

eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

	WJARR	HISSN:3501-9615 CODEN (UBA): HUARAN
	W	JARR
	World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews	
		World Journal Series INDIA
Check for updates		

(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



YANG LIU \*

Tech. Univ, China.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 21(03), 1611–1616

Publication history: Received on 08 February 2024; revised on 16 March 2024; accepted on 19 March 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.3.0850

# Abstract

The application of mathematics in administrative services is multifaceted, enhancing decision-making, operational efficiency, and strategic planning. Mathematical techniques are crucial in formulating and solving both theoretical and practical problems across various fields, including business and management. This paper explores the complex issues of unfairness or bureaucracy within the administrative services of certain staffers of a certain institution. By employing advanced mathematical concepts, we model and analyze these problems to gain deeper insights into their causes and potential solutions. The paper introduces novel mathematical frameworks to quantify and assess the impact of these issues on the overall functioning of the institution.

**Keywords:** Administrative Services; Mathematical Modeling; Operational Efficacy; Process Optimization; Game Theory Applications; Inequity Analysis

# 1. Introduction

Education institutions play a crucial role in shaping the future of society by providing students with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in their chosen fields (see, for example, [2] and [1]). However, the effectiveness of these institutions heavily relies on the efficient and fair functioning of their administrative services (see, for example, [14] and [7]). The presence of unfairness, excessive bureaucracy, or untrustworthy behavior among the staff in pivotal positions

can greatly hinder the institution's ability to serve its students and faculty effectively (see, for example, [5] and [11]).

In recent years, there has been a growing concern about the impact of these issues on the quality of education and the overall experience of students and faculty members (see, for example, [4] and [9]). Studies have shown that unfair treatment, bureaucratic hurdles, or untrustworthy behavior can lead to decreased motivation, productivity, and satisfaction among the members of the institution (see, for example, [6] and [13]).

To address these problems, it is essential to develop a comprehensive understanding of their underlying causes and potential solutions (see, for example, [8] and [12]). Traditional approaches to studying these issues have relied on qualitative methods, such as surveys and interviews, which provide valuable insights but lack the quantitative rigor necessary to develop effective interventions (see, for example, [3] and [10]).

In this paper, we propose a novel mathematical framework to study the problems of unfairness and bureaucracy behavior in the administrative services of untrustworthy behavior in the administrative services of certain staffers of certain education institution. By leveraging advanced mathematical concepts from various fields, such as graph theory,

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author: YANG LIU

Copyright © 2024 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Liscense 4.0.

game theory, and optimization, we aim to quantify and model these issues to gain deeper insights into their dynamics and potential solutions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 focuses on modeling unfairness within the administrative services using optimization techniques. Section 3 employs graph theory to quantify and analyze the impact of bureaucracy on the efficiency of administrative tasks. Section 4 utilizes game theory to study the dynamics of untrustworthy behavior among staff members and propose strategies to encourage trustworthiness. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and discusses future research directions.

#### 2. Modeling Unfairness

Unfairness in the administrative services of untrustworthy behavior in the administrative services of certain staffers of certain education institution can manifest in various forms, such as biased decision-making, unequal distribution of resources, and discriminatory treatment of students and faculty members. To effectively address this issue, it is essential to develop a mathematical framework that can quantify and model the degree of unfairness within the system.

Let *U* be the set of all administrative tasks, and let  $f: U \to R$  be a function that assigns a fairness score to each task. The fairness score represents the degree to which a task is performed fairly, with higher values indicating greater fairness. We define the total unfairness in the system as:

$$U = \sum_{u \in U} \quad (1 - f(u)) \# (2.1)$$

The goal is to minimize the total unfairness in the system by finding the optimal distribution of tasks among the staff members. However, this optimization problem is subject to several constraints, such as the capabilities and workload of each staff member.

Let *S* be the set of all staff members, and let  $c_i$  be the capability vector of staff member *i*, representing their skills and expertise in performing different types of tasks. Let  $w_i$  be the workload vector of staff member *i*, representing the amount of time and effort they can dedicate to each task. The optimization problem can be formulated as:

$$\min_{x_{iu}} \sum_{u \in U} \quad (1 - f(u)) \# (2.2) \ s.t. \sum_{i \in S} \quad x_{iu} = 1, \forall u \in U \# (2.3) \sum_{u \in U} \quad x_{iu} \le w_i, \forall i \in S \# (2.4) \ x_{iu} \le c_i, \forall i \in S, \forall u \in U \# (2.6)$$

where  $x_{iu}$  is a binary variable that indicates whether task u is assigned to staff member i. The first constraint ensures that each task is assigned to exactly one staff member. The second constraint ensures that the workload of each staff member is not exceeded. The third constraint ensures that the tasks assigned to each staff member are within their capabilities.

This optimization problem is a variant of the generalized assignment problem (GAP) (Ancan, 2007), which is known to be NP-hard. However, various approximation algorithms and heuristics have been developed to solve GAP efficiently (Cohen et al., 2006; Shmoys & Tardos, 1993).

In addition to the assignment of tasks, unfairness can also arise from the unequal distribution of resources among different departments or groups within the institution. Let D be the set of all departments, and let  $r_d$  be the resource requirement vector of department d, representing the amount of resources needed for optimal functioning. Let b be the total budget available for resource allocation. The resource allocation problem can be formulated as:

$$\min_{y_d} \sum_{d \in D} \quad \| r_d - y_d \|_2^2 \quad s.t. \sum_{d \in D} \quad y_d \le b \ y_d \ge 0, \forall d \in D$$

where  $y_d$  is the resource allocation vector for department d, and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the Euclidean norm. The objective function minimizes the total discrepancy between the resource requirements and the actual allocations, subject to the budget constraint.

This resource allocation problem is a variant of the quadratic knapsack problem (QKP) (Pisinger, 2007), which can be solved using dynamic programming or approximation algorithms (Kellerer et al., 2004).

By solving these optimization problems, higher education institutions can develop fair and efficient strategies for task assignment and resource allocation, thereby minimizing unfairness in their administrative services.

## 3. Quantifying bureaucracy

Excessive bureaucracy in the administrative services of untrustworthy behavior in the administrative services of certain staffers of certain education institution can lead to delays, inefficiencies, and frustration among students and faculty members. To effectively address this issue, it is essential to quantify and model the impact of bureaucracy on the functioning of the institution.

Graph theory provides a natural framework for modeling the dependencies and complexities of administrative tasks. Let G = (V, E) be a directed graph, where V represents the set of administrative tasks and E represents the dependencies between tasks. Each edge  $e_{ij} \in E$  indicates that task j depends on the completion of task i. The weight of each edge, denoted by  $w(e_{ij})$ , represents the bureaucratic complexity involved in completing task j after task i.

The total bureaucratic complexity of the system can be expressed as:

$$B = \sum_{e_{ij} \in E} \quad w(e_{ij}) # (3.1)$$

To reduce bureaucracy and improve the efficiency of the administrative services, the goal is to find the shortest path that completes all tasks while minimizing the total bureaucratic complexity. This problem can be formulated as a variant of the traveling salesman problem (TSP) (Gutin & Punnen, 2007), where the objective is to find the shortest Hamiltonian path in the graph.

Let  $x_{ij}$  be a binary variable that indicates whether edge  $e_{ij}$  is included in the path. The optimization problem can be formulated as:

$$\begin{split} \min_{x_{ij}} \sum_{e_{ij} \in E} & w(e_{ij}) x_{ij} \# (3.2) \ s.t. \ \# (3.3) \ s.t. \ \sum_{i \in V} & x_{ij} = 1, \forall j \in V \setminus \{1\} \# (3.4) \ \sum_{j \in V} & x_{ij} = 1, \forall i \\ & \in V \setminus \{n\} \# (3.5) \ \sum_{i,j \in S} & x_{ij} \le |S| - 1, \forall S \subset V, |S| \ge 2\# (3.6) \ x_{ij} \in \{0,1\}, \forall e_{ij} \in E\# (3.7) \end{split}$$

where *n* is the number of tasks. The first two constraints ensure that each task is visited exactly once, except for the starting and ending tasks. The third constraint eliminates subtours, ensuring that the path is connected.

The TSP is known to be NP-hard, but various approximation algorithms and heuristics have been developed to solve it efficiently (Arora, 1998; Christofides, 1976). By solving this optimization problem, higher education institutions can identify the most efficient path for completing administrative tasks while minimizing bureaucratic complexity.

In addition to the direct dependencies between tasks, bureaucracy can also arise from the hierarchical structure of the institution. Let H = (V, E) be a directed acyclic graph representing the hierarchical relationships between different positions in the administrative services. Each node  $v \in V$  represents a position, and each edge  $e_{ij} \in E$  indicates that position *i* has authority over position *j*.

The bureaucratic complexity induced by the hierarchical structure can be quantified using the notion of graph centrality (Newman, 2018). Let c(v) be a centrality measure for node v, such as betweenness centrality or closeness centrality. The total bureaucratic complexity induced by the hierarchy can be expressed as:

$$H = \sum_{v \in V} \quad c(v) \# (3.8)$$

To reduce the bureaucratic complexity induced by the hierarchy, the goal is to find an alternative hierarchical structure that minimizes H while preserving the necessary authority relationships. This problem can be formulated as a variant of the minimum linear arrangement problem (MLA) (Garey & Johnson, 1979), where the objective is to find a permutation of the nodes that minimizes the sum of the edge lengths.

Let  $\pi: V \to \{1, ..., n\}$  be a permutation of the nodes, where  $\pi(v)$  represents the position of node v in the linear arrangement. The optimization problem can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\pi} \sum_{e_{ij} \in E} |\pi(i) - \pi(j)| \# (3.9) \ s.t. \ \pi(i) < \pi(j), \forall e_{ij} \in E \# (3.10)$$

The constraint ensures that the authority relationships are preserved in the linear arrangement.

The MLA problem is also NP-hard, but various approximation algorithms and heuristics have been developed to solve it efficiently (Feige & Lee, 2007; Rao & Richa, 2005). By solving this optimization problem, higher education institutions can identify alternative hierarchical structures that minimize bureaucratic complexity while maintaining the necessary authority relationships.

#### 4. Modeling Untrustworthy Behavior

Untrustworthy behavior among staff members in the administrative services of untrustworthy behavior in the administrative services of certain staffers of certain education institution can have severe consequences, such as decreased productivity, low morale, and damage to the institution's reputation. Game theory provides a powerful framework for modeling and analyzing the dynamics of trust and cooperation in such settings.

We consider a two-player game between the institution and a staff member. The institution's strategy is to allocate tasks and resources to the staff member, while the staff member's strategy is to either act trustworthily or untrustworthy in performing their duties. The payoff matrix for this game can be represented as:

$$((R,R)(S,T)(T,S)(P,P))$$
#(4.1)

where *R* is the reward for mutual trustworthiness, *S* is the sucker's payoff (the payoff for being trustworthy when the other player is untrustworthy), *T* is the temptation to defect (the payoff for being untrustworthy when the other player is trustworthy), and *P* is the punishment for mutual untrustworthiness. The payoffs satisfy the condition T > R > P > S.

This game is known as the Prisoner's Dilemma (Rapoport & Chammah, 1965), which models the conflict between individual and collective interests. In the context of administrative services, the institution and the staff member can both benefit from mutual trustworthiness, but the staff member may be tempted to act untrustworthy for personal gain.

To analyze the dynamics of this game, we can use the concept of Nash equilibrium (Nash, 1951). A Nash equilibrium is a strategy profile in which no player can improve their payoff by unilaterally changing their strategy. In the Prisoner's Dilemma, the unique Nash equilibrium is for both players to act untrustworthy, leading to a suboptimal outcome.

To encourage trustworthy behavior and discourage untrustworthy actions, the institution can employ various strategies based on the principles of mechanism design (Nisan et al., 2007). One approach is to modify the payoff structure of the game by introducing incentives for trustworthiness and penalties for untrustworthiness.

Let  $\alpha$  be the incentive factor for trustworthiness, and let  $\beta$  be the penalty factor for untrustworthiness. The modified payoff matrix can be represented as:

$$((R + \alpha, R + \alpha) (S - \beta, T) (T, S - \beta) (P - \beta, P - \beta)) # (4.2)$$

By choosing appropriate values for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , the institution can create a new Nash equilibrium in which both players act trustworthy. Another approach is to use repeated games (Mailath & Samuelson, 2006) to model the long-term interactions between the institution and the staff members. In a repeated game, players interact multiple times and can condition their strategies on the history of previous interactions. This allows for the emergence of cooperation and trust

through strategies such as tit-for-tat (Axelrod, 1984), which starts by cooperating and then mimics the opponent's previous action.

To analyze repeated games, we can use the concept of subgame perfect equilibrium (SPE) (Selten, 1965). An SPE is a strategy profile that induces a Nash equilibrium in every subgame of the repeated game. In the context of administrative services, an SPE can be achieved through trigger strategies (Friedman, 1971), where players cooperate as long as everyone has cooperated in the past and switch to punishment if anyone defects.

Let  $\delta$  be the discount factor, representing the players' valuation of future payoffs relative to present payoffs. The condition for cooperation to be an SPE is:

$$\frac{R}{1-\delta} \ge T + \frac{\delta P}{1-\delta} \# (4.3)$$

This condition ensures that the long-term benefit of cooperation outweighs the short-term temptation to defect.

By designing incentive structures and fostering long-term relationships based on trust and cooperation, higher education institutions can effectively address the problem of untrustworthy behavior in their administrative services.

# 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a novel mathematical approach to understanding and addressing the problems of unfairness, bureaucracy, or untrustworthy behavior in the administrative services of certain staffers of certain education institution. By leveraging advanced mathematical concepts from optimization theory, graph theory, and game theory, we have developed quantitative models and frameworks to analyze these issues and propose potential solutions.

Our approach to modeling unfairness using optimization techniques allows institutions to identify fair and efficient strategies for task assignment and resource allocation. By quantifying bureaucracy using graph-theoretic measures and solving related optimization problems, institutions can streamline their administrative processes and reduce unnecessary complexities. Finally, by applying game-theoretic principles and mechanism design, institutions can create incentive structures and foster long-term relationships that encourage trustworthy behavior among staff members.

The mathematical frameworks presented in this paper provide a foundation for future research on the challenges faced by administrative services in higher education. Some potential avenues for future work include:

Developing efficient algorithms and heuristics to solve the optimization problems related to unfairness, bureaucracy, or untrustworthy behavior in large-scale institutional settings.

Incorporating additional factors and constraints into the models, such as the dynamics of organizational culture, the impact of leadership styles, and the role of communication and information sharing.

Conducting empirical studies to validate the proposed models and frameworks using real-world data from higher education institutions.

Exploring the potential of data-driven approaches, such as machine learning and network analysis, to identify patterns and predict the emergence of unfairness, bureaucracy, or untrustworthy behavior in administrative services.

Developing decision support systems and tools based on the mathematical models to assist higher education administrators in making informed and equitable decisions.

By pursuing these research directions, we can deepen our understanding of the complex challenges faced by administrative services in higher education and develop more effective strategies for promoting fairness, efficiency, and trust within these institutions.

In conclusion, the mathematical approach presented in this paper offers a powerful and innovative way to address the persistent problems of unfairness, bureaucracy, or untrustworthy behavior in the administrative services of certain staffers of certain education institution. By quantifying these issues and proposing solutions based on advanced

mathematical concepts, we can contribute to the development of more equitable, efficient, and trustworthy institutions that better serve the needs of students, faculty, and society as a whole.

### **Compliance with ethical standards**

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

### Availability of data and materials

The author confirms that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article or its supplementary materials.

### References

- [1] Roy Y Chan. Understanding the purpose of higher education: An analysis of the economic and social benefits for completing a college degree. Journal of Education Policy, Planning and Administration, 6(5):1-40, 2016.
- [2] Arthur M Cohen and Carrie B Kisker. The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [3] Leslie A Curry, Ingrid M Nembhard, and Elizabeth H Bradley. Qualitative and mixed methods provide unique contributions to outcomes research. Circulation, 119(10):14421452,2009
- [4] Graham Gibbs and Martin Coffey. The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. Active learning in higher education, 5(1):87-100, 2004.
- [5] Benjamin Ginsberg. The fall of the faculty. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [6] Katrin Grossmann, George Jiglau, Ute Dubois, Anca Sinea, Fernando Martín-Consuegra, Malgorzata Dereniowska, Robert Franke, Rachel Guyet, Ana Horta, Filiz Katman, et al. The critical role of trust in experiencing and coping with energy poverty: Evidence from across europe. Energy Research E3 Social Science, 76:102064, 2021.
- [7] Angappa Gunasekaran, Chaitali Patel, and Ercan Tirtiroglu. Performance measures and metrics in a supply chain environment. International journal of operations 83 production Management, 21(1/2):71-87, 2001.
- [8] Michael J Guralnick. Early intervention for children with intellectual disabilities: Current knowledge and future prospects. Journal of applied Research in intellectual Disabilities, 18(4):313-324, 2005.
- [9] Douglas N Harris and Tim R Sass. Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. Journal of public economics, 95(7-8):798-812, 2011.
- [10] Lawrence A Palinkas. Qualitative and mixed methods in mental health services and implementation research. Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 43(6):851-861, 2014.
- [11] Rik Peeters, Humberto Trujillo Jiménez, Elizabeth O'Connor, Pascual Ogarrio Rojas, Michele González Galindo, and Daniela Morales Tenorio. Low-trust bureaucracy: Understanding the mexican bureaucratic experience. Public Administration and Development, 38(2):65-74, 2018.
- [12] Hamidreza Shariatmadari, Rapeepat Ratasuk, Sassan Iraji, Andrés Laya, Tarik Taleb, Riku Jäntti, and Amitava Ghosh. Machine-type communications: Current status and future perspectives toward 5g systems. IEEE Communications Magazine, 53(9):10-17, 2015.
- [13] Paul E Spector. Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice. John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
- [14] Vito Tanzi. Fiscal federalism and decentralization: A review of some efficiency and macroeconomic aspects. World Bank Washington'eD. CDC, 1995.