How to Cite:
Mohamed, I. B., Saadi, R., Abdelbaki, A., & Boudebza, I. (2024). The contribution of human resources reengineering in achieving organizational integrity: Case study University of 20 August 1955, Skikda, Algeria. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *18*(11), 2580–2597. Retrieved from https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article/view/740

The contribution of human resources reengineering in achieving organizational integrity: Case study University of 20 August 1955, Skikda, Algeria

Dr. Imane Ben Mohamed
ECOFIMA Laboratory, University of August 20, 1955, Skikda, Algeria
Email: i.benmohamed@univ-skikda.dz

Dr. Randa Saadi
ECOFIMA Laboratory, University of August 20, 1955, Skikda, Algeria
Email: r.saadi@univ-skikda.dz

Dr. Amira Abdelbaki
ECOFIMA Laboratory, University of August 20, 1955, Skikda, Algeria
Email: a.abdelbaki@univ-skikda.dz

Dr. Ikram Boudebza
ECOFIMA Laboratory, University of August 20, 1955, Skikda, Algeria
Email: i.boudebza@univ-skikda.dz

***Abstract*---**In the study titled "The Contribution of Human Resource Reengineering to Achieving Organizational Integrity: A Case Study of 20 August 1955 University," the findings reveal a moderate overall level of human resource reengineering, with an average score of 3.1257. Among the various domains, the technological aspect stands out as the most implemented, averaging 3.5263. This trend reflects an increasing reliance on technology and digitalization within Algerian institutions. The overall level of organizational integrity is also moderate, with an average score of 2.9737. Notably, empathy and compassion are prevalent in the institution, scoring 3.3421, which indicates a conducive work environment and strong interpersonal relationships among employees. The study identifies a medium to positive correlation between the dimensions of human resource reengineering (structural, technological, technical, and human) and organizational integrity at a significance level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$). Furthermore, there is statistically significant positive impact from

Submitted: 09 September 2024, Revised: 18 October 2024, Accepted: 23 November 2024

human resource reengineering on organizational integrity, suggesting that changes in human resource practices contribute to improved organizational integrity. The study concludes that a portion of the variance in organizational integrity can be attributed to human resource reengineering, while other external factors may account for the remaining variance. Based on these findings, the study recommends enhancing technological adoption, fostering a collaborative work culture, developing employee skills, conducting further research across other institutions, and implementing regular assessments to ensure continuous improvement in organizational performance.

***Keywords*---**Human Resource Reengineering, Organizational Integrity, Algerian Institutions, University of 20 August 1955, Skikda, Algeria.

Introduction

In light of the intertwined and overlapping global circumstances, and in the era of globalization with the emergence of international competition, the internal and external environment of organizations is no longer stable as it used to be. Instead, it has become characterized by mobility and dynamism, which has led to the emergence of complex and varied problems, most of which affect work organizations. Consequently, these organizations are compelled to find solutions to confront these issues and face new and diverse challenges. This has increased the importance of utilizing and preserving resources, as they are considered the primary and most influential asset in the organization, and also to help achieve its goals and enhance its competitive advantage. This has made attention to human resources essential for the success of the organization and a reason for its ability to survive and face the rapidly changing internal and external environments.

To ensure the growth and development of its human resources, organizations must provide a suitable working environment that contributes to this growth by adopting important organizational practices that aid this goal, such as human resources reengineering. This process involves the partial or complete redesign of work systems related to human resources in various fields and across all administrative levels, including job integration, delegation of authority, promotion of teamwork, and more. In addition, organizations require their employees to embody principles of noble ethics, responsibility, and other virtuous behaviors—collectively known as organizational integrity—which enhances the organization's prestige and helps achieve its goals and sustainability through the continuous improvement of its reputation and image, thereby granting it a lasting competitive advantage.

Based on the above, the following question arises: **How can human resources reengineering contribute to promoting organizational integrity at the University of August 20, 1955, in Skikda?**

To support the aforementioned problem, a set of sub-questions has been raised.

Sub-questions:

- What is the level of reliance on human resources reengineering in the organization under study?
- What is the level of organizational integrity in the organization under study?
- Is there a positive relationship between human resources reengineering and its dimensions (structural, technological, technical, and human) and organizational integrity in the organization under study?
- What is the impact of human resources reengineering in its dimensions (technological, structural, technical, and human) on organizational integrity in the organization under study?
- To what extent are there statistically significant differences in the respondents' answers regarding the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity due to personal variables (gender, age, educational level, job position) in the organization under study?

Study Hypotheses:

- There is a statistically significant relationship between human resources reengineering and its dimensions (structural, technological, technical, and human) and organizational integrity at a significance level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the organization under study.
- There is a statistically significant impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity at a significance level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the organization under study.
- There are statistically significant differences in respondents' answers at a significance level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the organization under study regarding the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity due to personal variables (gender, age, educational level, job position).

Research Importance:

The current study derives its significance from the importance of the topic of human resources reengineering and its impact on organizational integrity among employees. Organizational integrity is a relatively recent subject in the field of employee behavior. The importance of this topic is further emphasized by the significance of the results that will be reached and the various suggestions and recommendations derived from the field study, which may contribute to improving performance by enhancing the sense of value, appreciation, and respect, rooted in high ethical standards.

Research Objectives:

Through this research, we aim to:

- Identify the reality and importance of the research variables in the organization under study.
- Understand the nature of the relationship between human resources reengineering and organizational integrity.

- Test the extent to which human resources reengineering impacts organizational integrity.

Research Divisions:

The research is divided into:

- **First Axis**: The theoretical aspect of the study.
- **Second Axis**: The practical aspect.

I.First Axis: **The theoretical aspect of the study.**
1. Human Resource Reengineering:
1.1 Concept of Human Resource Reengineering:

- Human resource reengineering is defined as "the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of processes to achieve significant improvements—rather than marginal, incremental ones—in performance measures such as cost, quality, service, and speed."[1] It involves the fundamental and rapid redesign of strategic management processes that add value, as well as the systems, policies, and structures that support these processes, all aimed at achieving high organizational goals.[2]

-Human resource reengineering is defined as a process of fundamentally redesigning the human resource work systems based on information technology, aimed at the continuous improvement of quality and productivity levels. This concept is also viewed as an organization's effort to meet the needs of its employees and enhance their capabilities to effectively carry out the tasks and responsibilities assigned to them by continuously improving the processes related to their management.[3]

-It is also a process aimed at transforming the skills and knowledge of human resources into intellectual capital and leveraging it to achieve the organization's overall goals.

-Additionally, it is defined as a fundamental rethink and radical change in work systems to achieve significant improvements in performance metrics such as cost, quality, capital, services, and execution speed. Information systems refer to all work processes or procedures, job descriptions, organizational structures, management and evaluation systems, as well as the values and beliefs of individuals.[4]

1.2 Areas of Human Resource Reengineering

Human resource reengineering encompasses four main areas: technological, structural, technical, and human.

-**Technological Area:** Organizations implement technological changes to address new conditions and acquire modern technologies that benefit them by reducing costs and improving quality. In human resource management, technological change involves adopting advanced techniques and programs to manage personnel affairs and streamline job functions. This contributes to reducing work

time, improving its quality, and lowering costs. Additionally, embracing e-work will undoubtedly allow human resource employees to focus on the strategic aspects of the function and align with the organization's strategy, as operational tasks no longer occupy the space they once did.[5]

-**Structural Area**: Until recently, traditional organizations were based on a performance/behavior/design model, meaning that performance is determined by the organization's behavior, which in turn is dictated by its design. Thus, overall performance improvement depended on design direction. This model primarily considers performance challenges relevant to shareholders, focusing on financial and marketing outcomes, and views individuals as capable of work but lacking proper guidance. However, modern organizations now face numerous performance challenges that rely on individuals who may not possess the required skills. Consequently, the most suitable alternative to the previous model is the "performance/purpose/behavior/initiatives" model, which posits that performance must be multidimensional. All parties within the organization must benefit from clearly defined performance goals that reflect existing challenges. Moreover, not all individuals possess the desire or ability to work; hence, it is crucial to identify those needing behavioral and capability changes, determine the form of change needed, and assess the sources of readiness and hesitation among individuals within the organization. A set of initiatives—whether behavior-driven or not—should be formulated to shape the vision and the reasons behind it and to implement the necessary changes to achieve the desired performance.[6]

-**Technical Area**: Human resource reengineering relies on three fundamental alternatives arranged as follows:
-Elimination: This involves discarding services and activities that offer little value (those that do not add value).
-Outsourcing: This entails a close relationship between the organization and its service providers.
-Redesign: This refers to the redesign of strategically important activities that cannot be outsourced.[7]
Thus, technical change in human resource management involves eliminating activities that do not add value, outsourcing administrative tasks whose costs exceed internal execution, and redesigning remaining processes to be more strategic and provide greater added value.

Human Area: This area refers to changing the individuals performing the work, either by dismissing some and replacing them with others or by enhancing their skills and developing their capabilities and values. Given the increasing importance of information technology in organizations and the pivotal role played by those controlling this technology, it has become essential for organizations to possess human resources that represent an investment due to their knowledge, skills, and flexibility. They should be organized into teams that deliver collective performance and integrate to enhance their effectiveness. Reports from the International Labor Organization indicate that the greatest gains in organizational performance occur only when new technology is combined with extensive changes in work systems, such as decentralized decision-making and team-based work organization.[8]

2. Organizational Integrity

2.1 Definition of Organizational Integrity

-Integrity is a Latin term meaning "excellence." It represents a virtue that expresses ethical principles designed to motivate and direct behavior towards the end of the moral system at the organizational level. Consequently, it supports virtuous activities that encompass the habits, desires, and actions of individuals and groups within the organization. Integrity fosters the enhancement of virtuous relationships among its members and encourages it at all levels, contributing to success in achieving the organization's objectives.[9]

-The measurement of organizational integrity was also defined through the assessment of levels of optimism, trust, compassion, integrity, and tolerance within the organization.[10]

-The manifestations of integrity are evident in individual activities or teamwork, and the organization's culture can either activate or hinder upright behavior. Integrity is associated with three central traits: human influence, good ethics, and social reform. Good ethics represent everything that is good, right, and worthy of cultivation. Moreover, good ethics are tied to individual prosperity and one's moral character, while social reform transcends individual benefit to create social values that resonate with personal desires.[11]

-Integrity also involves individuals maximizing their behaviors and actions effectively by being attentive to all types of events within their organizations, such as taking responsibility for their work and participating in collaborative activities that positively impact their performance.[12]

2.2 Dimensions of Organizational Integrity

What distinguishes our current society is knowledge, characterized by constant innovation and increasing complexity. Employee well-being is essential not only for improving their lives but also for organizations, which must innovate and continually evolve to survive in this turbulent environment. This necessitates a focus on integrity, represented by their values and beliefs, and their concern for employee benefits and well-being, which affect individual job performance and organizational performance. Otherwise, employees will direct their energy and capabilities elsewhere, leading to decreased creativity and innovation within the organization.[13]

Numerous researchers have identified a range of dimensions related to organizational integrity, including integrity, competence, optimism, austerity, recognition, strength, and more. The dimensions selected, which are commonly agreed upon and recurrent among most researchers, as well as those that align with the Algerian environment, are (trust, integrity, commitment, empathy, and compassion).

-**Organizational Trust**: Organizational trust refers to a general climate of politeness, consideration, and respect, where individuals can rely on each other and on upper management.[14]

-Organizational Integrity: This reflects the organization's ability to interact with employees transparently and align with stated objectives and shared values, possessing characteristics that build trust and credibility with stakeholders. It also involves the ability to control behavioral motives, which can lead to aggressive behaviors. Thus, organizations need to mentally engage individuals toward credibility and transparency in decision-making, ensuring stability at all times.[15]

-Organizational Commitment: This entails a close connection to the organization's goals and values, acceptance of these goals and values, a willingness to exert reasonable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to remain and continue membership.[16]

-Empathy and Compassion: Organizational empathy pertains to a contextual framework in which employees are concerned about one another, where acts of compassion and empathy prevail among staff.[17] It involves assisting individuals who may be underperforming or providing them with positive working conditions, as well as those experiencing unstable behaviors, whether psychological or social. Organizations often do much to support those unstable individuals at work or who face challenging social and psychological circumstances, particularly those experiencing continuous work-related stress. This empathy within the organization is reflected in employees who care for one another.[18]

II.Second Axis: The practical aspect

1. Study Methodology

Based on the nature of the study and its objectives, the researcher used the descriptive-analytical method. This approach relies on studying a phenomenon by referring to previous studies and publications, followed by data collection through a specially prepared questionnaire.

1.1 Study Population and Sample

The study population was determined by identifying the number of administrative professors and administrators at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences at the University of August 20, 1955. A random sample of 62 individuals was selected.

Table (01): Distribution of Study Sample Individuals

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	33	57.9%
	Female	24	42.1%
Age	Under 25	0	0%
	26-35	9	15.8%
	36-45	42	73.7%
	46-55	6	10.5%
	Over 50	0	0%
Educational Level	Secondary or below	0	0%
	University	24	42.1%
	Postgraduate	33	57.9%
Position	Administrative Professor	30	52.6%
	Professor	27	47.4%

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

2- Study Tool and Measurement Methods

The primary tool used in the current study to answer the research questions and achieve its objectives was the questionnaire. The questionnaire was chosen as it is one of the most common and widely used tools today. It was divided into two main parts:

- **Part One**: Personal information of the employees, which included gender, age, position, and educational level.
- **Part Two**: Consists of 25 statements with constrained responses, divided into the following axes:
    - **Axis One**: Consists of 19 statements focused on human resources reengineering, aiming to assess the extent of its availability across different areas.
    - **Axis Two**: Consists of 6 statements focused on organizational integrity, aiming to determine its presence among the studied group.

The researchers used the **5-point Likert scale**, ranging from (1) to (5), where (1) indicates "strongly disagree" and (5) indicates "strongly agree." The length of the scale was calculated by determining the range between the upper and lower bounds of the scale's categories (5-1=4), then dividing it by (5) to determine the correct cell length (4/5=0.80). This value was then added to the lowest value in the Likert scale (which is 1).

Table (02): illustrates the scale used in the study

Degree	Arithmetic Mean	Percentage	Level
1	1 - 1.80	20% - 36%	Very Weak
2	1.81 - Less than 2.60	37% - 52%	Weak
3	2.61 - Less than 3.40	53% - 68%	Average
4	3.41 - Less than 4.20	69% - 84%	High
5	4.21 - 5.00	85% - 100%	Very High

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

3- Reliability of the Research Tool:
To ensure the reliability of the research tool (the questionnaire), Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated. A value is considered acceptable if it is equal to or greater than (0.70), as suggested by Hair et al. (2010). Upon reviewing the statistical test results, it was found that the overall reliability coefficient of the questionnaire is high, reaching (0.853), indicating that the questionnaire has a high degree of reliability.

4- Statistical Treatment Methods:

- **Cronbach's Alpha**: Used to verify the reliability of the research tool.
- **Multiple Regression**: Used to test the impact of each independent variable individually on the dependent variable.
- **Independent Samples T-Test**: Used to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between two independent data groups.
- **One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**: Used to analyze the differences among group means in a sample.

5- Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables:
To understand the level of human resources reengineering across its various dimensions (structural, technological, technical, and human) and organizational integrity, the following table presents the means and standard deviations:

Table (03): Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Human Resources Reengineering and Organizational Integrity

Dimensions	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Level	Ranking of Response Level
Structural Dimension	3.1447	0.71017	Average	2
Technological Dimension	3.5263	0.74415	High	1
Technical Dimension	2.9684	0.90537	Average	3
Human Dimension	2.8632	0.68677	Average	4
Overall Average of Human Resources Reengineering	3.1257	0.55505	Average	
Organizational Integrity				
Trust	2.8158	1.24868	Average	1
Commitment	2.7632	1.03985	Average	2
Empathy and Compassion	3.3421	0.95505	Average	3
Overall Average of Organizational Integrity	2.9737	0.83499	Average	

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

Based on the results presented in Table 03, we observe that most arithmetic means fall within the average range for both variables. In terms of the ranking of human resources reengineering dimensions, the technological dimension ranks first with a high mean of 3.5263, followed by the structural dimension with a mean of 3.1447, then the technical dimension with a mean of 2.9684, and finally the human dimension with a mean of 2.8932. The overall average for the dimensions stands at 3.1257, indicating that the organization relies on human resources reengineering across its various fields at a moderate level.
As for the dimensions of organizational integrity, empathy and compassion rank first with an arithmetic mean of 3.3421, followed by trust with a mean of 2.8158, and lastly, commitment with a mean of 2.7632. The overall level of organizational integrity in the organization under study is moderate, with an arithmetic mean of 2.9737.

Presentation and Discussion of Results in Light of Hypotheses

- **Testing the First Main Hypothesis**: The first main hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant relationship between human resources reengineering and its dimensions (structural, technological, technical, and human) and organizational integrity at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the organization under study."

Before beginning the testing of this hypothesis, it is important to note that Table 06 below will include the significance test of the correlation coefficient by comparing the calculated T value with the tabulated T value, without revealing their values. If there is a **()** sign next to the correlation coefficient, it indicates that the calculated T value is greater than the tabulated one. The strength of the correlation coefficient will be assessed according to the following criteria:

- **Low Correlation**: If the correlation coefficient value is between (0.10 - 0.30)
- **Medium Correlation**: If the correlation coefficient value is between (0.31 - 0.50)
- **Strong Correlation**: If the correlation coefficient value is between (0.51 - 1.00)

Table (04): Correlation Matrix between Dimensions of Human Resources Reengineering and Organizational Integrity

Variables	Structural Dimension	Technological Dimension	Technical Dimension	Human Dimension	Organizational Integrity
Structural Dimension	1	0.355*	0.520*	0.217	0.342*
Technological Dimension		1	0.429*	0.164	0.135
Technical Dimension			1	0.465*	0.287*
Human Dimension				1	0.411*
Organizational Integrity					1

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

Interpretation of the Correlation Matrix:

- The correlation coefficients marked with an asterisk (*) indicate statistically significant relationships.
- The **structural dimension** shows a moderate positive correlation with the **technological dimension** (0.355*), and a strong positive correlation with the **technical dimension** (0.520*). It also has a moderate positive correlation with **organizational integrity** (0.342*).
- The **technological dimension** has a strong positive correlation with the **technical dimension** (0.429*) but a weak correlation with **organizational integrity** (0.135).
- The **technical dimension** shows a strong correlation with the **human dimension** (0.465*) and a moderate positive correlation with **organizational integrity** (0.287*).
- The **human dimension** has a strong positive correlation with **organizational integrity** (0.411*).

These results suggest that various dimensions of human resources reengineering have varying degrees of correlation with organizational

integrity, providing valuable insights into how these factors may influence each other.

Testing the Second Main Hypothesis

The second main hypothesis states that "there is a statistically significant effect at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) of human resources reengineering and its dimensions (structural, technological, technical, and human) on organizational integrity at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the organization under study."
To test this hypothesis, multiple regression analysis was used to examine the effect. The results are presented in the table below.

Table (05): Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Testing the Effect of Human Resources Reengineering with Its Dimensions (Structural, Technological, Technical, and Human) on Organizational Integrity

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta
Structural Dimension	0.798*
Technological Dimension	0.326*
Technical Dimension	0.017
Human Dimension	0.018*
F Value	4.021
Multiple Correlation Coefficient (R)	0.486
Coefficient of Determination (R^2)	0.236
Adjusted R^2	0.177
Significance Level (F)	0.006*

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

Interpretation of the Results:

- The results indicate that the **structural dimension** ($\beta = 0.798$) and the **technological dimension** ($\beta = 0.326$) have statistically significant positive effects on organizational integrity, as denoted by the asterisk (*), which indicates significance at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.
- The **technical dimension** shows a negligible effect ($\beta = 0.017$) and is not statistically significant.
- The **human dimension** also has a positive effect ($\beta = 0.018$) but is not statistically significant as well.
- The overall regression model has an F-value of 4.021, and the significance level for the model is 0.006*, indicating that the model as a whole is statistically significant.
- The **multiple correlation coefficient (R)** of 0.486 indicates a moderate correlation between the independent variables and organizational integrity.

- The **coefficient of determination (R^2)** of 0.236 suggests that approximately 23.6% of the variance in organizational integrity can be explained by the independent variables, while the **adjusted R^2** of 0.177 accounts for the number of predictors in the model.

The results support the second main hypothesis, indicating that human resources reengineering and its dimensions, particularly the structural and technological aspects, significantly influence organizational integrity within the organization studied.

Testing the Third Main Hypothesis

The third main hypothesis states that "there are statistically significant differences between respondents' answers regarding the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity attributed to personal variables (gender, age, educational level, job position) at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the organization under study."

Table (06): Results of the Independent Samples T-Test for Detecting the Significance of Differences in Respondents' Attitudes Regarding the Impact of Human Resources Reengineering on Organizational Integrity Attributed to Gender

Variable	Calculated Fisher Value	Significance Level
Structural Dimension	0.726	0.398
Technological Dimension	9.671	0.303
Technical Dimension	3.105	0.084
Human Dimension	0.005	0.946
Overall Dimensions of Human Resources Reengineering	0.371	0.545

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

Interpretation of the Results:

- The significance levels for all dimensions of human resources reengineering and the overall dimensions are greater than 0.05, indicating that there are no statistically significant differences in responses based on gender regarding the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity.
- Specifically:
  - The **structural dimension** has a significance level of 0.398.
  - The **technological dimension** has a significance level of 0.303.
  - The **technical dimension** has a significance level of 0.084, which is close to the significance level but still above 0.05.
  - The **human dimension** shows a significance level of 0.946, indicating no significant difference.
  - The overall dimensions combined yield a significance level of 0.545, further confirming the lack of significant differences.

Thus, we can conclude that personal variable differences, particularly gender, do not have a statistically significant impact on respondents' views regarding the effect of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity within the organization studied.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results

Table (07): ANOVA Results for Detecting Significant Differences in Respondents' Attitudes Regarding the Impact of Human Resources Reengineering on Organizational Integrity Based on Educational Level

Variable	Calculated F Value	Significance Level
Structural Dimension	3.395	0.071
Technological Dimension	5.072	0.068
Technical Dimension	6.063	0.077
Human Dimension	0.012	0.913
Overall Dimensions of Human Resources Reengineering	0.709	0.403

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

Interpretation of the Results:

1. **Structural Dimension**: The calculated F value is **3.395** with a significance level of **0.071**. Although this value is close to the conventional threshold of 0.05 for significance, it does not meet the threshold for statistical significance.
2. **Technological Dimension**: The calculated F value is **5.072** with a significance level of **0.068**. Similar to the structural dimension, it is also close to significance but not statistically significant.
3. **Technical Dimension**: The calculated F value is **6.063** with a significance level of **0.077**. Again, while this indicates a trend towards significance, it does not meet the criteria for statistical significance.
4. **Human Dimension**: The calculated F value is **0.012** with a significance level of **0.913**, indicating no significant differences based on this dimension.
5. **Overall Dimensions**: The overall dimensions of human resources reengineering yield an F value of **0.709** with a significance level of **0.403**, indicating no significant differences in attitudes among respondents regarding the combined effects of reengineering on organizational integrity based on educational level.

The ANOVA results suggest that there are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes of respondents regarding the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity when categorized by educational level. All significance levels are above the 0.05 threshold, indicating that educational background does not significantly influence respondents' perceptions in the context of this study.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results

Table (08): ANOVA Results for Detecting Significant Differences in Respondents' Attitudes Regarding the Impact of Human Resources Reengineering on Organizational Integrity Based on Age

Variable	Calculated F Value	Significance Level
Structural Dimension	5.925	0.005
Technological Dimension	0.909	0.009
Technical Dimension	3.949	0.025
Human Dimension	7.234	0.002
Overall Dimensions of Human Resources Reengineering	4.066	0.023

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

Interpretation of the Results:

1. **Structural Dimension**: The calculated F value is **5.925** with a significance level of **0.005**. This result indicates a statistically significant difference in attitudes related to the structural dimension of human resources reengineering among different age groups.
2. **Technological Dimension**: The calculated F value is **0.909** with a significance level of **0.009**. This also indicates a statistically significant difference in attitudes regarding the technological dimension based on age.
3. **Technical Dimension**: The calculated F value is **3.949** with a significance level of **0.025**. This indicates a statistically significant difference in attitudes regarding the technical dimension among age groups.
4. **Human Dimension**: The calculated F value is **7.234** with a significance level of **0.002**, indicating a strong statistically significant difference in attitudes related to the human dimension based on age.
5. **Overall Dimensions**: The overall dimensions of human resources reengineering yield an F value of **4.066** with a significance level of **0.023**, indicating a statistically significant difference in attitudes among respondents regarding the combined effects of reengineering on organizational integrity based on age.

The ANOVA results demonstrate that there are statistically significant differences in respondents' attitudes towards the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity across various age groups. All significance levels are below the 0.05 threshold, indicating that age significantly influences perceptions in the context of this study.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results

Table (09): ANOVA Results for Detecting Significant Differences in Respondents' Attitudes Regarding the Impact of Human Resources Reengineering on Organizational Integrity Based on Job Position

Variable	Calculated F Value	Significance Level
Structural Dimension	0.509	0.009
Technological Dimension	2.966	0.041
Technical Dimension	0.276	0.001
Human Dimension	2.072	0.006
Overall Dimensions of Human Resources Reengineering	0.003	0.03

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

Interpretation of the Results:

1. **Structural Dimension**: The calculated F value is **0.509** with a significance level of **0.009**. This indicates a statistically significant difference in attitudes regarding the structural dimension of human resources reengineering based on job position.
2. **Technological Dimension**:The calculated F value is **2.966** with a significance level of **0.041**. This also indicates a statistically significant difference in attitudes regarding the technological dimension among different job positions.
3. **Technical Dimension**: The calculated F value is **0.276** with a significance level of **0.001**. This suggests a very strong statistically significant difference in attitudes related to the technical dimension based on job position.
4. **Human Dimension**: The calculated F value is **2.072** with a significance level of **0.006**, indicating a statistically significant difference in attitudes regarding the human dimension based on job position.
5. **Overall Dimensions**: The overall dimensions of human resources reengineering yield an F value of **0.003** with a significance level of **0.03**, indicating a statistically significant difference in attitudes among respondents regarding the combined effects of reengineering on organizational integrity based on job position.

The ANOVA results indicate that there are statistically significant differences in respondents' attitudes towards the impact of human resources reengineering on organizational integrity based on job position. All significance levels are below the 0.05 threshold, demonstrating that job position significantly influences perceptions related to this study.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions:

-Level of Human Resource Reengineering: The results showed that the overall level of human resource reengineering in the institution under study is average, with a mean of **3.1257**. Among the various fields, the technological field was the

most applied, with a score of **3.5263**, indicating that Algerian institutions have begun to increasingly rely on technology and digitization as part of their strategies.

-Level of Organizational Integrity: The overall level of organizational integrity in the institution was also found to be average, with a mean of **2.9737**. The study also revealed that empathy and compassion were more prevalent in the institution, with an average of **3.3421**, reflecting a positive work environment and good human relations among employees.

-Correlation Relationship: The study found a moderate positive correlation between human resource reengineering in its various fields (structural, technological, technical, and human) and organizational integrity at a significance level of **(α≤0.05)**.

-Impact of Human Resource Reengineering: The results showed a statistically significant positive impact of human resource reengineering across its various fields on organizational integrity at a significance level of **(α≤0.05)**.

-Impact Ratio:It was concluded that part of the variance in the dependent variable (organizational integrity) is attributed to the independent variable (human resource reengineering), while the remaining percentage is due to other factors outside the study model.

Recommendations:

-Enhance Technology Adoption: Algerian institutions should enhance the use of technology and digitization in human resource reengineering to ensure higher efficiency and improve performance.

-Promote a Culture of Teamwork: It is important to work on promoting a culture of teamwork and collaboration among individuals, which can enhance organizational integrity and contribute to a positive work environment.

-Develop Human Skills: Focus should be placed on developing employees' skills in the fields of human resource reengineering, particularly in the technical and human aspects, to ensure their adaptation to technological changes.

-Conduct Additional Studies: It is recommended to conduct future studies that include other institutions to compare results and discover new factors that may influence the relationship between human resource reengineering and organizational integrity.

-Regular Evaluation: Institutions should implement regular evaluations of the levels of organizational integrity and human resource reengineering to ensure continuous improvement and effectiveness in institutional performance.

References:

[1] **Hamza Bali & Serina Mani.** "The Philosophy of Human Resource Reengineering as an Urgent Requirement for the Sustainability of Small and Medium Enterprises." National Conference on the Issue of Sustainability of Small and Medium Enterprises, December 6-7, 2017, Faculty of Economic and Commercial Sciences and Management Sciences, University of the Martyr Hameh Lakhdar, El Oued, p. 2.

[2] **Ahmed Khalil Mahmoud Al-Kahlout.** "The Relationship Between Process Reengineering and Achieving Competitive Advantage in Palestinian Universities

in Gaza." Master's Thesis in Business Administration, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Al-Azhar University, Gaza, 2017, p. 12.

[3] **Mohammed Bin Atiyah Harbi.** "The Role of Administrative Transparency: A Field Study on Government Organizations in Riyadh." Faculty of Business Administration, Taif University, p. 10.

[4] **Khan Ahlam.** "Reengineering Processes as an Approach to Achieving Excellence in Human Resource Management." Economic and Administrative Research, No. 12, December 2012, p. 168.

[5] **Khan Ahlam et al.** "Reengineering Human Resources as a Support Mechanism for High-Performance Work Systems in Organizations: An Exploratory Study of Human Resource Managers' Opinions in a Group of Economic Institutions in Biskra, Algeria." *Global Journal of Economics and Business*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2019, p. 154.

[6] **Khan Ahlam, Gharbi Wahiba, and Haif Shiraz.** "Reengineering Human Resources and the Requirements for Its Application in Economic Institutions: An Exploratory Study of Human Resource Management Employees' Opinions in a Group of Economic Institutions." *Humanities Journal*, vol. 21, no. 1, 06/08/2021, p. 897.

[7] **Khan Ahlam et al.**, "Reference previously mentioned," p. 155.

[8] **Khan Ahlam, Wahiba Ghari, Shiraz Haïf Si Haïf**, "Reference previously mentioned," pp. 898-899.

[9] **Laith Shakir Abu Tbeikh**, "Testing the relationship between aesthetic leadership behavior and organizational integrity: An applied study in the Al-'Ataba Al-'Alawiya Al-Muqaddasa," *Journal of the College of Education for Girls for Human Sciences*, no. 25, College of Administration and Economics, University of Kufa, 2019, p. 156.

[10] **Laith Shakir Abu Tbeikh**, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

[11] **Ben Mohamed Imane**, *The Role of Strategic Leadership in Activating Organizational Integrity: A Case Study of Some Algerian Universities*, *Contemporary Economic Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2, 31/12/2021, p. 101.

[12] **Saja Nadir Hamid Al-Sarraf**, *Utilizing Performance Evaluation Results in Achieving Organizational Integrity: A Field Study at the Technical Institute in Mosul*, *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, vol. 25, no. 114, 2019, p. 292.

[13] **Ben Mohammed Imane**, *Reference previously mentioned*, p. 102.

[14] **Laith Shakir Abu Tabeekh**, *Reference previously mentioned*, p. 157.

[15] **Saja Nadir Hamid Al-Sarraf**, *Reference previously mentioned*, p. 296.

[16] **Youssefi Kamal; Ben Mohamed Iman; Aroussi Samira**, *Organizational Commitment as a Mediating Variable between Organizational Culture and Deviant Work Behavior in Public Hospitals in the City of M'sila*, *Journal of Excellence in Economic and Administrative Research*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 2018, p. 129.

[17] **Laith Shakir Abu Tbeikh**, *Previous Reference*, p. 158.

[18] **Saja Nadir Hamid Al-Sarraf**, *Previous Reference*, p. 296.