



The Relationship Between Administrative Hypocrisy And The Organization Disorder: Diagnostic Approach

Younus et al

HexaTimes, USA

The Relationship Between Administrative Hypocrisy And The Organization Disorder: Diagnostic Approach

Prof. Tareq Shareef Younus¹, Dr. Reyaz Ahmmad², Dr. Lakshmi Radrakrishnan³,
Dr. Hasan Wahba⁴ and Dr. Faisal Al Bourini⁵

¹American College of Dubai, UAE, Email: tareq.younus@acd.ae

²American College of Dubai, UAE, Email: reyaz.ahmad@acd.ae

³American College of Dubai, UAE, Email: lakshmi.radhakrishnan@acd.ae

⁴American College of Dubai, UAE, Email: president@acd.ae

⁵Jadara University, Jordan, Email: mailto:bourini.faisal@gmail.com

Received: 24 Jun 19

Published online: 11 Jul 19

ABSTRACT

Administrative hypocrisy is one of the sources of deception that is often practiced by fakers and opportunists to achieve personal ends at the expense of public interests. These practices fall within the group of people that claim to be theoretically fair while their conduct is in complete contradiction with the values of integrity. Organizations regardless of their place of work or ownership type are subject to new conditions imposed by the global transformations in the context of competition, survival and sustainability in the market, including the standards of quality management performance, transparency in governance; organizations were guided by a clear vision consistent with the expectations of the customers. On the basis of the above, the current research is expected to answer the question: "What is the effect of administrative hypocrisy on the organizations disorder? What are the factors behind this type of behavior? This research has used both quantitative and qualitative methods (survey and interview) in order to provide greater validity of the research. For the quantitative research, structured questionnaire were distributed to (57) employees of the selected firms, while 22 respondents were interviewed for the qualitative research. The data analysis and statistical findings have shown that administrative hypocrisy does have a significant effect on the organization disorder. It is therefore recommended that analysis revealed the complexity of the variables of mismanagement and low values of administrative work are most influential in the existence of administrative hypocrisy phenomenon. And that their effect is significant as well as that the other variables in the research model did not appear to have a significant effect. The research recommended the importance of having an administrative value system that would attract an efficient administrative staff which fulfills the administrative work in compliance with the regulations and policies in place.

KEYWORDS: Hypocrisy, Deception, Integrity, Honesty, Organization Disorder, relevancy, Toxics Leadership

1. INTRODUCTION

Good versus Evil always stands the base of classification to all kind of actions and human behaviors. These two terms have been used in different disciplines and walks of life since the inception of the world.

It has been used extensively in describing human behavior, including administrative behavior in organizations. In the current research, the use of the term good administrative behavior and inappropriate administrative behavior will be the focus of discussion and scrutiny.

On one hand good behavior is a general term but it is a result of a set of criterion that are combined together, to give a positive impact on organizational or

administrative behavior. On the other hand, there is another term which is associated with the behavior that is contrary to the behavior we have briefed above, namely; a bad behavior. The bad behavior also depends on a set of bad elements which result in reflecting such attitude.

The motivation of this research is to provide a conceptual and applied analysis for extending the reality into current research model. The research theme has incorporated the administrative hypocrisy which ultimately leads to organization disorder. Hypocrisy is a multi-dimensions concept, and many scholars have debated on the complexity of the hypocritical actions. (Crisp and Cowton, 1994; Kittay, 1982; McKinnon,

1991; Shklar, 1985; Szabados and Soifer, 2004; Turner, 1990). Therefore, it becomes essential that a study of the impact of hypocrisy on spoiling the constructive aspect of organizations need more investigation and more elaboration.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical review contributes to knowing what has been presented by the researchers in the field of the current research topic as well as what is the knowledge gap might need to be bridged. However, the following comprehensive literature revision has approached the main research dimensions.

2.1 Administrative Hypocrisy

With the entry of the third millennium, we also have entered into a world dominated by the chaos of competition and transformations that is affecting various walks of life such administrative life, functional relations and infrastructure for administrative work; therefore, it became necessary to study the administrative and leadership fields. In this context, we focus on a phenomenon that has spread in the various fields of work, including the administrative field, and we call it an administrative hypocrisy.

There is no doubt that the management of the hypocrisy practiced by some workers in organizations, either with intent or ignorance ,if dealt, properly will improve the standards of the organizational climate enhancing thereby organizational performance. The phenomenon of administrative hypocrisy is universal in nature and is rejected by all values of administrative work. Therefore, an ideal organization establishes a system of values of administrative work to avoid this type of hypocrisy.

It is worth mentioning that the system of administrative values and the discipline of the employees in the organizations is utmost needed for the quality sake in a quality organizational system. Gordon& Rose (2013) perceived a management system to be competent enough to distinguish between those who are hypocrites and who are not hypocrites in the administration community. The management is aware

that someone is a hypocrite when he acts inconsistently with his purported beliefs (Zamulinski, 2015).

However, there are signs of hypocrisy which could be observed and used as important input to design a research scale and measurement to the unwanted elements such as hypocrites. It is worth mentioning that the indicators of administrative hypocrisy are often diagnosed through direct observations and field observations, as theoretical reviews provide general frameworks, while direct observations and interviews contribute significantly to the formulation of appropriate indicators for use in the construction of the scale.

In this context, the indicators of the current research scale were prepared in a combination of the theoretical review presented to us in this research and the interviews and observations that accompanied the preparation of the theoretical framework, which were classified as indicators within the tabulations of the research purposes.

2.2 Organization Disorder Elements

We often read important reports that include the collapse of a particular organization or the success of another organization, and in both cases there are evidently many reasons behind the collapse or success of the organizations. In this context Goldman (2006) has concluded in his research regarding one of the reasons behind organization disorder, that “personality disorders are a source of a highly toxic and dysfunctional organizational behavior; borderline personality disorder in a leader may serve as a systemic contaminant for an organization” (Goldman 2016). In this context we choose to focus on the causes of the collapse of organizations of all kinds and we stand for one of them, which we chose within the task of our research, specifically demonstration of administrative hypocrisy. In this regard, we note that the concept of the collapse of organizations is not related to itself as a term but is related to the signs of causality that causes it.

On the bases of the above interpretations we consider the problem in its broader concept since it is based on

cultural dimensions which in turn constitute many elements which could be constructive or destructive in term of practice in place such as value system, administrative behavior, regulations and the content of the job itself. In this situation, employees perceive the high performance required by the results control assimilated into their own values and other elements such as the policies and regulations which should be followed by all management and entire employees in the organization (Pfister & Lukka 2018).

The broader concept of the culture of the organization falls under the standards of organizational behavior, one of which is expected to be free of hypocrisy that pollutes the overall organizational culture in general and the organizational climate in particular (Hickman & Silva 2018).

Gee (2018) emphasized on the set of workplace elements as democracy, empowerment, team leaders and knowledge workers which constitute the language of the new work order promoted by today's management. The research perspective hold meaningful promises and satisfying work, greater respect for diversity, and more democratic distribution of knowledge; which such theme does not accommodate individuals with dual behavior. Collapse in other word emerges if the above values are not in place and in turn such behavior will lead to the organization disorder (Godkin & Allcorn 2009)

Leadership role is important to eliminate such viral actions if existed in the management; in case of emergence to the hypocrites; the leader should not listen to those who are observed from their body language or meetings or occasions and events which they find themselves close to their leaders. However, if those conditions were found in the organizations which reveals unsupportive environment, they become unable to meet the expected employee openness and transparent actions and behavior.

3. METHODOLOGY

The research adopted quantitative and qualitative methods; survey and interview were used due to the nature of research theme and data reliability purposes. The research population consists of individuals

working in different organizations. For the quantitative research, copies of structured questionnaire were distributed to 57 individual. The unit of analysis in this study is the multi sectorial organizations in the GCC region; which intends to examine the hypothesized research elements and the relationships represented by different level management positions including senior positions.

3.1 Sampling

Sample was chosen targeting workers in different sectors and working in various managerial, technical and academic positions. It also included males and females, different social status as well as different age groups, multiple grade categories, different salary scales and from different nationalities (table 1). The research generally uses convenience samples to obtain a large number of completed questionnaires (Saunders, 2011). It is worth mentioning that most of the research variables enjoy normal distribution, which gives them the reliability to use them in the analysis of the current research.

However, the research insured that the research instrument, that is the self-administered questionnaire, satisfies the criteria of a good measurement scale; reliability and validity tests (table 2) used to insure both internal consistency among the construct variables and provides confidence that the empirical findings accurately reflect the proposed constructs. It is also insure that the empirically-validated scales can be used directly in other studies in the field for different populations (Zikmund, 2003).

For transparent and true feedback the names of the organizations and the respondents are not required to be mentioned. This will provide accurate and up to the point in answering the questionnaire.

3.2 Research Questions

The research seeks to find answers to the following questions

- What are the trends of employee's opinions regarding the existing of the hypocrites in daily work environments?

- Is there a relationship existed between administrative hypocrisy and the organization disorder?
- How hypocrisy generates drivers for organizations disorder?

3.3 Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses have stated in consistence with the research questions as following:

- (H1): There are significant differences between respondent's opinion on both administrative hypocrisy and organization disorder at the significant level ($p \leq 0.05$).
- (H2): There is a significant correlation between administrative hypocrisy and organization collapse at the significant level ($p \leq 0.05$).
- (H3): There is a significant impact of administrative hypocrisy and organization collapse at the significant level ($p \leq 0.05$).

4. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In accordance with the methodological requirements, the data of the research sample file, which were classified in Table (1), were analyzed to show the nature of the variation in the sample of respondents in terms of their different characteristics. It is clear from the table that the nature of the research required that the sample of the research enjoy a wide spread between the quality of the respondents in terms of gender, social status, job level, academic qualification, level of monthly salary and more.

This diversity in the characteristics of the sample and the different levels of management and qualifications and the level of return obtained by workers in the institutions that the research obtained data from them gives the sample confidence that it reflects the appropriate field for such research theme and its objectives and hypotheses.

Table (1) : Personal Profile

Personal Profile	Status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age	18-29	15	26.3	26.3	26.3
	30-39	18	31.6	31.6	57.9
	40-49	15	26.3	26.3	84.2
	50 and Above	9	15.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Gender	Male	35	61.4	61.4	61.4
	Female	22	38.6	38.6	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Marital Status	Single	23	40.4	40.4	40.4
	Married	31	54.4	54.4	94.7
	Divorced	3	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Experience	Less than 1 year	3	5.3	5.3	5.3
	1-10 years	29	50.9	50.9	56.1
	More than 10 years	25	43.9	43.9	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Daily office hours	Up to 8 hours	18	31.6	31.6	31.6
	8-10 hours	25	43.9	43.9	75.4
	More than 10 hours	14	24.6	24.6	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Job Role at present	Leader & CEO	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
	Manager and section Director	9	15.8	15.8	17.5
	Executive Position	19	33.3	33.3	50.9
	Technical Position	4	7.0	7.0	57.9
	Service Work	4	7.0	7.0	64.9
	College Dean	1	1.8	1.8	66.7
	Prog., Director	2	3.5	3.5	70.2
	Faculty Lecturer and Teacher	17	29.8	29.8	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Qualification	High School	5	8.8	8.8	8.8
	Professional Certificate	3	5.3	5.3	14.0
	Diploma	8	14.0	14.0	28.1
	Bachelor Degree	10	17.5	17.5	45.6
	Master Degree	17	29.8	29.8	75.4
	PhD	14	24.6	24.6	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	
Scale of Salary	Below 5000 AED	10	17.5	17.5	17.5
	5000-20000 AED	43	75.4	75.4	93.0
	More than 20000 AED	4	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Reliability Test

The validity of the study instrument was measured through content validity, face validity, expert's validity and the group of arbitrators in the field of business and organizational behavior as well as experts in the senior level executives.

Appropriate opinions have considered in deletion and addition to the research measurement which made the final draft comply with the construct effective and valid measurement tool. On the other hand, the reliability coefficient of the research construct was extracted from research responses which reached (85.5%); such high coefficient reflects a suitable level of reliability which complies for the purposes of this study. Table (2)

Table (2): Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.855	6

In order to answer research questions and test hypotheses, descriptive analysis and deductive analysis were used as follows:

The first research question is about the possibility of the phenomenon of administrative hypocrisy in the institutions for reasons behind this kind of negative behavior and the question includes “what are the trends of employee’s opinions regarding the existing of the hypocrites in daily work environments?” SPSS calculates the arithmetic mean, standard deviation and standard error of the variables of the research model and examines its arithmetic mean as shown in table (3). The findings indicated that all the dimensions of the research were below the level specified in the research scale, which confirms that the trends towards this phenomenon are negative based on its existence in place of work.

All the means found the values below threshold point (3). The value below the threshold is mainly points a negative trend and discouraged attitudes provided by the respondents based on their assessment to daily organization work and the atmosphere.

Table (3): One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Low Work Value System	57	2.8316	1.03495	.13708
Administrative Failure	57	2.8114	.86753	.11491
Mismanagement	57	2.6930	.95316	.12625
Task Disorder	57	2.4687	.90462	.11982
Organization Disorder	57	2.8640	1.06389	.14092

Further to the above arbitrations t- test shows whether there are significant differences between the opinions of the respondents or that these differences came as a result of the coincidence associated with the trends of the research sample.

The results provided in table (4) show that the Low Work Value System, administrative failure, in addition to the collapse of the organization, were excluded from the research model due to insignificant differences in

the work place as the respondents opinions provide. Moreover, both mismanagement and task disorder were provided significant differences based on the respondents assessments to the existence of hypocrisy in the work place. The t-test value respectively for mismanagement and task disorder are 2.432 and 4.434 at significant level 0.01 and 0.00. This kind of significance deference reveals that the research sample confirmed that administrative hypocrisy practices were present in the daily dealings in the field, although they excluded the cases we referred to as unconfirmed in the daily behavior according to the opinion of the respondents.

Table (4): One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Low Work Value System	1.229	56	.224	-.16842	-.4430	.1062
Administrative Failure	1.641	56	.106	-.18860	-.4188	.0416
Mismanagement	2.432	56	.018	-.30702	-.5599	-.0541
Task Disorder	4.434	56	.000	-.53133	-.7714	-.2913
Organization Disorder	-.965	56	.339	-.13596	-.4183	.1463

Regarding the second research question which states that “is there a relationship existed between administrative hypocrisy and the organization disorder?”

The results as addressed in table (5) approved that organization disorder provided clear significant correlation with the independent variables in the research model respectively which is presented from high correlation with the administrative failure (0.751), mismanagement (0.668), task disorder (0.632) and low work value system (0.421) which all came significant strong value of significance (α almost 0.000).

However, the results approve that the second hypothesis defined has a significant correlation between administrative hypocrisy and organization collapse at the significant level ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table (5): Correlation

	Organization Disorder	Administrative Failure	Mismanagement	Task Disorder	Low Work Value System
Organization Disorder	1	.751 ^{**}	.668 ^{**}	.632 ^{**}	.421 ^{**}
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	57	57	57	57	57

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The above conclusion encouraged the research to further the analysis which intends to find statistical answer to the third research question as “how hypocrisy generates drivers for organizations disorder?”

The data analysis has shown in table (6) statistical parameters supported the third hypothesis.

Table (6): Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.773 ^a	.598	.567	.69989

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task Disorder, Low Work Value System, Mismanagement, Administrative Failure

The above table shows that the value of the coefficient of correlation between the variables behind administrative hypocrisy and the collapse of organizations is (0.773) and that the value of R Square is (0.598).

However, the test result confirms that there is a significant relationship and impact organization disorder.

Moreover, as shown in table (7), that the existing hypothesis is accepted as “There is a significant impact of administrative hypocrisy and organization collapse at the significant level (P almost 0.000)”.

Table (7): ANOVA^b Analysis to the impact of Administrative Hypocrisy and Organization Disorder

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	37.912	4	9.478	19.349	.000 ^a
Residual	25.472	52	.490		
Total	63.384	56			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task Disorder, Low Work Value System, Mismanagement, Administrative Failure

b. Dependent Variable: Organization Disorder

Further to width and depth investigations to the model relationship, the detailed statistical findings have provided significant results which help in screening the model conclusion. Therefore, the table (8) indicates that the model proves that the drivers are significantly pointed the administrative failure and low work value system were behind the organization disorder the findings were Beta (0.588 and 0.292) were significant at $p \leq (0.006 \& 0.036)$ respectively.

The rest variables mismanagement and task disorder have excluded from the model.

Table (8): Model Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	.441	.322		1.370	.177	-.205	1.087
Low Work Value System	-.300	.139	-.292	-	.036	-.580	-.020
Administrative Failure	.721	.221	.588	3.260	.002	.277	1.164
Mismanagement	-.034	.172	-.031	-.198	.844	-.379	.311
Task Disorder	.542	.172	.461	3.152	.003	.197	.887

a. Dependent Variable: ORD

The model addressed as in the table (8) results that the organization disorder is solely a function of administrative failure and low work value system based on the outcome of research sample opinions.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research dealt with a widespread phenomenon in all organizations suffering from the collapse of administrative performance and chaos of decisions, which is the phenomenon of administrative hypocrisy. It is worth noting that the current research is characterized by filling the measurement gap of this phenomenon. It is clear from the theoretical review that there is a significant lack of measurement of the phenomenon of administrative hypocrisy, while there is an abundance of theories, concepts and philosophies. Based on the above, the research sought to build indicators, and were categorized and tested according to the latest statistical methods to reach the credibility and stability of the scale.

In this context, the researchers have decided to identify different fields of work without giving names to allow for the credibility and transparency of the research sample that represents these research fields.

They also designed the research scale in such a way as to ensure that the sample was motivated to respond to the real answer according to the researcher's experience in the field. From this perspective, the current research provided a measure of honesty, consistency and reuse in work environments. The research revealed research results that led to providing direct answers to the research questions and testing the hypotheses of the research as follows:

The alternative hypotheses that confirm the significant relationship between the variables of research were accepted in both independent and dependent variables which were included in the research model. The influence of the administrative hypocrisy, specifically both non-efficient administration and low value work system on organization disorder. The administrative hypocrisy, especially the weakness of the administration, creates an emergence of a poor work values system.

As a result, the administration's interest in achievement becomes a low priority. Therefore, the state of interest in favoritism, hypocrisy and procrastination progresses in the case of compliance with the application of policies, regulations and critical performance indicators.

In general, in the case of this phenomenon in the field, the research suggests the importance of an efficient management selected in accordance with the work standards of appropriate qualifications and appropriate expertise, skills and work values and standard administrative behavior to be consistent with the requirements of administrative tasks and decision-making in different organizations. The research looks at monitoring the indicators of administrative hypocrisy and diagnosing its fulfillment to correct the cases before their rise in organizations toward organizations free of such chronic diseases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors of this research work express sincere thanks to the American College of Dubai for providing encouragement for doing this research. Also the research team expresses special appreciation to Mr. Rodrigue Mbadieu Fangué for his assistance in data feeding to the SPSS.

REFERENCES

- Alicke, M., Gordon, E., & Rose, D. (2013). Hypocrisy: what counts? *Philosophical Psychology*, 26(5), 673-701.
- Cameron, K., Quinn, R. E., & Caldwell, C. (2017). Positive leadership and adding value—a lifelong journey. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 13(2), 59-63.
- Crisp, R., & Cowton, C. (1994). Hypocrisy and moral seriousness. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 31, 343-349.
- Gee, J. (2018). *The new work order*. Routledge.
- Godkin, L., & Allcorn, S. (2009). Institutional narcissism, arrogant organization disorder and interruptions in organizational learning. *The Learning Organization*, 16(1), 40-57.
- Goldman, A. (2006). High toxicity leadership: Borderline personality disorder and the dysfunctional organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(8), 733-746.
- Hickman, C. R., & Silva, M. A. (2018). *Creating excellence: Managing corporate culture, strategy, and change in the new age*. Routledge.
- Kittay, E.F. (1982). On Hypocrisy. *Meta-philosophy*, 13, 281.
- McKinnon, C. (1991). Hypocrisy, with a note on integrity. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 28, 324-325.
- Pfister, J. A., & Lukka, K. (2018). Interrelation of Controls for Autonomous Motivation: A Field Study of Productivity Gains through Pressure-Induced Process Innovation. *The Accounting Review*.
- Saunders, M. N. (2011). *Research methods for business students*, 5/e. Pearson Education India.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students*. Pearson education.
- Shklar, J. *Ordinary vices*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Szabados, B., & Soifer, E. (2004). Hypocrisy: Ethical investigations. NY: Broadway Press.

Turner, D. (1990). Hypocrisy. *Metaphilosophy*, 21, 262-269.

Younus, T., & Al Dabagh, R. (2011) .Statistical Analysis- Using MINITAB, Management Series Books, ASU. Bahrain

Zamulinski, B. (2015). Hypocrisy and the Nature of Belief. *Ratio*, 28(2), 175-189