

Leadership Integrity Measurement Development

In Mayasari, Handrix Chris Haryanto, Iyus Wiadi and Handi Risza
Universitas Paramadina

Keywords: Integrity, Leadership, Measurement

Abstract: This research aims to develop a measuring instrument of integrity based on the presence of more holistic elements in understanding leadership. The research in the study of integrity is seen to be still very partial in nature to be used as a basis for evaluating the performance of individuals as leaders or organizations so that it is necessary to develop an eclectic measurement. The parameters in the eclectic measurement lead to the existence of organizational elements and organizational systems that support the effectiveness of leaders in managing an institution. This study uses a qualitative approach through interviews with experts in confirming measuring instruments. The results of the development of this integrity measurement tool can strengthen the integrity dimension that can be used as a guide in assessing the perceptions of the leaders of institutions. This aspect of perception will also provide input for improving the performance of leaders by paying attention to aspects of the consequences of behavior. In addition, the existence of the integrity dimension can be realized in the form of policies and guidelines to become the standard and basis for evaluating employee performance.

1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding the value of integrity in leadership aspects is important because, according to Petrick and Quinn (2000), leader integrity is the main resource besides capital in soft-competence owned by institutions. Core competence is an aspect of competitiveness for institutions to be able to demonstrate the performance and sustainability of the institution in the long run. Mayasari et al. (2012) show that the integrity inherent in individuals in organizations, including leaders, can be something unique and serve as the identity of institutions that have a good reputation in the eyes of stakeholders. Integrity becomes something that is not easily imitated because it has become an inherent part of the organization. The value of integrity that is consistently applied can increase trust (Ingenhoff & Sommer, 2010); minimize deviant behavior (Dineen, et al., 2006); reduce aggressive behavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996); support the implementation of a healthy business (Brown, 2006); avoiding deviations of values and anti-social (Palanski et al., 2015); support ethical leadership (Resick et al, 2006; Kalshoven et al., 2011). Koehn (2005) argues that the value of integrity is the value of morality and forming individual or leader character. Morality is a leader's

confidence that what will be executed is part of a community system. Leaders with morality aspects will consider the implications of actions on the system as well as a guide in carrying out one's actions. In other words, according to Engelbrecht et al. (2015), leaders who have integrity as moral values will create ethical leadership.

In reality, the manifestation of integrity in daily life, especially in leadership in an organization and even the behavior of government officials, is still quite alarming, especially in Indonesia. Based on Transparency International's assessment, the value of integrity represented by the low level of corruption has not been achieved. Based on the results of the Transparency International-The Global Coalition Against Corruption study, it shows that the average corruption perception index in Asia Pacific countries has a low Corruption Perception Index. Based on the results of the Transparency International survey, low ranking countries are perceived to be untrustworthy and unable to play a role as public institutions that serve the community well. Anti-corruption laws have been drafted, but, in practice, regulations have been largely ignored due to bribery, abuse of authority, corruption of politicians, and low standards of integrity.

Integrity in Indonesia during 2012-2018 shows that the category is still red, namely at a coefficient of 30, which means that it is unclear. The range of numbers is between 0-100, meaning that the closer it is to number 100, the less corruption. The sector under study involved political parties, the government, parliament or people's representatives, the police, the business sector, the courts, the media, the education system, social institutions, and the military. Table 1 explains the summary of the corruption perception index. Transparency International used to construct the index to allow for comparison of scores from one year to the next. Corruption Perception Index (CPI) draws on 13 surveys and expert assessments to measure public sector corruption in 180 countries and territories, giving each a score from zero (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean). Based on a 2012 survey, Indonesia ranked 118 out of 174 countries with a coefficient of 32; a survey in 2013, Indonesia ranked 114 out of

177 countries with a coefficient of 32; survey in 2014, Indonesia ranked 107 out of 174 countries with a coefficient of 34; survey in 2015, Indonesia ranked 88 out of 167 countries with a coefficient of 36; survey in 2016, Indonesia ranked 90 out of 176 countries with a coefficient of 36; survey in 2017, Indonesia ranked 96 out of 180 countries with a coefficient 37 and survey in 2018, Indonesia ranked 89 out of 180 countries with a coefficient 38.

Table 1. Corruption Perception Index of Indonesia

No	Year	Index	Country Rank
1	2012	32	118 of 174 countries
2	2013	32	114 of 177 countries
3	2014	34	107 of 174 countries
4	2015	36	88 of 167 countries
5	2016	36	90 of 176 countries
6	2017	37	96 of 180 countries
7	2018	38	89 of 180 countries

Source: Transparency International

Leadership with integrity will support the creation of ethical leadership, meaning leaders who consider the interests of all stakeholders. Previous studies have shown that the types of leadership that support the realization of ethical leadership include transformational leadership (Bass, 1999); charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1988); serving leadership (Zehir et al., 2014). Ethical leadership, according to Trevino and Brown (2004), is a moral leader who not only shows good character, honesty, can be trusted, responsible, and applies good work standards. Regarding the measurement of ethical

leadership, Kalshoven et al. (2011) developed measurements with seven dimensions namely people orientation, fairness, power-sharing, concerns for sustainability, ethical guidance, role clarification, and integrity.

Gardner (2003) argued that the types of leadership, including charismatic, tend to neglect leadership with integrity. Bass (1990) also shows that transformational leaders reinforce only aspects of influence, inspiration, intellectual, respect for individuals. Parry and Proctor-Thompson (2002) argue that leaders with aspects of influence may not necessarily have integrity. Integrity leadership needs to be strengthened to create a good social order. Mayasari et al. (2012) show that integrity is needed in leadership because 1) can help business people and individuals in organizations to form good morals including avoiding adverse public actions such as bribery, embezzlement, violation of personal interests; 2) understand all the risks and consequences along with the good and bad actions and put forward the view of utilitarianism to be the main concern; 3) integrity becomes a guideline for making decisions so that corruption will be avoided;

4) individuals can determine attitudes without being bound to something that must be implemented as long as in accordance with conscience, and the value of integrity pays attention to the emotional side and the human side.

1.1 Problem Formulation

The Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi) from time to time handle corruption issues. The results of the Laboratory of Economics, Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Gadjah Mada University (2016) showed that corruption cases in Indonesia tended to increase. This increase shows that there needs to be a constructive solution in terms of integrity. This behavior is due to the weak integrity value possessed by the leaders. Thus, understanding the elements that exist in leadership integrity needs to be analyzed further so that managerial elements will need to be understood and strengthened and implemented in the work environment at the same time can be used as a performance measure for leaders or managers concerned.

Measurement of integrity by taking into account aspects of a system of the organization while understanding aspects of psychology will strengthen the dimensions of integrity. These measured dimensions of integrity can be used as a guide for assessing the performance of institutional managers

whose perceptions are. However, this aspect of perception will provide input for improving the performance of leaders to pay more attention to all the consequences of behavior. In addition, these integrity dimensions can be realized in the form of policies or guidelines that can become the standard and basis for evaluating employee performance.

In line with the results of the Transparency International study, there is a further need to analyze aspects of integrity with a broader measurement dimension. Integrity measures used in previous studies are still partial in assessing the performance of individuals as leaders or organizations, so there is a need for effective measurements to provide a more comprehensive understanding of leadership integrity dimensions. Palanski et al. (2015) also argue that research related to integrity is still very limited to understanding the dimensions that explain integrity. The Worden (2003) defines integrity as consisting of only two aspects, namely consistency and includes all aspects related to the implications of integrity. Audi and Murphy's (2006) conceptual study shows that aspects of integrity include four dimensions of honesty, sincerity, fairness, and trust. Research by Palanski and Yammarino (2007) emphasizes that the value of integrity with three dimensions is consistency, the fulfillment of promises, and honesty.

Analyzing the aspects of integrity by understanding from a broader range of aspects, will basically support the creation of a leadership system in the organization, which also strengthens important elements. In addition, strengthening leadership integrity is manifested in organizational tools, including culture, work values, structure, and work systems that will ultimately support the optimal implementation of integrity. On the other hand, strengthening the value of integrity with various dimensions will essentially create an ethical leader who will have implications for the institution more broadly. These ethical leaders tend to be able to show consistency between attitudes and actions (Kannan-Narasimhan & Lawrence, 2012; Palanski & Yammarino, 2011; Simmons, 2002; Simmons, 2009; Kalshoven et al. 2011; Engelbrecht et al., 2015; Liu and Wang, 2014), which will ultimately create trust by stakeholders and demonstrate overall good institutional performance (Eisenbeiss, et al., 2015).

In the development of the integrity literature, Vargas-Vernandes et al. (2013) also show that integrity is able to support future leadership, but a holistic measurement is needed to understand integrity. This holistic measurement is characterized by eclectic characteristics that include elements of the organization, and organizational systems support

the effectiveness of leaders in managing an institution, which is not only from the character of the leader. This measurement is important to be used as a parameter in assessing the performance of leaders and institutions.

This research formulates the research questions as follows.

a. What elements are able to form the concept of leadership integrity?

b. How is leadership integrity measured?

The purpose of this study is to create elements that are able to identify leadership integrity and to develop measurement. The analysis of the elements more holistically will provide a broader understanding of the meaning of integrity inherent in leadership. Understanding the meaning of integrity is strengthened by developing measurements on each element that defines integrity. Measurements developed are expected to be the work parameters of individual leaders so that they can become performance evaluations that are targeted.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Integrity

Integrity is defined as the moral quality of self-management at the individual level. According to Palanski and Yammarino (2007), integrity has five meanings. First, wholeness (roundness or unity). Integrity is a union between thoughts, attitudes, words, and behavior all the time. Integrity with wholeness is oriented globally and locally. Both global and local, individuals should have unity. Second, consistency in diversity. When individuals are faced with decisions whose situation is complex because it will involve many parties, the individual remains consistent in his stance. Individuals are not easily influenced by others because they have to decide something based on the insistence of one party that is not necessarily the true consequences of his decision. Third, authentic. Individuals try to show that they are truly people who have something in common between words and words. Conformity between words and words not only arises because there is social coercion, but this conformity is already embedded in a person by itself. Fourth, consistency of words and actions. Consistency of words and actions must be in line. Individuals must not only rhetoric but must be applied in daily actions on an ongoing basis. Thus, individuals will always remember to do good by not breaking the rules. Fifth,

ethics and morality. Integrity is related to ethics and morality.

2.2 The Dimensions of Leadership Integrity

Vargas-Hernández et al. (2013) explains that leadership integrity can be effectively created if it is supported by a system of organizational integrity management capacity or organizational management integrity capacity system. This integrity capacity system is supported by individual integrity and organizational identity. Leadership integrity will be strong if each element supports one another. The integrity literature reinforces that integrity needs to be supported from personal to collective aspects, to organizations, and even at the global level. Individual and organizational integrity is an interactive attitude because it pays attention to the consequences of behavior on all organizational stakeholders (stakeholders).

2.3 Individual Integrity

Dimensions that support individual integrity are:

1) Moral awareness. This concept is the capacity to feel and to have sensitivity related to ethical issues that are relevant in making decisions that have implications for others. The decision making must pay attention to the voice of people or other aspects of the organization. The system sometimes blinds the eyes of the heart. However, with the moral sensitivity possessed by individuals, this will lead individuals to make decisions that do not deviate from existing regulations or codes of ethics. Decisions made will benefit the organization's stakeholders.

2) Moral deliberation. The second component of process integrity relates to the capacity to process the analysis of a decision. Analysis of a decision must consider the long term with regard to all risks and their consequences. This analysis involves ethical arguments that can be interpreted fairly by all parties involved.

3) Moral character. Moral considerations become part of an individual's character, which can include a number of aspects of enthusiasm, honesty, justice, common good, trust, compassion, and aspects of caring for others. This moral character will influence every decision made by paying attention to its impact to give attention to individuals who receive business decisions.

4) Moral conduct. Moral action becomes something that can be seen and used as a reference by

other individuals. Moral action becomes a business practice that is always used as a reference by everyone in the organization.

These four dimensions are expected to be internalized in individuals and organizations. The four dimensions are made a commitment to act in accordance with an ethical framework. Business activities that are based on integrity will be characterized by good employee performance, positive public perception, loyal consumers, loyal investors, and positive financial performance.

2.4 Organizational Integrity

The concept of organizational integrity is rooted in Weber's bureaucratic thinking that there is a need for universal rules that provide certainty for individuals to complete a job well. This concept of integrity reinforces the autonomy, competence, credibility of political institutions, and work efficiency in both public and private companies. Organizational integrity is a standard of personal morals and relational values with outsiders. This organizational integrity is a focus on kindness with others and strengthens the engagement between people in the organization. Organizational integrity creates standards for strengthening cultural cohesion for professional responsibility and competence in handling problems in organizations (Vargas-Hernández et al., 2013). Kolthoff (2007) argues that organizational integrity is defined as a code of conduct related to moral values, standards, norms, and rules that accepted by all members of the organization and stakeholders and upholds the commitment to provide services to all citizens. This integrity also includes consistency between principles and actions accepted by the community and has become a joint consensus. Integrity is also strengthened in ethical culture through open communication, interaction, accept diversity, and dialogue in the framework of ethical thinking, organizational integrity also encourages systems that strengthen anti-corruption.

Mayasari et al. (2012) reinforce that organizational integrity can be supported by a number of aspects as follows.

1) The value of integrity contained in the vision and mission. Vision has a forward-looking orientation that becomes a guideline in making strategies for stakeholders. The vision must reflect the value of integrity, thereby affecting every policy formulated by the organization. The mission relates to what is done by the company and who are

consumers of the company. The mission must be based on integrity.

2) Develop a code of ethics with integrity values. Organizations must develop a code of ethics with integrity values. This code of conduct can be used as a guide in carrying out daily organizational activities and is followed by all employees in the organization Recruitment policy. In recruiting employees, personality testing must be conducted with a focus on integrity. Thus, organizations can get employees who work with a tendency to value high integrity.

3) Top management. The chosen leadership must have integrity characteristics because it will be a role model and reference in the actions of employees who are at the management level below.

4) It is creating a work climate by prioritizing the value of integrity. The working climate, by focusing on integrity, will create a work climate that is mutually supportive, collaborative and avoids the conditions for competition.

5) Training the value of integrity. Integrity value training needs to be done routinely, and the aim is to provide solutions to ethical issues. This training should be done routinely to remind employees to always act according to ethics.

6) Integrity audit. Every year the organization conducts audits to evaluate and monitor the occurrence of unethical behavior. Thus there is a control mechanism in business activities.

7) Policies that are a requirement of gender equality. Organizations must implement policies that always pay attention to gender composition. This policy with regard to gender composition will have implications for equality of work participation and focus on the positive values of feminism.

3 RESEARCH METHOD

This research data was analyzed through two qualitative approaches. A qualitative research approach through interviews with experts to confirm the measuring instrument and conducting interviews related to the use of the instrument measurement with leaders in an institution. The unit of analysis of this research is the individual. Individuals in this study are leaders. Individuals related to leaders are used for the initial interview to strengthen the dimensions of leadership integrity.

For research with a qualitative approach that is interviews with leaders consider a number of criteria. The leader has worked at least in the same position for more than 2 years from various industries. The

consideration is that the individual can provide experience related to aspects of integrity needed in completing his work, including in handling existing work conflicts.

4 ANALYSIS

Below, there are items made based on the concepts of individual integrity and organizational integrity in

The context of leadership. Vargas-Hernández et al. (2013) explain that leadership integrity can be effectively created if it is supported by a system of organizational integrity management capacity or organizational management integrity capacity system. This integrity capacity system is supported by individual integrity and organizational identity. Leadership integrity will be strong if each element supports one another. The integrity literature reinforces that integrity needs to be supported from personal to collective aspects, to organizations, and even at the global level (Paine, 1997). Individual and organizational integrity is an interactive attitude because it pays attention to the consequences of behavior on all organizational stakeholders (stakeholders).

The content validity assessment sheet measuring tool used Aiken's V content validity approach. The expert as a panelist in assessing the items below is based on the extent to which the items have strong or weak relevance to aspects and indicators of behavior. Value 1 indicates that the item is very unrepresentative or highly irrelevant to the behavioral indicators and aspects to be measured, and value 5 indicates the items are very representative or very relevant to the behavioral indicators and aspects to be measured. The panelists are welcome to give a mark (V) on each item in accordance with the assessment of the relevance of the item to the behavioral indicators and aspects that already exist.

5 CONCLUSION

In the initial stage, this research has compiled the main construct specifications of each dimension of leadership integrity through a literature study. Constructing the construction specifications is done through documentation studies through a number of literature related to previous research. In more detail, future research will focus on developing measuring devices that will follow a number of procedures

according to those formulated by Churchill (1979). The procedure is as follows.

- a. Conduct data collection by means of a survey. This stage is related to distributing questionnaires that contain measuring tools for leadership integrity dimensions. Selection of respondents for data collection of individuals who work at a company for at least 2 years working at the same company.
- b. Use face validity and content validity tests on experts.
- c. It is measuring the reliability of data generated from surveys.
- d. Collecting data back by surveying the results of Data reliability testing. This stage is related to distributing questionnaires that contain dimensions of leadership integrity. The selection of respondents for data collection involved all individuals working in the Jakarta area.
- e. Measure validity.
- f. Developing norms, this is related to individual perceptions to compare scores or scores obtained. At this stage, the study will confirm the measurement scale.

REFERENCES

- Audi, R. & Murphy, P. E. 2006. The many faces of integrity. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16, 3-21.
- Bass, B. M. 1990. From transaction to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. & Steidlmeier, P. 1999. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10 (2), 181-217.
- Brown, M. T. 2006. Corporate integrity and public interest: A relational approach to business ethics and leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, 11-18.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. 1988. Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: CA Jossey-Bass.
- Churchill G. A. 1979. A Paradigm for developing better measures of marketing construct. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 64-73.
- Dineen, B.R., Lewicki, R.J., and Thomlinson, E.C. 2006. Supervisory guidance and behavioral integrity: Relationship with employee citizenship and deviant behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 622-635.
- Engelbrecht, A. S., Heine, G., & Mahembe, B. 2015. The influence of integrity and ethical leadership on trust in the leader. *Management Dynamics*, 24 (1), 2-8.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A., Van Knippenberg, D. 2015. Doing well by doing good? Analyzing the relationship between CEO ethical leadership and firm performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, 635-651
- Gardner, W. L. 2003. Perceptions of leader charisma, effectiveness and integrity. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16 (4), 502-524.
- Ingenhoff, D. and Sommer, K. 2010. Trust in companies and in CEO: A comparative study of the main influences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95: 339- 355.
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. 2011. Ethical leadership at work Questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22 (1), 51-69.
- Kannan-Narasimhan, R. & Lawrence, B. S. 2012. Behavioural integrity: How leader referents and trust matter to workplace outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111 (2), 165-178.
- Koehn, D. 2005. Integrity as a business asset. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58, 125-136.
- Liu, G. & Wang, X. 2014. Ethical leadership and Ba Ling: a survey on the perception of accounting interns in CPA firms. *Chinese Management Studies*, 8 (4), 642-664.
- Mayasari, I., Wiadi, I., Maharani, A. & Pramono, R. 2012. Penerapan nilai integritas dan perspektif gender dalam perilaku beretika. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi Kinerja*, 16 (2), 153-179.
- Palanski, M. E. & Yammarino, F. J. 2007. Integrity and leadership: Clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal*, 25 (3), 171-184.
- Palanski, M. E., Gentry, W. A., Cullen, K. L., & Nichols, C. M. 2015. Virtuous leadership: Exploring the effects of leader courage and behavioral integrity on leader performance and image. *Journal of Business Ethics*: 132, 297-310.
- Palanski, M.E. & Yammarino, F.J. 2011. Impact of behavioural integrity on follower job performance: Athree-study examination. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 765-786.
- Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thompson, S. B. 2002. Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organisational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35, 75-96.
- Petrick, J. A. & Quinn, J. F. 2000. The integrity capacity construct and moral progress in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23: 3-18.
- Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. 2006. A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345- 359.
- Simmons, T. 2002 Behavioural integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' word and deeds as a research focus. *Organizational Sciences*, 13(1): 18-35.
- Simmons, T., Friedman, R., Liu, L.A., Parks, J.M. 2009. The importance of behavioral integrity in a multicultural workplace. *Cornell Hospitality Report*, 8(17), 6-16.
- Trevino, L. K. & Brown, M. E. 2004. Managing to be ethical: Debunking five business ethics myths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18 (2), 69-81.
- Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. 1996. Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organizational Science*, 7, 151-165.
- Vargas-Hernández, J. G., León-Arias, D., & Valdez-Zepeda, A. 2013. Enhancing leadership integrity

effectiveness strategy through the institutionalization of an organizational management integrity capacity systems. Contemporary Legal and Economic Issues IV Worden, S. 2003. The role of integrity as a mediator in strategic leadership: A recipe for reputational capital. Journal of Business Ethics, 46 (1), 31-44.

Zehir, C., Müceldili, B., Altındag, E., Ehitog, lu, Y.S., & Zehir, S. 2014. Charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of ethical climate. Social Behavior and Personality, 42 (8), 1365-1376

APPENDIX

Item of Individual Integrity

Aspect	Indicators of Behavior	Item	Relevance Value				
			1	2	3	4	5
Moral awareness in individual integrity is the capacity to feel and to have sensitivity related to ethical issues that are relevant in making decisions that have implications for others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having sensitivity related to ethical issues in making decisions • Have other aspects considered in making decisions. • Being able to realize the ethical mistakes made when making decisions • Focusing on considerations that can benefit various parties in decision making. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Someone has sensitivity aspects related to ethical issues that affect others. 2. In making decisions, it must pay attention to the voice of people or other aspects of the organization. 3. It is necessary according to conscience in making decisions so as not to deviate. 4. Decisions made will create many benefits for the organization's stakeholders. 					
Moral deliberation relates to the capacity to process the analysis of a decision. Analysis of a decision must consider the long term with regard to all risks and their consequences. This analysis involves ethical arguments which can be interpreted fairly by all parties involved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to take long-term decisions well based on the value of justice • Able to calculate risks and consequences well to get a fair decision. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The analysis of a decision must consider the long term with regard to all risks and their consequences. 2. Consideration of the decision can be interpreted fairly by all parties involved. 					
Moral character is a moral consideration that is part of an individual's character that can include a number of aspects of spirit, honesty, justice, common good, trust, compassion, compassion, and aspects of caring for others. This moral character will influence in every decision making by paying attention to its impact to give	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a high sense of enthusiasm • Consider honesty in every decision • Consider fairness for all parties in decision making. • Focusing on shared needs in consideration of decision making • Having compassion in making every decision. • Pay attention to the conditions that exist in 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the spirit aspect 2. Having honesty 3. Have a fair sense 4. Concerned with the common good 5. Have the love of others 6. Have attention for others 7. Show trust for others 					

attention to individuals who receive business decisions.	<p>others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can trust others. 						
Moral conduct is a moral act that can be seen and referred to by other individuals. Moral action becomes a business practice that is always used as a reference by everyone in the organization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to carry out decisions that are in accordance with the rules properly • Showed firm rejection when the decision was felt to only benefit one party • Avoid fraudulent behavior that based on shortcuts 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moral actions can be imitated by others 2. Moral action becomes a business practice that is always used as a reference by everyone in the organization. 3. Can be a role model for the organization 					

Item of Organizational Integrity

Aspect	Indicators of Behavior	Item	Relevance Value				
			1	2	3	4	5
Organizational integrity means there is a value of integrity contained in the vision and mission. Vision has a forward- looking orientation that becomes a guideline in making strategies for stakeholders. The vision must reflect the value of integrity thereby affecting every policy formulated by the organization. The mission relates to what is done by the company and who are consumers of the company. The mission must be based on aspects integritas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a value of integrity in vision and mission • Vision that is able to provide guidance in the future • A mission that has good operations based on integrity 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a value of integrity contained in the vision and mission. 2. Vision has a forward-looking orientation that becomes a guideline in making strategies for stakeholders. 3. Mission related to what is done by the company and who are consumers of the company based on aspects of integrity 					
Organizational integrity means developing a code of ethics with integrity values. Organizations must develop a code of ethics with integrity values. This code of conduct can be used as a guide in carrying out daily organizational activities and is followed by all employees in the organization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a code of ethics based on the value of Integrity • Organizational code of ethics that can be a guide. • A code of ethics that is followed by all employees. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organizations must develop a code of ethics with integrity values. 2. This code of ethics can be used as a guide in carrying out daily organizational activities 3. The code of ethics is followed by all employees in the organization. 					
Organizational integrity means inherent in recruitment policy. In recruiting employees, personality testing must be conducted with a focus on integrity. Thus,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of recruitment is based on personal search that has the character of integrity 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employee recruitment, personality testing must be conducted with a focus on integrity 2. The organization is expected to get 					

<p>organizations can get employees who work with a tendency to value high integrity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to get employees with high integrity values. 	<p>employees who work with a tendency to value high integrity</p>					
<p>Organizational integrity is inherent in Top management. The chosen leadership must have integrity characteristics because it will be a role model and reference in the actions of employees who are in the management level below.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders with integrity • Leader's integrity character that can be a role model • The leader as a role model 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leaders chosen must have integrity as a role model. 2. The leader chosen must have integrity character as a reference in employee actions. 3. The leader shows a good role model. 					
<p>Organizational integrity is inherent in the creation of a work climate. The working climate by focusing on integrity will create a work climate that is mutually supportive, collaborative and avoids the conditions for competition.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrity-based work climate • Collaboration-based work climate • A work climate that avoids competition 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work climate by focusing on integrity 2. Supporting working conditions for collaboration. 3. There is no element of competition. 					
<p>The value of integrity is inherent in training the value of integrity that needs to be done routinely whose purpose is to provide solutions to problems related to ethics. This training should be done routinely to remind employees to always act according to ethics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of integrity training • organizational ability to prepare employees • Training the value of integrity as an evaluation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrity value training needs to be done routinely 2. Preparing all employees to solve problems. 3. As a way to remind employees to always act according to ethics. 					
<p>Integrity value in the form of integrity audit. Every year the organization conducts audits to evaluate and to monitor the occurrence of unethical behavior. Thus there is a control mechanism in business activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting an ethical behavior audit • Organizational monitoring related to ethical behavior • Organizational control mechanism in conducting business 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Every year the organization carries out audits to evaluate the occurrence of unethical behavior 2. Every year the organization conducts audits to monitor the occurrence of unethical behavior. 3. There is a control mechanism in business activities 					

<p>The value of integrity inherent in policies that are a condition of gender equality. Organizations must implement policies that always pay attention to gender composition. This policy with regard to gender composition will have implications for equality of work participation and focus on positive values of feminism</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender-based policies • Implications of gender equality • Feminism is positively related to gender equality 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a policy that requires gender equality 2. Gender equality has implications for equality of work participation. 3. Gender equality focuses on the value of positive feminism. 					
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

