

# Control Deterrence: Toward a Theoretical Background for Binary Organizational Control System

Mahmoud Al-Fayyad

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences, Assistant Professor, Zarqa University

**Abstract:** *This article aims at developing a theoretical background for deterrent organizational control system relying on two pillars: mundane control system and heaven control system. The researcher reviewed available literature of organizational control system, deterrence theory, and religious scripts to achieve research objectives. This research concludes that (HCS) supports the preventive role of mundane control system and form together effective binary control system. Suggested (BOCH) represents a good tool to grasp religious inclinations of individuals in favor of organizations and society and blocks external endeavors to exploit such inclinations for deviated purposes. (BOCS), also, lays suitable ground for incoming studies to test its applicability and effectiveness.*

**Keywords:** *Management control system, mundane control system, heaven control system, control deterrence, self-control, and BOCS.*

*Received 26/1/2010; Accepted 27/12/2010*

## Introduction

Control systems are designed to prevent deviations from plans and to ensure effective behavior and relations at workplace. Unless individuals adhere to ethical considerations, control effectiveness could not be achieved. The more deterrent is the control system, the more adherences to ethical considerations and more effectiveness are likely to be found and achieved. Most of related studies refer control deterrence to sanctions and discuss legality and suitability of sanctions against offended behavior. In this research, control deterrence refers to a strong internal conscious to surmount individual's inclinations to fulfill his need unethically.

Two inclinations dispute in human self: Devil's whispers which entice unethical conducts and values which catalyze ethical behavior. Devil's whispers induce self-badness, unethical inclinations, and jealousy. Early on the globe, Satan propelled Cain (The Son of Adam) to kill his brother Abel who adhered to morality enrooted deeply in his spirit and declined to fight his brother. Cain lacked of self-control to curb his inclinations to perpetrate unethical conduct.

There are worldwide acceptance of common values and ethical considerations that are ingrained in human selves and reinforced along history by religions and regulations. Help, cordiality, clemency, candor, honesty, altruism, blessing others, and benefaction are few examples among others. Heaven and Mundane legislations foster justice and seek societies' welfare and security. According to the source of enactment, control systems could be classified into two categories:

(1) Heaven control system imposed by God through a Mission (Religion) sent by a Prophet to direct God-human relationship (worshipping) and orient Human interactions; and (2) Mundane control system developed by human organizers to regulate human interrelationships and behaviors to achieve beneficial, secured, and effective conducts (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2001; Samuelson, 1999; Washington, 1796; and Mitchell, 2003). These two control systems bear integrated role and support each other.

## Research Significance

Work place violence and crimes show increased remarkable rates leaving impression of uncontrollable phenomena and decreasing patterns sometimes seem to be situational rather than perpetual. This article represents an endeavor to lay a theoretical background of preventive control system which is expected to foster self-control and reduce self-inclination towards perpetrating deviated behavior. Educating employees about Heaven Control System and sever sanctions waiting for deviators in the other life, may encourage them to commit ethical behavior.

## Problem Definition

Motivation and disciplinary systems support management control system and help organizations to achieve their objectives efficiently and effectively. Motivation systems encourage efficient and ethical behavior, while Disciplinary system prevents unethical behavior. Reports illustrate increasing trends of

workplace violence which, in turn, reveal that (OCSs) are not efficient to play the intended role, and evoke the need for more effective control system. This research, then, intends to answer the following questions:

1. What are the characteristics and efficiency of Mundane Control System (OCS)?
2. What are the characteristics and efficiency of (HCS)?
3. What are the major differences between (HCS) and (MCS)?
4. How can (HCS) and (MCS) be integrated into (BOCS) and then applied?

## **Methodology**

This article is theoretical, descriptive, and analytical in nature. It employs deductive method to achieve its objectives and infer results from available secondary sources of data and information. Secondary data and information of management theories and results of related studies are also analyzed and employed where necessary to support article's arguments. Some verses of Scriptures' are quoted to support the argument where necessary.

## **Literature Review**

### **Management Control System**

Management Control (MC) and Organizational Control (OC) are used as a synonym for (MCS) which is defined as an overall evaluation process of organizational strategy and resources (Otley 1994). (MC) is a managerial tool that helps to influence members' performance in implementing organizational strategy toward achieving its objectives (Longenecker and Pringle 1984; Anthony & Govindarajan 2007). (MC) represents a broader term of Organizational Control (OC) and includes built-in activities emphasizing automatic- and self-control mechanisms (Chenhall 2003).

Another definition implies that (MC) represents a process of successive steps including: pointing out targeted objectives and performance, determining means used to measure performance, and designing standards to compare performance (Koontz 1988). Theories of motivation imply that motivation and communication techniques are part of (MCS) because control information and evaluation results are used to motivate employees' righteous behavior (Horngren *et al.* 2005; Maciariello *et al.*, 1994). Control protection (self-learning, social learning, and disciplinary system) refers to a rule states that people learn from the consequences of their behaviors (Davis & Luthans, 1980; Baker, 2002).

Control power is not immediately obvious because it could be realized through organizational structure,

policies and rules, recruiting and training, budgets, electronic surveillance machinery, and rewards and punishments (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2001; Robbins, 1987). Heaven Control System as the least obvious system should be educated for employees to tune their psychological state to seeking rewards and avoiding penalties at the Other Life, which help to solve control dilemma of unobserved nature and behavior of workers (Stajkovic & Luthans 1997; Anthony & Young 1999).

The present research classified control systems - according to their source- into two broad categories: Heaven Control System (HCS) imposed by God, and Mundane Control System (MCS) developed by human being. In this article (MCS), (MC), and (OC) will be used interchangeably.

### **Mundane Control System (MCS)**

MCS represents any control system developed by individuals, groups, organizations, or communities to regulate and sustain effective and ethical interactions, relationships, or performance. Effectiveness of MCS could be achieved formally and informally. Samuelson (1999) refers formal MCS to rules, procedures, instructions, and work standards; while informal MCS or "social control system" refers to values, norms, and ethical standards. Evidence shows that MCS fail to stop or decrease rates of workplace violence.

Traditionally, control system performs two functions: preventive and corrective. Preventive or positive control system aims at avoiding work-related deviations and drifts. In contrast, corrective or negative control procedures are directed to discover and rectify deviations. In fact, corrective function of control system serves a preventive role. Sanction inflicted on a particular individual plays a preventive role for the same deviation in future from the same individual or from other member of a society.

Spencer (1979: 219) subdivided the power of (OC) into three categories: coercive or physical power, utilitarian or material power, and normative or symbolic power. According to Spencer, mosques' and churches' officials rely on symbolic power, therefore, they are considered as formal and persuasive leaders who stimulate followers to thank and pray. In contrast, coercive organizations as prisons rely on formal physical power which is overwhelmed sometimes by informal power of a specific inmate as a group leader. Utilitarian organizations such as factories fall in-between coercive and symbolic organizations.

Unlike Spencer's point of view, this researcher believes that the persuasive power of mosques' and churches' officials stems from religious dogma of followers. An individual who believes in other life and his responsibility for deviated behavior may obey religion's instructions but not officials' power of worshiping houses. Organizations can easily conduct deliberate training sessions to strengthen dogmatic

power of employees and persuade them that they are accountable -after death- for their mundane behavior.

### Heaven Control System (HCS)

According to this research, (HCS) denotes 'religious' control system which are imposed by God to serve two ends: worshipping God, and behaving honestly to achieve quality of human relationships and interactions. We find in (the Holy Qur'an, 51: 56, 57) what means: "I have only created Jinns and men, that they may serve Me". "No Sustenance do I require of them, nor do I require that they should feed Me". We find also example for quality relationship in (the Holy Qur'an, 49: 12) which means: "O ye who believe! avoid suspicion as much (as possible): for suspicion in some cases is a sin: and spy not on each other, nor speak ill of each other behind their backs". We find also example for quality interactions in (the Holy Qur'an, 2: 282) which means: "O ye who believe! When ye deal with each other, in transactions involving future obligations in a fixed period of time, reduce them to writing let a scribe write down faithfully as between the parties..."

Mitchell (2003: 10) asserts that the world's great religions guard values and herald virtues. He also asserts that Holy Books are strewn with warnings about wealth accumulation without accompanying social responsibility. The same meaning is found in (the Holy Qur'an, 9: 34): "And there are those who bury gold and silver and spend it not in the Way of Allah: announce unto them a most grievous penalty".

Progeny of Adam (peace be upon him) shares three unities: unity of God, unity of creation, and unity of religions. Religions stand on three pillars: monotheism, service of God (worship), and quality of human transactions. Although transactions differences may have been found in religions along history, they still rely to common values and ethical considerations. This meaning is found in (the Holy Qur'an, 5: 48<sup>(1)</sup>): "To thee We sent the Scripture in truth, confirming the Scripture that came before it, and guarding it in safety: ..... To each among you <sup>(1)</sup> have We prescribed a Law and an Open Way. .... but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you; so strive as in a race in all virtues. ....".

Deontology clearly appears in religions. In (the Holy Qur'an, 41: 34) we find this meaning: "Nor can Goodness and Evil be equal. Repel (Evil) with what is better: then will he between whom and thee was hatred become as it were thy friend and intimate!"

(1) The true number of this verse is 48 rather than 51 in the translation.

(2) You: Mankind of incoming generations.

We also find in the Bible (Luke 6:27-28): "But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good

to them which hate you, Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.". We find also in Galatians 6:7-8: "Do not be deceived: God cannot be mocked. A man reaps what he sows ....."

Washington (1796) the president of America, whereupon, suggested that popular government cannot exist without morality-and morality is based upon biblical principles. In effect, he defined religious values as: "of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports....And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. – Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure—reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle".

### Do MCS or HCS Fructify?

Everywhere, statistical reports demonstrate negative answer. Nowadays, we attest endless examples of violating values and conducting unethical practices. Cardno (2002) tackled daily moral unrest somewhere in the world, and exemplified the Columbine high-school massacre and the World Trade Center terrorist acts.

The following crime rates are calculated per 100,000 citizens. In Jordan, Department of General Census (JDGC) reported 28,811 crimes in 2006 with average of 514.5 crimes. In the same year, USA Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) reported 1,418,043 registered crimes with average of 473.6 crimes. In Canada 2006, Statistical Report announced crimes rate of 7,500 crimes. British Crime Survey reported about 5.5 millions registered crimes in 2006, with an average of 10000 crimes. Nation Master submits the most recent crime data of worldwide selected countries with an average of 3370 crimes ranging from highest rate of 11382 crimes in Dominica to lowest rate of 116 crimes in Yemen.

Although crime figures may be over- or underestimated and don't reflect actual rates, they signal the failure of control (MCS) to reduce or eliminate crime rates. Holding comparisons between crime figures or rates are misleading process because a given factor for one criminal may not be so for another. Crime figures, also, couldn't be attributed to the stage of development a country experienced, poverty, or technological advancement. Human inclination to behave unethically may be the common factor among deviators.

In contrast, religious commitment could be apparent and spurious for a person who can not stop violent behavior. Receding crime rates and fostering communities' welfare seem to be far-reaching with absence of mutual support and systematic integration between (HCS) and (MCS). God absolutely controls us and assures severe penalties for unethical deviations. In

the Bible, we find (Mark 9: 45): "And if your foot causes you to sin, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life lame than with two feet to be thrown into hell". We find in the Holy Quran (18:107): "As to those who believe and work righteous deeds, they have, for their entertainment, the Gardens of Paradise".

### Control Deterrence

"Global Security Organization" defines control deterrence as a state of mind brought about by the existence of a credible threat of unacceptable consequences. "The American Heritage Dictionary" & "Princeton University Dictionary" refer unacceptable consequences to act, means, or process. Sanctions and penalties create a specific level of deterrence which varies from individual to another. Increasing inevitability of undesirable consequences will increase the level of employees' commitment intended organizational outcomes (Lynam & Miller, 2004).

Deterrence is an important feature of any control system. Control deterrence could be established internally or externally. Internal control deterrence refers to individual's psychological state that creates internal self control to block deviated behavior (Higgins, 2007). This type of deterrence is optimal and worthily to be reached through continuous education and industrious edification. In contrast, external control deterrence refers to outside party that imposes penalty against deviated behavior (Richard *et al.*, 2000; Cardno, 2002).

Higher level of control deterrence promises a higher level of self-control (Piquero & Tibbetts, 1996). Self deterrence is preferable because Human Nature often rebels external control or deterrence (Bridges & Stone, 1986). The researcher believes that advanced level of ethical commitment stems from individual's motivation to pursue perpetual awards and happiness in the Other Life. Those individuals commit ethical behavior and avoid unethical conduct whether they are under human control or not, because they conjure up God's control.

The researcher also believes that two factors prevent individuals to formulate self-control: (1) deviators prefer immediate gain obtained from deviated behavior over unacceptable consequences thereafter, (2) deviators get addicted to deviated behavior which in turn chokes individual's ability to assess possible consequences. In the above cases, control system should prescribe severe penalties to outweigh whatever immediate consequences could be gained. (HCS) avouches such a matter, but (MCS) lacks it.

Gençtürk & Aulakh (2007:92) distinguished between two types of (MCS): formal and informal. Formal control system denotes the control of higher level managers, whereas informal control system represents the obligations of society norms which

protect against exploitative and opportunistic use of decision rights.

(HCS) strength stems from human nature when it feels the supreme power of the Creator. Cornado (2002) pointed to the report of Oxford University study conducted in 1999 that concluded: "even children with no religious input, had abstract notions of a Creator, thereby paving the way for a solid foundation in the concepts of right and wrong". In (the Holy Qur'an, 10: 22) we find this meaning: " ....; then comes a stormy wind and the waves come to them from all sides, and they think they are being overwhelmed: they cry unto Allah, ....!". It is unrealistic for human being to get his own enactments outdo or substitute God's enactment!

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) views control deterrence as a function of four variables: (a) the perceived probability of being caught and paying a penalty; (b) the perceived level of the penalty; and (c) peer group pressure, (d) weighed against the perceived benefits accruing from the violation. These four variable are clearly provided by (HCS):

1. Each behavior is monitored by God. Violators could not escape and will pay a penalty in the Other Life.
2. Penalty (Hell) is too severe, and unbearable.
3. Others, even those forcing an individual to deviate, will not bear or share him what penalty he will receive.
4. Penalties (permanent) in the Other Life will exceedingly outweigh what benefits (temporary) may be received in Mundane Life.

Lange (2008: 710) conceptualized his model of organizational corruption control around (FAO) model and subdivided its functionality into 4 categories:

1. Autonomy reduction where employees' freedom is circumscribed formally as in bureaucratic model, or informally by colleagues, society, or norms.
2. Consequence system which includes formal organizational reward and punishment systems that influence the member's behaviors.
3. Environment sanctioning wherein the organization interprets and transmits to the member external pressures for legal/regulatory compliance and social conformity.
4. Intrinsically oriented control.

So many researches supported (FAO) model. Keane *et al.* (1989: 336) found that Juvenile females are more susceptible to police contact for marijuana use. In contrast, male-police contacts (control deterrence) amplify deviance. Keane *et al.* (1993: 30) supported the general theory of crime proposed by Gottfredson & Hirschi and found disclose relationship between low self-control and driving under the influence of alcohol for both men and women. They found also that low self-control criminals are less restrained from illegal

activities. Higgins (2007: 523) linked digital piracy of undergraduates to low self-control and found it greater among male students than females.

According to Bridges & Stone (1986: 207), educational attainment, beliefs about immunity from punishment, and persons' offense histories are strongly associated with threat perceptions. These results highlight the importance of early education to engrain self-esteem in children's minds and train them to consider it as a worth property.

## Self-Control

According to Wikipedia, self-control refers to "exertion of one's own will (willpower) over the inhibitions of his body or self". Related literature examined two important relationships: The impact of religiosity on self-control, and the impact of self-control on criminality. Religiosity enhances self-control and adherence to the law, social norms, and orthodox behavior (Benda, 2002; Baier & Wright, 2001; Aziz & Rehman, 1996; and Evans *et al.*, 1995). Other researchers relate individual's orthodox behavior to some factors other than religiosity: 1) parenting during 6-8 childhood (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990); Gray & Steinberg, 1999; and Hay, 2001); 2) social effect (Johnson *et al.*, 2000; Richard *et al.*, 2000); 3) values (Akers, 1998); 4) individual's access to crime (Grasmick *et al.*, 1993; LaGrange & Silverman, 1999); and 5) fear of supernatural consequences in Heaven life (Burkett, 1993) or in Mundane life (Harris, 2003).

The relationship between self-control and individuals' propensity to engage in crime received empirical evidence. Individuals with low level of self-control may easily engage in criminal opportunity (Burt *et al.*, 2006; Vazire & Funder, 2006; Morselli & Tremblay, 2004; Pratt & Cullen, 2000; and Piquero & Tibbetts, 1996). Few studies show contrary results (Benson & Moore, 1992; and Tittle, 1991).

Researchers deducted two factors underlying the above mixed results:

1. Complexity of social context and of religious communities (Ellison *et al.* 1997), (Evans *et al.* 1995), (Jang & Johnson 2001), (Stark 1996) and (Welch *et al.* 1991).
2. Complexity and divergence of Human selves which are subjected to individual's state of mind, Self-control, then, overlaps with impulsivity (Farrington, 2005; Cooke & Michie, 2001; Lynam & Miller, 2004; and Raine *et al.*, 2005).

Our selves are mixtures of clay and souls. Human body represents the clay component, while human soul represents the spiritual component. Wang (2007: 248) discussed the term "Humanization of Nature" introduced by Li Zehou where internal component of the term refers to physical and psychic faculties of humankind. Human soul represents God's breathed

secret (something of His spirit) into Adam's body (clay) so that he became a live creation (Human self).

Devil, the humanity enemy, seduced our parents Adam and Eve and weakened their self-control to approach forbidden tree, so that God drove them out from paradise and sent them down to the earth. In the Holy Bible (Genesis 2: 16, 17), we find: "But the LORD told him "You may eat fruit from any tree in the garden (16), except the one that has the power to let you know the difference between right and wrong. If you eat any fruit from that tree, you will die before the day is over (17).

God entrusted Adam to populate the earth by executing His Sharia. Sharia (Sharī'ah) refers to the body of a religion law which means "way" or "path" and represents the legal framework within which our lives are regulated according to religion principles of jurisprudence (Otterman, 2005 ). Devil seduced Cain (Adam's son) to kill his brother (Abel) who adhered to morality inherent deeply in his spirit. Devil continues to dominate human behavior and prevent self reproaching and regret.

Religions warn believers against to following Devil's whispers which solicit them to disobey God's orders and fulfill body requirements and self gratification unethically (the Holy Qur'an, 24: 21: the Holy Bible, Matthew 12:36).

During epochs followed, God sent prophets to their nations, each with suitable Sharia. Inflexible prophets: Moses, Jesus, and Mohammad (peace be upon them) were sent with three main religions: Judaism, Christening, and Islam. These religions share the same credos of worshipping God and interacting ethically (the Holy Qur'an, 42: 13).

An individual controls himself to a degree relates directly to the components of that self (soul and clay). Three forces dispute human self: Devil whispers, body requirements, and ethical considerations. An individual holds internal dialogue each time he intends to take action: do it, don't do it, it is an ill-gotten, licit, allowed, forbidden, beneficial, harmful, and so on. Human response to Devil's whispers depends on the type of his soul (self):

1. Righteous self (in complete rest and satisfaction): infallible soul because it has enough faith to resist Devil's whispers (the Holy Qur'an, 89: 27-30). Prophets and righteous individuals could be classified into this category.
2. Self-reproaching (eschew Evil self): Represents lower level of morality than the righteous self. Occasionally, Devil predominate individual spirit so that he may follow Devil whispers (the Holy Qur'an, 75: 1-2). Thereupon, unethical behavior or negative results will submit to evaluation which results in self-reproaching. In organizational context, it is sufficient to remind those employees about the torment on the Other Life for cheaters and ethical

deviators. Individuals who honestly follow religion's instructions are classified into this category.

3. Prone to evil (wicked) self: this self helps Devil to dominate individuals' behavior so that deviated behavior becomes the rule rather than the exception. In organizational context, employees of wicked selves are expected to deviate from norms, values, and regulations.

## Results

Firstly Differences between HCS and MCS: Although there are significant differences between HCS and MCS, they can be integrated into an effective organizational control system. The following table provides a brief comparison regarding illustrated criteria:

Table 1. A comparison between HCS and MCS.

Criteria	HCS	MCS
Source	God's enactment through Scriptures and Prophets	Human legislation
Nature	Dogmatic and perceptual	Sensible
Perfection	No gaps	Gaps are possible
Duration	Durable until abrogated by another Prophet	Needs continuous modification or change
Possibility of crimer's escape	Impossible	Possible
Rewards	Paradise	Different types of incentives: wages, salaries, promotion, ....
Sanctions	Hill	Different types of sanctions: salary deduction, jail, demotion, .
Level of deterrence	Very high	Moderate to low
Forgiveness of God's rights	God may forgive His own rights	Human being isn't authorized to forgive God's right
Forgiveness of Human rights	God will never forgive unless the human owner forgives	Human being may forgive his own or others' rights
Domain	Both First and Other life	First life
Promoted values	Universal (Human) or common	May be local
Human selves, needs, and thought	God Knows our thought and real intention of behavior	Human being knows declared intention but not real intention.
Human behavior and relations	Improved	Intended to be improved
Demur and rejection	Will be sanctioned by God	May be accepted and could be changed.
Reason of commitment	Faith of enduring rewards or sanctions at the Other life, morality, and/or righteous soul	Obligations, morality, rewards, and/or sanctions in Mundane Life

God's (religious) enactments are perfect and absolute, whereas Man's enactments are sometimes amiss. Human enactments should fulfill religious requirements because punishment at Other Life will be too severe. Jesus (peace be upon him) had been sent to fulfill the law on the earth (Matthew 5:17-20): "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets;....; For I tell you, unless your righteousness

exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven".

An employee with ill inclinations may find his way to escape MCS, but surely he can't escape HCS because God is absolutely knowledgeable of Mankind intent and conduct. So many religious scripts inform us that God will call us to account in the Other Life. God may forgive our dereliction to worship him, but He never forgives us to harm or frighten others, steel, cheat, or not to perform as well-ethical as we can. Jesus (peace be upon him) informed us that Hell is waiting for sinners (Matthew 5:27-30):" You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery ... For it is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body go into hell (30)".

HCS imposes high level of deterrence which is sensed in different levels depending on individual's commitment to religious dogma. Religious dogma couldn't be just speech; it should guide action and behavior. An individual who believes in God and eternity of Other Life feel accountable for his behavior and responsible for morality standards.

Human enactments need to be developed overtime, to fill the gaps which may appear after bringing enactments into application. Prophets (peace be upon them) were sent for their nations with suitable Sharia and with the same principles of worshipping God and Morality. Morality is ingrained in Mankind selves and religions indoctrinate values and ethical principles. Religious dogma connects mundane behavior to resulted requital after death. Accordingly, human relations are improved and society welfare will be achieved. God may forgive His own rights, but Human rights will be subject to clearance in the Other Day.

Human enactments could be biased, amiss, unsuitable, or unstable calling for further development and resulting in costly and ineffective process. Although respectable and honored individuals comply with law and morality standards, but still other community members are not. Religious commitment leads to morality commitment, but morality commitment does not necessarily result from religious commitment. It is important to translate religious dogma into honest behavior rather than manipulating religious standards to suit status quo.

Secondly Integrating HCS and MCS: Differences between HCS and MCS do not necessarily impede integrating endeavors to apply them simultaneously. Mostly, organization's crumbling abruptly appears before which everything is going well. In fact, it is a matter of undiscovered cumulative tiny deviations and/or deliberate workplace violence. Inefficiencies of MCS encourage more and more work place violence which in turn increases organizational pitfalls and accelerate organizational collapse. Supporting MCS with HCS is expected to yield integrated OCS (BOCS) which reduces work place violence and deviation. If

(BOCS) is not sufficient to stop unethical inclinations to be executed, MCS alone will not be!

(OCS) requires integrating institutional objectives with employees within a holistic context of social norms and values. Religious missions exceed such an adaptive role to foster ethical intent underlying human behavior. Religions represent the best referential body of universal values. HCS is essentially cultural matter, while OCS is mostly practical in nature. The Day of Judgment is intangible in nature so that it becomes a matter of credo. Practically, OCS may be interpenetrated by employee's behavior which is driven by unethical inclinations and Satan's whispers. Integrating these two control system into (BOCS) enhances advantages and eliminates disadvantages of each.

Holding a well-established credo about the Day of Judgment will block unethical behavior because it generates better level of self-control which is resulted from Paradise avidity and Hell fear. Control systems could be classified in descendent order regarding deterrence level: HCS, self control, and OCS. Whatever the control system to be applied or the level of deterrence to stem from, could be deviated behavior couldn't be completely eliminated. It is a matter of developing better level of efficiency and reducing the level of work place violence. Integrating process is expected to be a cheap and cost effective process.

## Recommendations

The researcher recommended the following:

1. An organization may educate its employees religiously in order to integrate OCS with HCS into (BOCS) which generates another defensive tire against unethical behavior.
2. Conducting training programs to disseminate deterrence culture among employees who should perceive later accountability of immediate behavior. Employees, also, should perceive the importance of pre-evaluation of behavior in the light of common interest, values, and ethical standards.
3. Educating employees that God is absolutely conversant for their intent and behavior.
4. Educating employees that HCS, unlike OCS, is not escapable anyway for those who transgress God's orders and perpetrate unethical behavior.
5. Educating employees that tiny permanent sanction in the Other Life outweighs a greatest temporary benefit or self enjoyment an individual may reap from deviated behavior.
6. Educating employees to compromise between Mundane results and Heaven results each time they intend to behave.
7. Reminding employees continually of the basics of HCS (religious instructions) to improve the level of self-control amongst them.

8. Rewarding employees who behave ethically and provide a proof of own awaking conscious.
9. Providing employees with practical examples of those who regret and feel sad for their unethical behavior. Such anguished individuals may inform the employees about the inevitable end of deviated behavior.

## Conclusions

Human enactments and regulations including control systems are insufficient to organize spiritual dimension of human self because it is obscure part of our structure. As a result, it is difficult for control systems to achieve equilibrium between the spiritual and physical dimensions of human self. Moreover, Mundane Control Systems lack of effective deterrence to curb unethical behavior. HCS is deterrent but intangible, whereas OCS is not deterrent but tangible. HCS is cultural and educational in nature whereas OCS is mostly applicative. Accordingly, integrating HCS with OCS represent a best alternative reduces corruption levels and reaps the best possible organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

## References

- [21] Akers R., *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*, Boston: MA, Northeastern University Press, 1998.
- [22] Anthony R. and Govindarajan V., *Management Control Systems*, Chicago: Mc-Graw-Hill, 2007.
- [23] Anthony R. and Young D., *Management Control in Nonprofit Organizations*, Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill, 1999.
- [24] Aziz S. and Rehman G., "Self-Control and Tolerance among Low and High Religious Groups," *Computer Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies*, vol. 12, pp. 83-85, 1996.
- [25] Baier C. and Wright R., "If You Love Me, Keep My Commandments: A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Religion on Crime," *Computer Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 38, pp. 3-21, 2001.
- [26] Baker G., "Distortion and Risk in Optimal Incentive Contracts," *Computer Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 37, pp. 728-751, 2002.
- [27] Benda B., "Religion and Violent Offenders in Boot Camp: A Structural Equation Model," *Computer Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 39, pp. 91-121, 2002.
- [28] Benson M. and Moore E., "Are White-Collar and Common Offenders the Same?," *Computer Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 29, pp. 251-272, 1992.
- [29] Bridges S. and Stone A., "Effects of Criminal Punishment on Perceived Threat of Punishment:

- Toward an Understanding of Specific Deterrence,” *Computer Journal cf Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 207-239, 1986.
- [30] British Crime Survey, [www.homeoffice.gov.uk](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk), Last Visited 2007.
- [31] Burkett S., “Perceived Parents’ Religiosity, Friends Drinking, and Hellfire: A Panel Study of Adolescent Drinking,” *Computer Journal for The Scientific Study cf Religion*, vol. 35, pp. 134-154, 1993.
- [32] Burt C., Simons R., and Simons A., “Longitudinal Test of the Effects of Parenting and the Stability of Self-Control: Negative Evidence for the General Theory of Crime,” *Computer Journal cf Criminology*, 44: 2, 353-396, 2006.
- [33] Cardno Steve, “The Creation Basis for Morality,” <http://answersingenesis.org>, Last Visited 2002.
- [34] Chenhall R., “Management control system design within its organizational context: Findings from contingency-based research and directions for the Future,” *Computer Journal cf Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 127-168, 2003.
- [35] Cooke D. and Michie C., “Refining the Construct of Psychopathy: Towards a Hierarchical Model, Psychological Assessment,” vol. 13, pp. 171-188, 2001.
- [36] Davis T. and Luthans F., “A Social Learning Approach to Organizational Behavior,” *Academy cf Management Review*, vol. 5, pp. 281-290, 1980.
- [37] Ellison C., Burr J., and McCall P., “Religious Homogeneity and Metropolitan Suicide Rates,” *Social Forces*, vol. 76, pp. 273-299, 1997.
- [38] Evans T., Cullen F., Dunaway R., and Burton V., “Religion and Crime Reexamined: The Impact of Religion, Secular Controls, and Social Ecology on Adult Criminality,” *Criminology*, vol. 33, pp. 195-224, 1995.
- [39] FAO, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department. Definitions, Terminology and Methodology, [www.fao.org.com](http://www.fao.org.com), Last Visited 2010.
- [40] Farrington D., “The Importance of Child and Adolescent Psychopathy,” *Computer Journal cf Abnormal Child Psychology*, vol. 33, pp. 489-497, 2005.
- [1] Galatians 6:7-8, “New International Version,” *International Bible Society*, 1984
- [41] Gençtürk E. and Aulakh P., “Norms- and Control-Based Governance of International Manufacturer-Distributor Relational Exchanges,” *Computer Journal cf International Marketing*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 92-126, 2007.
- [2] Genesis 2: 16-17, “Contemporary English Version,” *American Bible Society*, 1995.
- [42] Global Security Organization, Definition of Deterrence, [www.globalsecurity.org](http://www.globalsecurity.org), Last Visited 2010.
- [43] Gottfredson M. and Hischi T., *A general Theory cf Crime*, Macmillan Publishing Company, NY, 1990.
- [44] Grasmick H., Tittle C., Bursik R., and Arneklev B., “Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s General Theory of Crime,” *Computer Journal cf Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 30, pp. 5-29, 1993.
- [45] Gray M. and Steinberg L., “Unpacking Authoritative Parenting: Reassessing A Multidimensional Construct,” *Computer Journal cf Marriage and the Family*, vol. 61, pp. 574-87, 1999.
- [46] Harris A., “Religiosity and Perceived Future Ascetic Deviance and Delinquency among Mormon Adolescents: Testing the This-Worldly Supernatural Sanctions Thesis,” *Sociological Inquiry*, vol. 73, pp. 28-51, 2003.
- [47] Hay Carter, “Parenting, Self-Control, and Delinquency: A Test of Self-control Theory,” *Criminology*, vol. 39, pp. 707-736, 2001.
- [48] Higgins George, “Digital Piracy: An Examination of Low Self-Control and Motivation Using Short-Term Longitudinal Data,” *Cyber Psychology and Behavior*, vol 10, no. 4, pp. 523-539, 2007.
- [49] Horngren C., Sundem G., and Stratton W., *Introduction to Management Accounting*, Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005.
- [50] Huczynski A. and Buchanan D., *Organizational Behavior: An Introductory Text*, UK, Pearson Education Limited, 2001.
- [51] Jang, S. and Johnson B., “Neighborhood Disorder, Individual Religiosity, and Adolescent Use of Illicit Drugs: A Test of Multilevel Hypotheses,” *Criminology*, vol. 39, pp. 109-145, 2001.
- [52] Johnson B., Jang S., Li S., and Larson D., “The Invisible Institution and Black Youth Crime: The Church as an Agency of Local Social Control,” *Computer Journal cf Youth and Adolescence*, vol. 29, pp. 479-498, 2000.
- [53] Keane C., Gillis A., and Hagan J., “Deterrence and Amplification of Juvenile Delinquency by Police contact: The Importance of Gender and Risk-Orientation,” *The British Computer Journal cf Criminology*, 29, 336-352, 1989.
- [54] Keane C., Maxim P., and Teevan J., “Drinking and Driving, Self-Control, and Gender: Testing a General Theory of Crime,” *Computer Journal cf Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 30-46, 1993.
- [55] Koontz H. and Weihrich H., *Management*, Singapore: McGraw-Hill, 1988.



- [56] LaGrange T. and Silverman R., "Low Self-Control and Opportunity: Testing The General Theory of Crime as An Explanation for Gender Differences in Delinquency," *Criminology*, vol. 37, pp.41-72, 1999.
- [57] Lange D., "A Multidimensional Conceptualization of Organizational Corruption Control," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 710-729, 2008.
- [58] Longenecker J. and Pringle C., "Management Ohio: Charles E.," *Publishing Company*, 1984.
- [3] Luke 6:27-28, "New International Version," *International Bible Society*, 1984.
- [59] Lynam D. and Miller J., "Personality Pathways to Impulsive Behavior and Their Relations to Deviance: Results from three Samples," *Computer Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, vol. 20, pp. 319-341, 2004.
- [60] Maciariello J. and Kirby C., *Management Control Systems: Using Adaptive Systems to Attain Control*, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc, 1994.
- [4] Mark 9: 45, *English Standard Version*, Crossway Bibles, a Division of Good News, 2001.
- [5] Matthew 12:36, *American Standard Version*, 1984.
- [6] Matthew 5:17-20, *English Standard Version Crossway Bibles*, A Division of Good News, 2001.
- [7] Matthew 5:27-30, *English Standard Version Crossway Bibles*, A Division of Good News, 2001.
- [61] Mitchell C., "A Short Course in International Business Ethics," *World Trade Press*, [www.ebrary.com](http://www.ebrary.com), Last Visited 2003.
- [62] Morselli C. and Pierre T., "Criminal Achievement, Offender Networks, and the Benefits of Low Self-Control," *Criminology*, vol. 42, pp. 773-804, 2004.
- [63] Nation Master Statistics of Total Crimes, [www.nationmaster.com](http://www.nationmaster.com), Last Visited 2008.
- [64] Otley D., "Management Control in Contemporary Organizations: Towards a Wider Framework," *Management Accounting Research*, vol. 5, pp. 289-299, 1994.
- [65] Otterman S., Islam: Governing under Sharia: Council on Foreign Relations, [www.cfr.org](http://www.cfr.org), Last Visited 2010.
- [66] Piquero A. and Tibbetts S., "Specifying The Direct and Indirect Effects of Low Self-Control And Situational Factors in Offenders' Decision Making: Toward a More Complete Model of Rational Offending," *Justice Quarterly*, vol. 13, pp. 481-510, 1996.
- [67] Pratt T. and Cullen F., "The Empirical Status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime: A Meta-Analysis," *Criminology*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 931-64, 2000.
- [68] Princeton University, WordNet 3.0 [wordnet.princeton.edu.com](http://wordnet.princeton.edu.com), Last Visited 2006.
- [69] Raine A., Moffitt T., Caspi A., Loeber R., Stouthamer-Loeber M., and Lynam D., "Neurocognitive Impairments in Boys on the Life-Course Persistent Antisocial Path," *Computer Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, vol. 114, pp. 38-49, 2005.
- [70] Report of Jordanian Department of General Census, [www.dos.jo.com](http://www.dos.jo.com), Last Visited 2010.
- [71] Richard A., Bell D., and Carlson J., "Individual Religiosity, Moral Community, and Drug User Treatment," *Computer Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 39, pp. 240-246, 2000.
- [72] Robbins S., *Organization Theory: Structure, Design, and Applications*, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- [73] Samuelson L., *The Effects of Increasing Turbulence on Organizational Control: Some Reflections*, <http://swoba.hhs.se/hastba/papers>, Last Visited 1999.
- [8] Scriptures: The Holy Bible [www.biblegateway.com](http://www.biblegateway.com), Last Visited 2010.
- [9] Scriptures: The Holy Quran from: A Translation of Qur'an Meanings by: Ali, Abdullah Yusuf, Lebanon, Beirut, Dar Al Arabia.
- [74] Spencer M., *Foundations of Modern Sociology*, N.J: Prentice-Hall Inc, 1979.
- [75] Stajkovic A. and Luthans F., "A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Organizational behavior Modification on Task Performance, 1975-1995," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 40, pp. 1122-1149, 1997.
- [76] Stark R., "Religion as Context: Hellfire and Delinquency One More Time," *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 57, pp. 163-173 1996.
- [77] Statistical Report of Canada, [www.cbc.ca.com](http://www.cbc.ca.com), Last Visited 2010.
- [9] Sura No. 10 (Yunus or Jonah), Verse no. 22, pp. 489.
- [10] Sura No. 18 (Kahf), Verse no. 107, pp. 759.
- [10] Sura No. 2 (Baqara), Verse no. 282, pp. 113.
- [11] Sura No. 24 (Nūr), Verse no. 21, pp. 901.
- [12] Sura No. 41 (Fussilat), Verse no. 34, pp. 1296.
- [13] Sura No. 42 (Al-Shura), Verse no. 13, pp. 1308.
- [14] Sura No. 49 (Hujurat), Verse no. 12, pp. 1406.
- [15] Sura No. 5 (Al Ma'ida), Verse no. 48, pp. 258.
- [16] Sura No. 51 (Zariyat), Verses No. 56, 57, pp. 1429.
- [17] Sura No. 75 (Al-Qiyamat), Verses 1-2, pp. 1649.
- [18] Sura No. 89 (Al-Fajr), Verses 27-30, pp. 1730.
- [19] Sura No. 9 (Taubah), Verse no. 34, pp. 449.
- [78] The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language Houghton Mifflin Company, [www.thefreedictionary.com](http://www.thefreedictionary.com), Last Visited 2003.
- [79] Tittle C., "A General Theory of Crime: Book Review," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 96, pp. 1609-1611, 1991.

- [80] USA Federal Bureau Investigation. [www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius), Last Visited 2007.
- [81] Vazire S., and Funder C., "Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 10, pp. 154-165, 2006.
- [82] Wang K., "The Challenges of Globalization: A Non-Western Perspective, Part 5," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 248, 2007.
- [83] Washington George, *Farewell Address: USA*. [www.traditionalvalues.org](http://www.traditionalvalues.org), Last Visited 1796.
- [84] Welch M., Tittle C., and Tittle and Petee T., "Religion and Deviance among Adult Catholics: A Test of the Moral Communities' Hypothesis," *Computer Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 159-172, 1991.