.

1.4 Specific Objectives

1.4.1 To examine the role of BPR at KK Security.

1.4.2 To investigate the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security.

1.4.3 To determine the tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security.

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 Managers

This study may help managers of security firms to minimize high staff turnover while undertaking BPR. This may be achieved through the study recommendations that have been offered. Mangers will also have a good idea of how BPR affects their turnover and thus develop reengineering processes that are effective and efficient.

1.5.2 Employees

The study may help employees at security firms understand the objectives of BPR and demystify the age old belief that top management is victimizing them. Once they understand BPR, it is hoped that they may embrace the radical change that BPR comes with.

1.5.3 Future Researchers

The results of this research would have added to the scarcely available information in Kenya on BPR. This study forms a strong foundation for future researchers who would like to pursue a study in the area of global trends in BPR and its impact on various components of the organization.
1.6 Scope of the Study
The study was limited to administrative staff at KK Security head office in Nairobi. These staff members were drawn from different departments in the organization that is; customer care, marketing, administration, human resource, training, operations, accounts and the technical department. The study results cannot be generalized for all security firms since the study only focused on KK Security. The results therefore are limited to the organization being studied in their Head Office in Nairobi.

1.7 Definition of Terms
1.7.1 Re-engineering
According to Abdolvand et al. (2008) re-engineering 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.

1.7.2 Business Process
This is a set of logically related tasks performed to achieve a defined business outcome. This is a structured, measured set of activities designed to produce a specified output for a particular customer or market. It implies a strong emphasis on how work is done within an organization (Zigiaris, 2008).

1.7.3 Business Process Reengineering
Business process reengineering (BPR) is the analysis and redesign of workflow within and between enterprises. Business process re-engineering is also known as business process redesign, business transformation, or business process change management (Rouse, 2009).

1.7.4 Employee Turnover
This is the rotation of workers around the labor market; between firms, jobs and occupations; and between the states of employment and unemployment (Pawlewski & Cempel, 2010).
1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter has given a brief background of the research problem. A brief history and general information about KK Security and the problems at hand are also given while at the same time linking them to the problem statement. The general objective has been explained further by enumerating the specific objectives that guided the study. The relevance of this study has been underscored when highlighting its significance.

The next chapter aims to review other studies and literature that highlight Business Process Reengineering in detail, employee turnover in organizations and a possible correlation between the two. The chapter sets out to shed light on a process that has been synonymous with staff layoffs and retrenchments for many years. Traditional reasons for employee turnover in an organization have also been explored. This gave way to chapter three on research methodology which discussed the use of questionnaires as a data collection method used for this study. Chapter four discusses the results and findings arrived at through this research and chapter five presents recommendations and gives a conclusion of the whole study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter is looking at studies done of various researchers on business Process reengineering with particular focus on the objectives of the research mentioned in chapter one. These include the role of BPR in organizations; the impacts of BPR on staff turnover and lastly tools that can be used to mitigate the negative impact of BPR on staff turnover have also been examined.

2.2 Role of Business Process Reengineering in Organizations

According to Motwani et al. (2008) BPR refers to the radical redesign of a business process to gain dramatic improvements in performance measures such as cost, quality, service, and speed. Carter (2005) argues that reengineering implies the need to restructure due to the changes in the business environment with restructuring meaning having a system and process for success.

Major BPR efforts represent an organization’s commitment of millions of dollars for redesigning internal organizational processes as argued by Motwani et al. (1998) changing fundamental product delivery and customer service procedures, and often re-examining and repositioning corporate strategy. However, organizations that embrace BPR, should first ask whether the output or result is valued by the customer (McHugh, Merli & Wheeler, 2005).

BPR usually concentrates on the few core business processes out of the many processes in any company (Johnson et al., 2003). A core business creates value by the capabilities it gives the company for competitiveness. Core business processes are valued by the customer, the shareholder or the regulator and are critical to get right. They are required for success in the industry sector in which the company is doing business (McHugh et al., 2005). These processes are those that the business strategy has identified as critical to excel at, in order to match or beat the competition.

Schmidt (2008) argues that the main focus of business reengineering is process orientation. The company is seen through a process lens implying a horizontal perspective of the firm that transcends traditional organizational barriers. BPR is a complex and
difficult task and has a high-failure rate. Thus, organizations should not try BPR before meticulous examination of all phases and stages of the project. These should include the process activities, peoples’ jobs and reward system, the management system performers’ tools and technologies (Abdolvand et al., 2008).

Gupta (2009) argues that, the role of BPR is to realize dramatic improvements by fundamentally rethinking how an organization’s work should be done instead of mere process improvement that focus on functional or incremental improvement. Reengineering involves “radical improvements” and not any incremental changes. According to Olalla (2009) BPR is a methodology which requires change in existing processes and designation of radically new ones and it is inevitable that some certain factors make this change feasible. These factors are known as enablers and may be defined as elements that act as vehicles for processes to change. According to Radhakrishnan and Balasubramanian (2008) to be an enabler is to supply the means, knowledge, or opportunity, make feasible or possible or to give legal power, capacity to do something.

2.2.1 Information Technology

Goksoy, Ozsoy and Vayvay (2012) argue that over the decades it has become evident that one of the most important ways to facilitate effective organization redesign through process reengineering in organizations is through the use of information technology (IT) as an enabler of change. Information Technology plays a major role in BPR as it provides office automation; it allows the business to be conducted in different locations, provides flexibility in manufacturing, permits quicker delivery to customers and supports rapid and paperless transactions (Zigiaris, 2008).

According to Rajesh, Gupta and Singh (2008) building an effective IT infrastructure is a vital factor in successful BPR implementation. Effective overall system architecture, flexible IT infrastructure and proper installation of IT components all contribute to building an effective IT infrastructure for business processes which changes the way business is done in an organization.

According to La Rock (2008) BPR seeks to break from current processes and to devise new ways of organizing tasks, organizing people and making use of IT systems so that the resulting processes will better support the goals of the organization. Radhakrishnan and
Balasubramanian (2008) argue that new technologies often provide breakthrough in business process reengineering. They enable new processes that previously were not possible for example the internet is an example of a mechanism that fundamentally changes customer service processes by giving customers new ways to access information, conduct transactions and interact with companies. On the other hand, Bhuveneswari (2009) argues that IT plays an important role by either enabling or constraining successful BPR. IT can constrain reengineering if the organization’s IT infrastructure is inadequate or inflexible. This infrastructure includes both technical and managerial expertise required to provide reliable services within and outside the firm.

He further argues that the role of IT is to make a new process design possible. The applications of IT to reengineering require inductive thinking, which is the ability to first recognize a powerful solution and then seek the problems that it might solve. A fundamental error that most companies commit when they look at technology is to see how a new technology will help in solving problems in their existing process. Gupta (2009) states that, companies have to think how a technology can help them to do things that they are not doing in the current process. Reengineering is about innovation. Palmer (2004) adds that, it is about exploiting the latest capabilities of technology to achieve entirely new objectives.

According to Bhuveneswari (2009) IT plays an important role in the application of business process reengineering in organizations. This include; enabling people to work together: Personal Computers (PCs) are commonplace and mostly part of Local Area Network (LAN), or even Wide Area Networks (WAN), which electronically link teams to allow non-physical collaborative work and helps to integrate business. This is between business Partners Company and customers, as well as vendors. This maybe through the use software’s like Oracle. Malhotra (2011) also argues that IT can affect the organization in different ways; it can transform unstructured processes into routinized transactions; can transform information with rapidity and ease across large distances; can replace or reduce human labour in a process and can bring complex analytical methods to bear on a process.

Palmer (2004) points out that, IT should be viewed as more than an automating or mechanizing force that can fundamentally reshape the way business is done. It is considered as both a strategic catalyst and enabler of process reengineering Broadbent, Weill and Clair (2009). Reengineering is about innovation and it also requires recognition

2.2.2 Structural Enablers
Among numerous structural changes that can facilitate process reengineering; the most effective is the organizing of functional tasks into group-based units or teams (Gunasekaran & Love, 2007). According to Goksoy et al. (2012) teams perform better as they integrate cross-functional skills in single work units. A broad set of skills and perspectives increases the likelihood that output will meet multifunctional requirements. For instance, new product development teams increasingly include representatives from all the functions involved in the product development process. According to Martinez (2009) one of the benefits of composing teams to aid process reengineering is that working in teams improves the quality of work life. Teams provide opportunities for small talk, development of friendships, social interaction and empathic reactions from other employees.

Although the execution of teams and team building have been underlined as the most important structural enabler of BPR, it should be recognized by the management that forming teams are not always vital to BPR, the work of individuals can also be effective. That is why; in order to figure out the best way of facilitating BPR, the organizational culture and functional diversity should be fully understood and analyzed by the top management before carrying out any structural changes (Gunasekaran & Love, 2007).

2.2.3 Human Resources as an Enabler of BPR
Goksoy et al. (2012) argue that, the human resource enablers focus on new process skills, job motivation and human resource policies. The human factor plays an important role in the daily operations, performance and success of organizations. No reengineering effort will succeed without first reeducating and retraining people who will ultimately work the new process. According to Al-Mashari and Zairi (2009), all people must be openly and actively involved and should be consulted at all stages of the process by its leaders. This people involved including; line managers, process owners and those involved in Information Systems. The idea of experimentation is an essential part of a successfully reengineered organization and, therefore, people involved or affected by BPR must be
prepared to endure errors and mistakes while reengineering is taking place (La Rock, 2008).

Brown (2004) indicates that if you are going to move information and responsibility down to the low level, then the key question is how can you be sure that people will behave appropriately? You need to be sure that everyone is playing by the same rule book. Hence, it can be concluded that the success of BPR is closely linked to the success of human resources and human resource policies.

2.2.4 Total Quality Management (TQM)
According to Gunasekaran and Love (2007) Total Quality Management (TQM) is an enabling ingredient that can contribute to the successful implementation of BPR. Essentially, TQM forms the foundations of BPR as it embraces open communications, and breaks down the barriers which exist between management and non-management personnel. Gopalan (2011) indicates that TQM and BPR share a cross-functional relationship. According to Martinez (2009) proponents of reengineering often seek radical redesign and drastic improvement of processes which is achieved by teamwork and individual people efforts. However, to get full cooperation from participants a cultural change has to be initiated, and that is where TQM comes in. TQM is based on applying continuous change or fine-tuning across an enterprise (Gopalan, 2011).

Martinez (2009) argues that TQM is an enabler of BPR and that is the reason it needs to have TQM in order to be successful. BPR and TQM both lead to organizational change. When an organization has undergone BPR, the need for change has been internally transmitted. The usual result of this is that employees become more conscious of the need for improvement and that a static position cannot be maintained if the organization wishes to successfully compete in the marketplace. Thus, a re-engineered organization might have acquired a culture for change and improvement which is conducive to TQM.

2.2.5 Six Sigma
According to Carey (2010) the essence of Six Sigma is found in the reality that business processes are inherently unpredictable. Six Sigma provides a way of measuring the variability in a process as it delivers services to an end-user or customer. Gopalan (2011) argues that Six Sigma in many organizations simply means a measure of quality that
strives for near perfection. Six Sigma is a disciplined, data-driven approach and methodology for eliminating defects in any process from manufacturing to transactional and from product to service (Carey, 2010). Business process reengineering and Six Sigma deal with improving an organization’s process from the customer perspective.

Six Sigma was originally created by Motorola to help reduce manufacturing defects as argued by Najjar et al. (2012). There was a five year goal of no more than 3.4 defects per million. Analyzing the variation in defects was the key to Six Sigma, which required very accurate data. This method was designed as a quality improvement initiative, but its later implementation in other industries and services allowed for broader application.

2.3 Impact of BPR on Staff Turnover

According to Carter (2005) most companies after reengineering, downsizing without figuring out how to reduce the workload. Legitimate reengineering is a matter of streamlining internal processes and eliminating redundancies. However, this has also become a euphemism for staff reduction and de-layering. This leaves managers with pressure of working with slashed budgets, downsized workforces, mergers and acquisitions. As a result of downsizing and cost cutting, people get stressed because they do not view their jobs as stable.

Davenport (2006) argues that, most business people in the United States (US), reengineering has become a word that stands for restructuring, layoffs, and too-often failed change programs. The reason behind this is that the rock that reengineering has foundered on is people. Reengineering treated the people inside companies as if they were just so many bits and bytes, interchangeable parts to be reengineered but no person in any organization would want to be reengineered. As a result, this has contributed to fear and anxiety in companies that have reengineered as Davenport and Stoddard (2005) points out in his study.

According to La Rock (2008), only 30% of BPR projects have been regarded as a success. BPR was not reaching its potential and there are various reasons for its limited success. For example, employees’ resistance to change as they consider BPR as threats to their jobs. BPR also lacks detailed guidance and support for the actual implementation of reengineering this is because many publications describe the situation before and after
BPR but do not discuss the path to reach the final situation. This is caused by companies relying too little on research before introducing BPR projects in their company. Davenport and Stoddard (2005) argue that companies rely on little research and common sense which has led to frustrations and leaders in companies thinking, “We must be doing it the wrong way”. The factors that cause success and failure of BPR efforts are based on different dimensions. These include;

2.3.1 Change Management
La Rock (2008) argues that, change management systems and culture are important to the success of BPR initiatives. This involves Change management, which involves all human and social related changes needed by management to facilitate the acceptance of newly designed processes and structures into working practice and to deal effectively with resistance. According to Zairi and Sinclair (2006) revision of reward systems, communication, empowerment, people involvement, training and education, creating a culture for change, and stimulating receptivity of the organization to change are the most important factors related to change management and establishing a culture of performance measures. Some of these human and social changes needed by management include;

2.3.1.1 Effective Communication
This is considered as a major key to successful BPR related change efforts. Communication is required at all levels of the organization with those involved in the reengineering process and those who also not involved (Wynn, 2007). Effective communication according to La Rock (2008) between stakeholders inside and outside the organization is necessary to market a BPR program and to ensure patience and understanding of the structural and cultural changes needed as well as the organization’s competitive position. Zairi and Sinclair (2006) state that, communication should be open, honest, and clear, especially when discussing sensitive issues related to change such as personnel reductions.

2.3.1.2 Empowerment
BPR results in decisions being pushed down to lower levels of the organizational structure and both individuals and teams becomes a critical factor for successful BPR efforts. This enables staff at all levels to feel more responsible and accountable and it promotes self-management and a collaborative teamwork culture (Ward, 2008).
According to La Rock (2008) empowerment means that staff is given the chance to participate in redesign processes. When empowered, employees are able set their goals and monitor their own performance as well as identify and solve problems that affect their work and also able to support the BPR efforts.

2.3.2 Management Competency and Support
La Rock (2008) argues that sound management processes ensure that BPR efforts will be implemented in the most successful manner. The most noticeable managerial practices that directly influence the success of BPR implementation are top management support and commitment, championship and sponsorship, and effective management of risks. Abdolvand et al. (2008) argue that, top leadership should always have a clear knowledge about the current situation of the organization. This is because they play a crucial role in organizational process improvement as they are the primary decision makers and the essential ingredients of any human activity system. This is necessary for BPR to have a “sufficient knowledge about the BPR projects” and “realistic expectation of BPR results.” As a result, top management should be able to provide employees with channels of communication and improve their ability of understanding each other and also the BPR projects that a company undertakes. This empowers employees and they are able and willing to cooperate in a new system.

2.3.3 Organizational Structure
Talluri (2000) argues that there is a clear need to create a new organizational structure which determines how BPR teams are going to look, how human resources are integrated, and how the new jobs and responsibilities are going to be formulated. Sturdy (2010) notes that BPR creates new processes that define jobs and responsibilities across the existing organizational functions. An adequate job integration of organizational human resources infrastructure is important to a BPR project’s success. This will enable a series of tasks to be performed efficiently; product quality, processing time, and cost are also going to improve. As a result, the organization must therefore, have the ability to create the new organizational structures without disrupting or destabilizing the existing manufacturing capabilities.
2.3.4 Project Planning and Management
Proper planning for the BPR project with an adequate time frame are key factors in delivering a successful BPR project on time. The project management includes; strategic alignment, effective planning and project management techniques, identification of performance, adequate resources, effective use of consultants, building a process vision and integrating BPR with other improvement techniques (La Rock, 2008). These techniques identify a methodology for external orientation and learning, making effective use of consultants in building a process vision, which integrates BPR with other improvement techniques, and ensures adequate identification of the BPR value (Sturdy, 2010).

2.3.5 Revising Reward and Motivation Systems
Al-Mashari and Zairi (2009) argue that Staff motivation through a reward programme has a crucial role in facilitating re-engineering efforts and smoothing and making the BPR success. BPR brings about different jobs, and thus existing reward systems are no longer appropriate for the new work environment (Hammer & Champy, 2004). Therefore, reward systems should be revised as part of the BPR effort and the new reward and incentive system must be widespread, fair and encourage harmony among employees. Introducing new job titles can be considered as one example of encouraging people to endorse the re-engineering programme without fear (Al-Mashari & Zairi, 2009).

2.3.6 IT Infrastructure
IT infrastructure is considered as a vital component to the success of BPR in any organization. According to Sturdy (2010), the competency and effective use of software tools have been proposed as the most important factors that contribute to the success of BPR. These include building an effective IT infrastructure with adequate investment, measures of its effectiveness, proper integration and effective reengineering of legacy of IT. Rajesh et al. (2008) argues that top management should be involved in strategy formulation, as well as providing a commitment for the whole process of redesign, while the IT manager is responsible for designing and implementing the IT strategy.

2.3.7 Communication
Sturdy (2010) argues that communication is an important aspect of BPR, and the ease with which management can communicate through all levels of the organization during a
BPR effort, will have a significant bearing on the success of a BPR project. Communication involves translating the ideas and vision of management, which must then be translated into the attitudes and behaviors of those impacted by the programme it is necessary to ensure, that the communication effort starts well in advance of the commencement of the BPR programme (Johansson et al., 2006). According to Davenport (2006) inadequate communication between BPR teams and other personnel relating to the need for change and the hiding of uncertainties in communication can result in a lack of motivation and reward”.

2.3.8 Organizational Resistance to Change
According to Al-Mashari and Zairi (2009) naturally, BPR fosters change and human being resists change. This resistance is the most common barrier of BPR and renders success difficult. Crowe et al. (2009) argues that employees resist changes because of uncertain future initiated by BPR changes including job loss, authority loss, getting anxious, skepticism about project result and feeling uncomfortable working in new environment after BPR has taken place. Inadequate communication among employees and their leaders which can result into lack of motivation and reward may result into resistance to change. Sturdy (2010) argues that job loss and security combined with a sense of loss of control and position, particularly within middle management can result in resistance to change. However, line managers may not be receptive to change, due to a lack of determination for radical change, and also through a lack of cross-functional cooperation.

2.3.9 Ineffective BPR Teams
An organization embracing BPR has to have the flexibility to create the types of teams required for the successful implementation of the BPR project. Crowe et al. (2009) argue that the inability to create cross-functional project teams and difficulty in finding suitable teams members can give rise to serious problems. Lack of hierarchical structures will leave people thinking solely in terms of their own immediate working group. Conflicts can also occur between BPR teams and the persons within them who have functional responsibilities, which can lead to unclear definition of job roles. Lack of communication among members, lack of training for BPR teams and inadequate team skills will also lead to an ineffective BPR team.
2.3.10 Problems Related to BPR Resources
According to Sturdy (2010) before any BPR project is embarked on, it is very necessary to ensure that all the necessary resources required will be available to the programme. Failure of BPR in organization occurs due to lack of planning of the total financial impact of the process and also difficulty in forecasting future resources that are required after adopting BPR. Grover et al. (2005) argue that there must be preparedness for anything new that an organization adopts. The employees and other resources need to be ready before the introduction of the process which must be introduced in such a way that ensures its successful use. There must be planning which includes considering the organization’s current culture, top management commitment and the adequate resources for carrying out the process and for implementation of the same.

2.4 Tools to Mitigate Negative Impact of BPR on Staff Turnover
According to Thilakasiri (2010) when a BPR project is undertaken across the organization, it requires managing a massive amount of information about the processes, data and systems. If you do not have an excellent tool to support BPR, the management of this information can become an impossible task. To be successful, BPR projects need to be top down, taking in the complete organization, and the full end to end processes. It needs to be supported by tools that make processes easy to track and analyze.

Johansson et al. (2006) argue that BPR seeks to make radical changes in the way a business operates, it is necessary to make concomitant changes in the business as an organic entity. The areas in the organization that need to be changed include; Culture, structure, performance measurements, incentive systems and management styles. In order to do this, management needs to use a number of tools and techniques that have been emerging since the early 1980s under the umbrella of “change management” (Thilakasiri, 2010).

According Neill and Sohal (2009) the various definitions of BPR do not refer specifically to the tools and techniques used in reengineering business processes. This has resulted into many authors and consultants alike pursuing many different tools in the search for the best reengineering application. These tools and techniques include;
2.4.1 Benchmarking

Talluri (2000) indicates that benchmarking is the initial step undertaken by firms that are involved in BPR efforts. It is a process that determines industry best practices and can be utilized as a guide for improving an organization’s practices. Primarily, benchmarking techniques identify efficient and productive business processes that can be used as a target for improvement of inefficient processes which leads to firms indulging in reengineering efforts to reconfigure their processes to improve productivity (Ward, 2008). For this reason benchmarking has gained increasing acceptance as a technique that enhances BPR efforts within organizations.

According to Ward (2008) benchmarking in service industries provides several key insights for improving performance. This is possible if a firm applies the three categories of benchmarking. These categories according to Camp (2005) include; internal, industry/competitive benchmarking and process/generic benchmarking. Internal benchmarking involves benchmarking against internal operations or standards, usually in a multidivisional or multinational enterprise. Industry/competitive benchmarking deals with organizations benchmarking against other firms in the same industry, whether, they are direct competitors or not. In the case of KK Security would benchmark itself with other security firms like G4S and Riley security services and lastly process benchmarking involves generic processes that are used to position leaders in any industry as benchmarks.

Yung and Chan (2007) argue that applying benchmarking during the implementation of BPR projects, organizations will be in a better position both to monitor and to analyze the degree of success of the improvement projects. On the other hand, with sufficient benchmarking, an organization can also learn and improve on the entire business function according to its customers’ perspective. Morris and Brandon (2006) suggested that benchmarking should begin by gathering data about the company, which is later used to benchmark the initial operating processes’ performances and the expected operating processes’ performances after the implementation of various improvement projects. The next major element of benchmarking is to gather information about the way business is conducted and this information will provide a framework for change.
2.4.2 The Matrix for Change

According to Brynjolfsson, Renshaw and Alstyne (2006) the Matrix of Change can help managers identify critical interactions among processes. In particular, this tool helps managers deal with issues such as how quickly change should proceed, the order in which changes should take place, whether to start at a new site, and whether the proposed systems are stable and coherent. When applied at a security firm the Matrix of Change can provide unique and useful guidelines for change management. The Matrix of Change presents a way to capture connections between practices. According to Davenport and Stoddard (2005) it graphically displays both reinforcing and interfering organizational processes. Armed with this knowledge, a change agent can use intuitive principles to seek points of leverage and design a smoother transition.

The Matrix of Change presents a way to capture connections between practices. It graphically displays both reinforcing and interfering organizational processes (Brynjolfsson et al., 2006). Armed with this knowledge, a change agent can use intuitive principles to seek points of leverage and design a smoother transition. Once the broad outlines of the new system and the transition path have been charted, authority can once again be decentralized for local implementation and optimization (Davenport & Stoddard, 2005). The Matrix of Change functions as a four step process. It provides a systematic means to judge those business practices that matter most. It highlights interactions among these practices and possible transition difficulties from one set of practices to another. It encourages various stakeholders to provide feedback on proposed changes. And, it uses process interactions to provide guidelines on the pace; sequence, feasibility, and location of change (Brynjolfsson et al., 2006).

2.4.3 A Strategic Relationships Analysis Tool

According to Eric, Mylopoulos and Lesperance (2006), business processes are modelled as a network of dependency relationships among employees in an organization. Employees depend on each other for goals to be achieved, tasks to be performed, and resources to be furnished. Dependencies may be threaded through roles that employees play, and positions that they occupy (Johansson et al., 2006). These dependencies have strategic implications because on the one hand, they open up opportunities by enabling employees to achieve goals not otherwise achievable, or not as well, but on the other
hand, they bring vulnerabilities since the depended persons may fail to deliver (Eric et al., 2006; Johansson et al., 2006).

This tool allows the network of strategic dependencies among employees and positions and roles to be constructed, refined and analyzed, including the analysis of opportunities and vulnerabilities, and analysis of patterns of dependencies based on the concepts of enforcement, assurance, and insurance (Magutu et al., 2010). The tool also includes a graphic user interface for presenting and manipulating the model. For example, this tool might be used to construct and analyze the claim-processing model or its alternatives, for that matter, noting goals that are not being achieved, tasks that are not being accomplished or resources that are not being furnished. The tool can also note long chains of dependencies that suggest vulnerabilities, or dependency patterns which define conflict-of-interest situations (Eric et al., 2006).

**2.4.4 Strategic Relationship Redesign Tool**

According to Lindsay (2006) the basic idea of this tool is that one can obtain an understanding of the “why” behind process elements or steps by following their links to process design goals, extending the rationale model when appropriate. Alternatively, given some design goals, one can explore alternative ways for achieving them. This could be assisted by generic means-ends knowledge (for example: methods for reducing errors, for preventing fraud) that are stored in a knowledge base, using knowledge structuring mechanisms such as classification and generalization. Moreover, correlation rules can be used to assist in the detection of cross-impacts among goals and in identifying design tradeoffs.

Eric et al. (2006) explain that one of the challenges in constructing such a tool is to collect a representative body of means-ends knowledge in business process redesign to illustrate the practical utility of this tool. A first step towards this goal has been the collection of methods for achieving security, accuracy and performance soft goals in the context of non-functional requirements for information system design.

**2.4.5 A Process Model Validation Tool**

This tool provides support for validating a process model that is, confirming that it is consistent with the understanding of the process (Mathu, Whitman & Cheraghi, 2009).
Validation is accomplished by allowing the user to simulate the execution of a process. Given a description of the conditions in effect at the beginning of a business process, the tool answers queries about the state of world as the process proceeds. The tool offers a declarative language for process specification and can simulate processes even when a process or its initial state is only partially specified. Given a process specification and a partial description of an organizational state, the simulation tool is intended to answer questions about the state of the organization during and after the business process reengineering has been carried out (Eric et al., 2006).

2.4.5 A Process Verification Tool
Mathu et al. (2009) argue that, this tool is intended to assist with verifying that a specified process satisfies given properties, in particular, state constraints in the organization. Given a set of process specifications and a set of constraints that have to be maintained by business process reengineering, the tool will suggest strengthened specifications to ensure that the constraints are sorted out.

According to Wynn (2007), using the process verification tool, makes it possible to identify potential problems during the introduction of business process reengineering in the organization and if so, the model can be modified before it is used for execution. Systems such as workflow systems rely on process verification tool for execution of work.

2.4.6 Training and Education
According to Al-Mashari and Zairi (2009) many researchers consider training and education to be an important component technique for successful BPR implementation. BPR is a simple concept, but to use it confidently and efficiently will require you training your managers in the thinking on tools that lie behind it. Much of this can be done in-house on-the-job by managers who have gained these skills previously, and are using them with their teams or can consider specific training.

Organizations that undertake re-engineering projects may have to increase their training budgets. BPR-related concept, skills, and techniques as well as interpersonal and Information technology skills, are all important dimensions of training for BPR. Employees and their mangers need to be trained on tools that are adopted and other
processes that are undertaken in the implementation BPR projects (Maul et al., 2008). This training benefits business managers, line managers, Information system managers, and other staff in the front-line.

2.4.7 Urgency Theory
This involves organizations dealing with the phenomenon of doing more with less. This can be used as a technique to mitigate BPR on staff turnover since after BPR, most organizations downsize without figuring out how to reduce the workload. This leaves employees who remain at the company to devote themselves to do all the work that is left behind by their colleagues who are sent home after reengineering (Lindsay, 2006). According to this theory, obtaining greater productivity and performance from employees in significant less time is a constant management concern. This then challenges a manager’s ability to effectively manage time pressure, limited resources and fewer people after reengineering while trying to augment productivity and performance output (Carter, 2005).

According to Carter (2005) this theory would be an important technique to mitigate the impact of business process reengineering however, some of the advantages and disadvantages to be considered before taking the theory. Some of the advantages include; Greater productivity and performance in less time; Greater customer responsiveness and appreciation of customers’ time needs; Significant competitive advantage; Eliminates weak performance; Better time management and Improved ability to develop innovations and more core competencies. The disadvantages of urgency theory include; Burnout factor, too many responsibilities being given to one person, quality levels being compromised due to inefficiencies as a result causing chaos.

2.5 Chapter Summary
The chapter was able to highlight the definition of Business process reengineering, its elements and key concepts that are entailed in the process. It was able to show that when undertaking BPR there are a number of reasons that need to be considered like the impacts of the change on its people. When planning to undertake BPR, there is need to communicate the process to the employees so that they are part of the whole process and this would reduce the level of resistance while undertaking the change in the organization. It also identified the different tools and techniques to be used to mitigate negative impact
Business process reengineering and to have a successful process. The next chapter discusses the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter highlights the research methodology that was used in the study of BPR at KK Security and its effects on staff turnover. The research process includes the research design, the population which includes the specific population that the study focused on; sampling design; sampling frame; sampling technique; sample size showing the distribution of the population; data collection methods; research procedures and the data analysis methods that was used in this study.

3.2 Research Design
The research adopted a descriptive design, where the researcher measured the impact of business process reengineering on staff turnover at KK Security. According to Malhotra (2007) the main objective of descriptive research design is to describe something - usually characteristics or functions. The design was appropriate, as it allowed the description, interpretation, of existing relationships and comparison of variables under study. According to Sloman (2010) descriptive analysis has the following advantages; it involves direct observation of behaviour in a natural environment thus providing a means to gather baseline rates of the problem behaviour and, it is useful in identifying particular antecedents or consequences to incorporate in functional analysis.

This design was appropriate because the respondents were expected to inform how BPR at their company had impacted on Staff turnover. The design focused on understanding and explaining the BPR and staff turnover and constituted the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data. This research helped in providing information that was used for further research so as to gain conclusive evidence in future. The research targeted administrative staff at KK Security with emphasis that the target population be derived from different departments in the organization.
3.3. Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1. Population

Castillo (2009) defines population in relation to research as a large collection of individuals or objects that is the main focus of a scientific query. The target population for the study was administrative staff at KK Security head office in Nairobi. This staff was drawn from different departments in the office which included; customer care, sales and marketing, finance, training, operations and the business development department. The research targeted 100 administrative staff at the head office.

3.3.2. Sampling Design

3.3.2.1. Sampling Frame

According to Currivan (2004), a sampling frame is a list or device used to define a researcher’s population of interest. It defines a set of elements from which a researcher can select a sample of the target population. The selection of a sample from a defined target population requires the construction of a sampling frame which ensures that the right population that the researcher is targeting for the research is identified. The sampling frame for the study was obtained from the administrative staff at KK Security Head Office in Nairobi.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

Having identified the target group, the research adopted the probability sampling research design and use stratified random sampling to identify the strata or subgroups that represented the entire administrative staff at KK security based on the respondent’s descriptions drawn from different departments. In this research probability sampling was used so as to ensure that individuals in the process were given equal chances of being selected (Crossman, 2012).

A stratified sample was used to divide the entire target population into different subgroups (strata) in this case the targeted administrative staff at KK Security was subgrouped according to the various departments they were drawn from. From these subgroups the appropriate number for the research was drawn. This was to ensure that the research had adequate amount of subjects from each department participating in the research. Stratified sampling was used to ensure that the sample population for conducting research was a good representation of the overall population at KK Security.
and reduced cases of bias. The method was also very easy to carry out and of very high efficiency.

Stratified random sampling was appropriate in this research to break the population of interest into mutually exhaustive sample population called strata. This was to ensure that specific groups were represented, even proportionally, in the sample(s) (different departments), by selecting individuals from strata list (Black, 2009). Eventually, the respondents per category were obtained using the probability sampling by use of simple random sampling. This was to ensure that the process was less biased and that there was an equal chance of representation of all the administrative staff at the organization. Purposeful sampling was also applied in this research to select the right respondents that were knowledgeable on the information that was being sought in this research.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
The sample size that was used in this research was 83 administrative staff at KK Security head office. This was drawn from different departments in the office and the highest number being derived from the administration department as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent departments</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; HR</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer care and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Data Collection Methods
Primary data was obtained through the use of administering questionnaires which were structured according to the research objectives of this research. The questions contained both closed ended and open ended question and were standardized to ensure validity and
reliability. The questionnaires were administered to the individuals selected from within the targeted population at KK Security and especially drawn from the different department at the company. The questionnaires were taken to the selected individuals and were collected after two days from the date of delivery. This was possible through the assistance of a research assistant. The responses received from the administration of the questionnaires were treated in confidence and strictly used for the purpose of this research.

3.5 Research Procedures
The questionnaires were designed on the basis of the research questions and were standardized, valid and reliable for testing purposes. The questionnaires were first pre-tested at the administration department at the company for the purpose of getting its reliability in capturing the needed information. This helped in the validation of the final questionnaires that were used in the study. Prior to the administration of the questionnaires for the selected employees at KK security, a communication was done via email to book appointments and after confirmation; the research assistant delivered the questionnaires to the targeted individuals at the company. These questionnaires were accompanied by a letter of introduction stating the purpose of the research that was being undertaken.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods
Data analysis methods help to describe facts, detect patterns, develop explanations, and test hypotheses. It is used in all of the sciences. It is used in business, in administration, and in policy (Levine, 2006). Descriptive statistics includes the numbers, tables, charts, and graphs used to describe, organize, summarize, and present raw data and enables the researcher to meaningfully describe a distribution of measurements (Texas State, 2005). After the questionnaires were received from the respondents, they were all given reference numbers to the answers and the responses grouped into categories. This was necessary for efficient analysis of data which includes categorizing, manipulating and summarizing of data to obtain answers to research questions. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was designed to perform statistical analysis on quantitative data. Since the study was descriptive, descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were calculated. This was to enable the researcher to reduce,
summarize, and describe quantitative data obtained from empirical evidence. The analyzed data was presented in tables and charts for better interpretation.

3.7 Chapter Summary
This chapter has covered the research methodology that was used in this research. It has shown that this research adopted the causal research design and the target population was the administrative staff at KK Security. The sample size for this research was 83 respondents who were drawn from different departments in the company through the use of stratified sampling. Questionnaires were used as the data collection tools and the questionnaires were designed based on the research objectives that guided the research and were administered to the selected population at their workplace. The next chapter presents results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results and findings of the study on the research questions with regards to the data collected from the respondents with respect to KK limited. The first section covers the background information with regards to the respondents. The second section covers the various aspects on the role of BPR at KK Security. The third section looks at the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security and the final section was on the tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security. A total of 51 administrative staff at KK Security participated in the survey which represented a 62% response rate.

4.2 Background Information
This section presents the background information on the gender of the respondents, age, position held in the organization and the number of working years.

4.2.1 Gender of the Respondents
Table 4.1 shows the findings with regards to the gender of the respondents. Female participants had a high representation of 55% while male were 45%. This shows a parading shift in this industry given that the security sector had for long been a preserve for the men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of the Respondents</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Age of the Respondents
Table 4.2 presents a summary of the findings with regards to the age of the respondents. In terms of age 31-40 age group were 56% followed by 41 -50 group with 22%, 21-30 group had the lowest representation of 8%. These findings show that indeed most employees were fairly young and therefore in a better position to comprehend the new trends in business process engineering.

Table 4.2: Age of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of the Respondents</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41– 50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Position held in the Organization
Table 4.3, presents a summary of the with regards to the various positions held in the organization. Position wise, majority were from middle level (37%), subordinate 29%, lower level 18% while the lowest percentage was in the management level with 16% representation. This findings show that indeed most respondents being in the middle management were able to comprehend the concept of business process re-engineering.

Table 4.3: Position held in the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level (Heads of department)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level (Management trainees and Supervisors)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate (Administration and clerks)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Number of Working Years
Table 4.4 presents a summary of the findings with regards to the number of working years. As seen in the table, 47% had 5years & above work experience, 3 – 4 years 25%,
between 1-2 years 18% while 10% had less than a year experience, as shown in by the table.

**Table 4.4: Number of working Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Working Years</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and above</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 The Role of BPR

The first objective of the study was to establish the role of BPR at KK. The following subsection will dwell on the various elements that come into play specifically with regards to BPR at the organization.

4.3.1 Employee Experience of BPR

Ninety percent of the KK security said that they had experienced business process reengineering. A crosstab between the staff who had experienced BPR and the participant departments showed that only the training department had some staff (33%) that had not experienced BPR as show from the figure below. This might be explained by the fact that the training department acts as the initial starting point for the new staff thus the staff here could be less than a year in the organization which explains why they might not have experienced BPR.

![Figure 4.1: BPR Experience](image)
4.3.2 BPR importance in the Implementation of BPR at KK Security

The participants were asked to rank the level of importance that BPR enablers have played in the implementation of a business process reengineering project. As seen in table 4.5, the participants were of the view that team work has played a major role in BPR implementation with a mean of 4.18, followed by resources at a mean of 4.06, Six Sigma (mean of 4), Information technology and resources (human and capital) had a mean of 3.98, while Total Quality Management had a lower mean of 3.92. In overall all the four implementation roles in the table below were rated above 50% (Important and Very Important) thus in conclusion the four BPR enablers had played an important role in the BPR implementation.

Table 4.5: BPR Importance to the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPR Enablers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N.I</th>
<th>L.I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>V.I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Work</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources (human &amp; capital)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Sigma (Measure of quality)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: N.I=Not Important; L.I=Less Important; N=Neutral; I=Important; V.I=Very Important

4.4 Impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security

The second objective of the study was to investigate the impact of BPR on staff turnover at KK security. Table 4.6 presents the findings with regards to the participants respondents on the level of importance of change management factors on successful implementation of BPR, effective communication was rated highest with a mean of 4.33, project planning and Management 4.29, IT infrastructure 4.23 and organization structure was fourth with a mean of 4.15 thus on average change management being rated an important factor for BPR implementation. Ineffective teamwork and employees resistance to change were ranked lowest with a mean of 3.91 and 3.69 respectively, this signifies that these factors were both viewed to be important & non important.
Table 4.6: Importance of change management factors in BPR implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPR Enablers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N.I</th>
<th>L.I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>V.I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project planning and Management</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT infrastructure</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Resources</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Competency</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and Motivation Systems</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of team work</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective teamwork</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Resistance to Change</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: N.I=Not Important; L.I=Less Important; N=Neutral; I=Important; V.I=Very Important

4.4.1 BPR Impact on Staff Motivational Level

The study further sought to establish the impact of BPR on motivational levels of staff. As seen in the table 4.7 for majority (43%) of the KK security staff, the motivation level after BPR project was fair, 30% felt it was low, 22% very low while only 2% felt that the staff motivation was high after the introduction of BPR project. In overall the introduction of BPR did not have a high impact on the motivation of KK security staff.

Table 4.7: BPR impact on Staff Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 (very low)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 (low)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 (fair)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 (high)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4.2 Extent of BPR impact in KK security

Further the study sought to establish the extent of BPR impact at KK security. The following subsection presents a summary of the findings with regards to these aspects. As seen in table 4.8, increase of hiring of employees in the company and laying off of employees were rated highly with a mean of 3.69 each, thus indicating that they were impacted by BPR quite often, on the other hand new organizational shared values and beliefs, new roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees and new customer focused processes had a mean of 3.24, 3.12 and 3.08 respectively thus impacted by BPR sometimes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPR Impact</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N.A</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A.T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase of hiring of employees in the company</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying off of employees</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New organizational shared values and beliefs</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New customer focused processes</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key: N.A=Not at All; R=Rarely; S=Sometimes; O=Often; A.T= All the Time*

### 4.4.3 Relationship between BPR and Staff Turnover

As seen in table 4.9 there is a direct positive relationship between the business process re-engineering and staff turnover (.357). This finding indeed indicates that business process reengineering is likely to bring about staff turnover of firms operating in Kenya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Staff Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson C.</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
4.5 Tools to Mitigate Negative Impact of BPR on Staff Turnover

The third and final objective of the study was to determine the tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security. The following subsection dwells into this aspect by seeking respondents’ views on this matter.

4.5.1 Process Model Validation Tool

Respondents were asked to state the extent of the use of process model validation tool in mitigating the negative impact of staff turnover. As seen in the figure majority of the respondents 33% believe that process model validation tool is used sometimes, 29% often, 20% rarely, 12% all the time, while 6% not at all. This implies that indeed process model validation tools are used by KK security.

![Figure 4.2: Process Model Validation Tool](image)

4.5.2 Urgency Theory

Figure 4.3 presents a summary of the findings with regards to the use of the urgency theory in mitigating the negative impact of BPR. As seen in the figure majority of the respondents 35% believe that urgency theory is used often, 22% rarely, 20% sometimes, 12% all the time, while 10% not at all. This implies that indeed urgency theory as a tool is used by KK security to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR.
4.5.3 Process Verification Tool

Figure 4.4 presents a summary of the findings with regards to how KK uses process verification tools to mitigate the negative impact of BPR. As seen in the figure majority of the respondents 33% believe that process verification tool is used often, 24% rarely, 24% sometimes, 10% all the time, while 8% not at all. This implies that indeed process verification as a tool is used by KK security to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR.

4.5.4 Benchmarking with other Companies

Figure 4.5 presents a summary of the findings with regards to how KK security benchmarks with other companies in a bid to reduce the negative impacts of BPR. As seen in the figure majority of the respondents 28% believe that KK security benchmarks itself with other companies often, 17% rarely, 13% sometimes, 20% all the time, while 22% not at all. This implies that indeed benchmarking as a tool is used by KK security to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR.
4.5.5 Strategic Relationship Analysis Tool

Figure 4.6 presents a summary of the findings with regards to how KK security uses a strategic relationships analysis tool to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR. As seen in the figure majority of the respondents 33% believe that KK security uses a strategic relationships analysis tool to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR rarely, 27% sometimes, 24% often, 10% all the time, while 6% not at all. This implies that indeed KK security uses a strategic relationships analysis tool rarely to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR.

4.5.6 Matrix of Change

As seen in figure 4.7 majority of the respondents 29% believe that KK security uses a matrix of change tool to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR often, 20% sometimes, 22% rarely, 12% all the time, while 16% not at all. This implies that indeed KK security uses a matrix of change tool to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR.
4.5.7 Training and Education of the Process

As seen in figure 4.8 majority of the respondents 24% believe that KK security uses training and education of the process to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR often, 24% sometimes, 16% rarely, 14% all the time, while 20% not at all. This implies that indeed KK security rarely uses training and education of the process to mitigate the negative impacts of BPR.

These findings show that indeed Process Model Validation Tool and Urgency theory had a mean of 3.15, Process Verification tool and benchmarking with other companies had a mean of 3.09 and 3.02 respectively. This shows that they were used sometimes in mitigation of negative impact of BPR on staff turnover. A strategic relationships analysis tool, matrix of change & training and education of the process were rarely used for mitigation.
4.6 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, results and findings based on the specific objectives have been presented in form of tables and figures. The next chapter provides a detailed discussion of the results and findings. Conclusions as well as recommendations will also be made. Recommendations for improvement on each specific objective will be provided followed by recommendations for further studies.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into four sections, which includes the chapter summary, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations respectively. The initial section provides a detailed summary of the elements that are important to the study. This includes the study objectives, methodology and the findings. The consequent section that follows offers a discussion of the major findings of the study with regards to the specific objectives. The third Section provides a detailed discussion as well as the conclusions, which are based on the specific objectives. This however is in light of the study findings and results that were obtained in the chapter four. The last sub-section provides the recommendations for improvement, which are based on the specific objectives. It also provides the recommendations made for further studies.

5.2 Summary

The general objective of this research was to assess the business process reengineering at KK Security and its effects on staff turnover. The study made sought to achieve the following objectives: to examine the role of BPR at KK Security; to investigate the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security and to determine the tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security.

In order to achieve the above, the study adopted a descriptive research design in order to obtain the data that is necessary, which in essence facilitated the collection of the primary data as a way of getting into the research objectives. The population under study was employees at KK security Company Limited. Simple random sampling technique was used to determine the sample size because of the homogeneity of the population and to reduce high refusal rates. The sample size was 83 respondents of which only 51 responded. The collection of the primary data was done using structured questionnaires that were pilot tested in order to ensure that there was reliability as well as validity. The coding of the data was done with the use of Microsoft Excel as well as SPSS in order to generate the descriptive statistics for instance frequencies and percentages. The presentation of the results was in form of tables and figures, as well as cross tabulations.
The findings on the role of BPR at KK Security revealed that team work has played a major role in BPR implementation, followed by resources, Six Sigma, Information technology and resources (human and capital), Total Quality Management. This implies that indeed the four BPR enablers had played an important role in the BPR implementation.

The findings on the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security revealed that effective communication was rated highest followed by, project planning and Management IT infrastructure organization structure was fourth, Ineffective teamwork and Employees Resistance to Change respectively. Further the study sought to establish the extent of BPR impact at KK security. increase of hiring of employees in the company and laying off of employees were rated highly with a mean of 3.69 each, thus indicating that they were impacted by BPR quite often, on the other hand new organizational shared values and beliefs, new roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees and new customer focused processes had a mean of 3.24, 3.12 and 3.08 respectively thus impacted by BPR sometimes.

The findings on tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security revealed that indeed KK security uses Process Model Validation Tool, Urgency theory, Process Verification tool and benchmarking with other companies to mitigate the negative impact of BPR. This shows that they were used sometimes in mitigation of negative impact of BPR on staff turnover. A strategic relationships analysis tool, matrix of change and training and education of the process were rarely used for mitigation.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Role of BPR
The findings on the role of BPR at KK Security revealed that team work has played a major role in BPR implementation, followed by resources, Six Sigma, Information technology and resources (human and capital), Total Quality Management. This implies that indeed the four BPR enablers had played an important role in the BPR implementation.

This finding is in line with La Rock (2008), who argues that BPR seeks to break from current processes and to devise new ways of organizing tasks, organizing people and...
making use of IT systems so that the resulting processes will better support the goals of the organization. Radhakrishnan and Balasubramanian (2008) argue that new technologies often provide breakthrough in business process reengineering. They enable new processes that previously were not possible for example the internet is an example of a mechanism that fundamentally changes customer service processes by giving customers new ways to access information, conduct transactions and interact with companies.

The findings on the role of Six Sigma, affirms the arguments by Carey (2010), who avowed that the essence of Six Sigma is found in the reality that business processes are inherently unpredictable. Six Sigma provides a way of measuring the variability in a process as it delivers services to an end-user or customer. The findings also agree with Gopalan (2011) who argued that Six Sigma in many organizations simply means a measure of quality that strives for near perfection. Six Sigma is a disciplined, data-driven approach and methodology for eliminating defects in any process from manufacturing to transactional and from product to service. Business process reengineering and Six Sigma deal with improving an organization’s process from the customer perspective.

The findings on information technology and its role on BPR, is in line with Bhuvaneswari (2009), who argues that the role of IT is to make a new process design possible. The applications of IT to reengineering require inductive thinking, which is the ability to first recognize a powerful solution and then seek the problems that it might solve. A fundamental error that most companies commit when they look at technology is to see how a new technology will help in solving problems in their existing process. The companies have to think how a technology can help them to do things that they are not doing in the current process.

The study finding on human capital affirms the argument by Goksoy et al. (2012), who argue that, the human resource enablers focus on new process skills, job motivation and human resource policies. The human factor plays an important role in the daily operations, performance and success of organizations. No reengineering effort will succeed without first reeducating and retraining people who will ultimately work the new process. According to Al-Mashari and Zairi (2009) all people must be openly and actively involved and should be consulted at all stages of the process by its leaders. This people involved including; line managers, process owners and those involved in Information Systems. The idea of experimentation is an essential part of a successfully reengineered
organization and, therefore, people involved or affected by BPR must be prepared to endure errors and mistakes while reengineering is taking place.

Finally the findings on Total quality management agrees with Gunasekaran and Love (2007), who argued that Total Quality Management is an enabling ingredient that can contribute to the successful implementation of BPR. Essentially, TQM forms the foundations of BPR as it embraces open communications, and breaks down the barriers which exist between management and non-management personnel. Gopalan (2011) indicates that Total Quality Management and BPR share a cross-functional relationship.

5.3.2 Impact of BPR on Staff Turnover
The findings on the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security revealed that effective communication was rated highest followed by, project planning and Management IT infrastructure organization structure was fourth, Ineffective teamwork and Employees Resistance to Change respectively. Further the study sought to establish the extent of BPR impact at KK security. It was established that increase of hiring of employees in the company and laying off of employees were rated, thus indicating that they were impacted by BPR quite often, on the other hand new organizational shared values and beliefs, new roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees and new customer focused processes were impacted by BPR sometimes.

The findings on effective communication agrees with La Rock (2008), who argues that communication between stakeholders inside and outside the organization is necessary to market a BPR program and to ensure patience and understanding of the structural and cultural changes needed as well as the organization's competitive position. Communication should be open, honest, and clear, especially when discussing sensitive issues related to change such as personnel reductions.

Additionally the findings on empowerment, affirms that BPR results in decisions being pushed down to lower levels of the organizational structure and both individuals and teams becomes a critical factor for successful BPR efforts. This enables staff at all levels to feel more responsible and accountable and it promotes self-management and a collaborative teamwork culture. La Rock (2008) Empowerment means that staff is given
the chance to participate in redesign processes. When empowered, employees are able set their goals and monitor their own performance as well as identify and solve problems that affect their work and also able to support the BPR efforts.

Similarly the findings on management capability is in agreement with Abdolvand et al. (2008), who argues that, top leadership should always have a clear knowledge about the current situation of the organization. This is because they play a crucial role in organizational process improvement as they are the primary decision makers and the essential ingredients of any human activity system. This is necessary for BPR to have a “sufficient knowledge about the BPR projects” and “realistic expectation of BPR results.” As a result, top management should be able to provide employees with channels of communication and improve their ability of understanding each other and also the BPR projects that a company undertakes. This empowers employees and they are able and willing to cooperate in a new system.

In the same regard, the findings on project planning affirms that proper planning for the BPR project with an adequate time frame are key factors in delivering a successful BPR project on time. The project management includes; strategic alignment, effective planning and project management techniques, identification of performance, adequate resources, effective use of consultants, building a process vision and integrating BPR with other improvement techniques (La Rock, 2008). These techniques identify a methodology for external orientation and learning, making effective use of consultants in building a process vision, which integrates BPR with other improvement techniques, and ensures adequate identification of the BPR value.

The study finding on resistance to change also affirms that resistance is the most common barrier of BPR and renders success difficult. Crowe et al. (2009) and Palmer (2004) argues that employees resist changes because of uncertain future initiated by BPR changes including job loss, authority loss, getting anxious, skepticism about project result and feeling uncomfortable working in new environment after BPR has taken place. Inadequate communication among employees and their leaders which can result into lack of motivation and reward may result into resistance to change. This is also in agreement with (Sturdy, 2010) who argues that job loss and security combined with a sense of loss of control and position, particularly within middle management can result in resistance to change.
5.3.3 Tools to Mitigate the Negative Impact of BPR

The findings on tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security revealed that indeed KK security uses Process Model Validation Tool, Urgency theory, Process Verification tool and benchmarking with other companies to mitigate the negative impact of BPR. This shows that they were used sometimes in mitigation of negative impact of BPR on staff turnover. A strategic relationships analysis tool, matrix of change and training and education of the process were rarely used for mitigation.

The findings on the use of benchmarking agrees with Talluri (2000) who argues that benchmarking is the initial step undertaken by firms that are involved in business process reengineering (BPR) efforts. It is a process that determines industry best practices and can be utilized as a guide for improving an organization’s practices. Primarily, benchmarking techniques identify efficient and productive business processes that can be used as a target for improvement of inefficient processes which leads to firms indulging in reengineering efforts to reconfigure their processes to improve productivity. For this reason benchmarking has gained increasing acceptance as a technique that enhances BPR efforts within organizations.

The findings on the matrix for change align with Brynjolfsson et al. (2006) who argued that the Matrix of Change can help managers identify critical interactions among processes. In particular, this tool helps managers deal with issues such as how quickly change should proceed, the order in which changes should take place, whether to start at a new site, and whether the proposed systems are stable and coherent. When applied at a security firm the Matrix of Change can provide unique and useful guidelines for change management. The Matrix of Change presents a way to capture connections between practices. It graphically displays both reinforcing and interfering organizational processes. Armed with this knowledge, a change agent can use intuitive principles to seek points of leverage and design a smoother transition.

Additionally the findings on the process verification tools agrees with Eric et al. (2006) who argue that, this tool is intended to assist with verifying that a specified process satisfies given properties, in particular, state constraints in the organization. Given a set of process specifications and a set of constraints that have to be maintained by business process reengineering, the tool will suggest strengthened specifications to ensure that the constraints are sorted out.
According to Wynn (2007) using the process verification tool makes it possible to identify potential problems during the introduction of business process reengineering in the organization and if so, the model can be modified before it is used for execution. Systems such as workflow systems rely on process verification tool for execution of work.

In the same regard the findings on the urgency theory agrees with Carter (2005) who argues that this theory would be an important technique to mitigate the impact of business process reengineering however, some of the advantages and disadvantages to be considered before taking the theory. Some of the advantages include; Greater productivity and performance in less time; Greater customer responsiveness and appreciation of customers’ time needs; Significant competitive advantage; Eliminates weak performance; Better time management and Improved ability to develop innovations and more core competencies. The disadvantages of urgency theory include; Burnout factor, too many responsibilities being given to one person, quality levels being compromised due to inefficiencies as a result causing chaos.

Additionally the findings on strategy relationship analysis tool however disagrees with Eric et al. (2006) who argued that business processes are modelled as a network of dependency relationships among employees in an organization. Employees depend on each other for goals to be achieved, tasks to be performed, and resources to be furnished. Dependencies may be threaded through roles that employees play, and positions that they occupy. These dependencies have strategic implications because on the one hand, they open up opportunities by enabling employees to achieve goals not otherwise achievable, or not as well, but on the other hand, they bring vulnerabilities since the depended persons may fail to deliver.

5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Role of BPR

The findings on the role of BPR at KK Security leads to a conclusion that team work has played a major role in BPR implementation, followed by resources, Six Sigma, Information technology and resources (human and capital), Total Quality Management. This implies that indeed the four BPR enablers had played an important role in the BPR implementation.
5.4.2 Impact of BPR on Staff Turnover
The findings on the impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security lead to a conclusion that effective communication impacts on staff turnover followed by, project planning and Management IT infrastructure organization structure was fourth, Ineffective teamwork and Employees Resistance to Change respectively. Further the study concludes that increase of hiring of employees in the company and laying off of employees were rated, thus indicating that they were impacted by BPR quite often, on the other hand new organizational shared values and beliefs, new roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees and new customer focused processes were impacted by BPR sometimes.

5.4.3 Tools to Mitigate the Negative Impact of BPR
The findings on tools to mitigate negative impact of BPR on Staff turnover at KK Security, lead to a conclusion that indeed KK security uses Process Model Validation Tool, Urgency theory, Process Verification tool and benchmarking with other companies to mitigate the negative impact of BPR. This shows that they were used sometimes in mitigation of negative impact of BPR on staff turnover. A strategic relationships analysis tool, matrix of change and training and education of the process were rarely used for mitigation.

5.5 Recommendations
5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement
5.5.1.1 Role of BPR
The study acknowledges the important role of BPR in organizations as such; it recommends that organizations that are seeking for success in the industry sector in which the company is doing business should conceptualize the concept of BPR. His is because these processes are those that the business strategy has identified as critical to excel at, in order to match or beat the competition.

5.5.1.2 Impact of BPR on Staff Turnover
The study recommends that most companies should be very cautious when re-engineering in order to avoid downsize without figuring out how to reduce the workload. This is because legitimate reengineering is a matter of streamlining internal processes and
eliminating redundancies. However, this has also become a euphemism for staff reduction and de-layering. This leaves managers with pressure of working with slashed budgets, downsized workforces, mergers and acquisitions. As a result of downsizing and cost cutting, people get stressed because they do not view their jobs as stable.

5.5.1.3 Tools to Mitigate the Negative Impact of BPR
The study acknowledges that there are negative impacts of BPR which have to be minimized using various tools. In this regard therefore the study recommends that for organizations to be successful, BPR projects need to be top down, taking in the complete organization, and the full end to end processes. It needs to be supported by tools that make processes easy to track and analyze.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies
The main limitations of the study were none other than limited time measurement for the collection of data as well as the questionnaire survey. The researcher therefore recommends that since the sector is still likely to experience growth, there is need to enhance BPR as a tool of not only facilitating competitive advantage and profitability but also streamlining the sector to suit into the millennium development goals. In this regard therefore the researcher recommends that there is need to have additional studies conducted in this area as it was superficially discussed in this paper.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

Business Process Reengineering involves the radical redesign of core businesses processes to achieve dramatic improvements in productivity, cycle times and quality. This questionnaire is to be filled in its entirety and with as much details as possible. Please relate the answers of this questionnaire to any business process reengineering that has been or is being undertaken in your organization.

PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (Please Tick appropriately for each question and Specify where necessary).

1. Gender
   Male [  ]    Female [  ]

2. Age group
   21 - 30 [  ]    31 - 40 [  ]    41 - 50 [  ]    51 and above [  ]

3. What is your position at KK Security?
   Management [  ]
   Middle level (Heads of department) [  ]
   Lower level (Management trainees and Supervisors) [  ]
   Subordinate (Administration and clerks) [  ]
   Others (Specify) .................................................................

4. How long have you worked at KK Security?
   Less than a year [  ]
   Between 1-2 years [  ]
   3-4 years [  ]
   5 years and above [  ]
PART 2: THE ROLE OF BPR IN AN ORGANIZATION

5. Have you experienced Business Process Reengineering as an employee of KK Security?
   Yes [    ]   No [    ]

       If Yes, under which department? ……………………………………….

6. Rank the level of importance that BPR enablers (i)-(iv) below have played in the implementation of a business process reengineering project at KK Security (tick in order of the highest to the lowest; 1= least important; 5= most important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Team Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Resources (human &amp; capital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3: IMPACT OF BPR ON STAFF TURNOVER

7. In your opinion rank the factors below and the level of their importance and impact on the successful implementation of BPR. (Tick in order of the highest to the lowest; 1= least important/least influential; 5= most important/most influential).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Effective Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Management Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Reward and Motivation Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Organizational Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) IT infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Employees Resistance to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Lack of team work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Inadequate Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What are the motivational levels of staff after the introduction of BPR project on a scale of 1 to 10?

9. Please indicate the extent to which the areas below have been impacted by Business Process Reengineering (BPR) in the organization on a scale of 1-5. (1-not at all, 2-rarely, 3-sometimes, 4-often, 5-all the time).

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |   |   |   |   |   |

   i) Increase of hiring of employees in the company
   ii) Laying off of employees
   iii) New roles necessitating the acquisition of multiple skills by employees
   iv) New customer focused processes
   v) New organizational shared values and beliefs

PART 4: TOOLS TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF BPR ON STAFF TURNOVER

10. Please indicate to what extent the Business Process Reengineering project in your company used the following tools and techniques within the areas impacted by the project. Please tick where appropriate on a scale of 1-5. (1-not at all, 2-rarely, 3-sometimes, 4-often, 5-all the time).

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |   |   |   |   |   |

   i) Benchmarking with other companies
   ii) Matrix of change (How change should take place)
   iii) Training and Education
   iv) Use of new procedures, rules and regulations
   v) Involvement of staff in the project
11. Please indicate if business process reengineering has resulted in the improvement of work ethic factors listed below. Please tick where appropriate on a scale of 1-5 (1-strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Improvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Focus (Internal or External)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of innovative ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Team work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance and use of Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition and use of new knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance and use of decision making powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Thank you for your time’