DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONAL INTEGRITY SCALE: Construct Validity
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Abstract— The main purpose of this study is to develop personal integrity scale which measures integrity as personal traits. This study used mixed method combining both qualitative and quantitative methods. As for qualitative method, this study applied focus discussion (FGD) for collecting the data on the key words of integrity. Quantitative method was used in collecting the data of the study involving 442 respondents consisting 219 (49%) online respondents and 116 (51%) field study respondents. Integrity scale was used as an instrument of the study with 9 dimensions and each dimension has 30 items. Data analysis was done using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The findings of the study indicate that integrity is simply defined as a alignment between individual’s words and actions as characterized by honesty, sincerity, and consistency. The findings of the study also indicate that there are nine traits or attributes for personal integrity. They are honesty, keeping promise, loyalty, responsibility, persistence, kindness and caring, respect, fairness, and citizenship. Based on the definition of integrity and its nine personal traits or attributes, construct validity was applied resulting a personal integrity scale.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, in any country, especially in developing countries like Indonesia, the issue of personal integrity becomes interesting issue. This is because personal integrity is not only a demand in the private sector and the company, but also in the government sector. In addition, personal integrity is also absolutely manifested in all aspects of life, ranging from social, political, social, economic, education, and culture. Without personal integrity, all sectors of life will collapse.

The results of literature review indicate that personal integrity is an important factor for the individual in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities. A meta-analysis study conducted by Murphy and Lee (1994) found that there is a correlation between the integrity and the overall performance. This is in line with the study done by Ones, Viswesvaran and Schmidt (1993) which shows that integrity is a construct that includes responsibility, commitment to long-term work, consistency, things are prone to violence, moral reasoning, hostility, work ethic, dependency, depression
and the level of energy. More specifically, this study measures the general construct of Conscientiousness (one of the big five personality dimensions).

Another research conducted by Tang and Liu (2011) showed that the higher the level of Authenticity of Supervisor’s Personal Integrity and Character (ASPIRE) the higher the Love of Maney (LOM), and self-esteem, but the lower Personal Unethical Behaviour (PUB). PUB significantly correlated machiavellienism high level, low self-esteem, and instrinsic low religiosity. The results of the study also indicate that the effect of LOM on PUB is not significant, but the influence of PUB on ASPIRE is significant. People with high LOM and low ASPIRE tend to have high PUB.

Based on the above-mentioned two studies, it can be concluded that personal integrity problems associated with ethical behavior or unethical behavior. Ethical or unethical behavior is a picture of the level of personal integrity. Individuals with a high level of integrity tend to demonstrate ethical behavior such as honesty, trustworthiness, and discipline. On the other hand, individuals with low integrity level tend to show unethical behavior, such as dishonesty, greediness, corruption, and noncompliance with regulations or unlawfullness.

It is important to note that the problems of unethical behavior is not only happening in Indonesia, but also in other countries. A Transparency International survey in 2012 showed that Indonesia was ranked at 118 position out of 176 countries. Together with Ecuador, Egypt and Madagascar, Indonesia is ranked 118 with a CPI score of 3.2 (scale of 0-10). While the first position in the world’s cleanest countries filled by Denmark, Finland and New Zealand. These countries lead with a score of Corruption Perception Index (CPI) amounted to 9 on a scale of 0-10. With these results, the country can be considered as a country that is very clean, almost close to perfect.

In addition, the cases of unethical behavior also occurs in many other aspects of life. In economic field, the case is very prominent when the massive fraud committed by Enron, Worldcom and several other large companies were revealed in mid 2000 to 2002. The company committed
fraud on how to manipulate the financial statements and in cooperation with public accounting firms to continue to provide a reasonable opinion on the financial statements which have been modified (Lasantu, 2012). In the area of governance, as many as 311 of the 530 heads of regions in Indonesia entangled case law, 86 percent of whom corruption cases (Setia, 2013). Plagiarism (Abimanyu, 2014; Yulianti, 2013) or harassment (Poet, 2014) among lecturers also be evidence of unethical behavior in the field of education.

Based on the above facts, it can be concluded that corrupt behavior as unethical behavior has been a latent disease in Indonesia and occurs in almost all public and private sectors. This corrupt behavior needs to be prevented early through preventive measures, if the Indonesian people want to be a dignified nation to uphold moral values and ethics. One of the strategic measures of a preventive nature to prevent corrupt behavior is by measuring the level of integrity of the person prior to being employed as public officials.

The problem is that until now, based on the results of the literature review, in Indonesia there is no instrument or standard measurement tool to measure the level of personal integrity. One of the tools that are often used in knowing the level of individual’s integrity (honesty) is a lie detector machine. However, the use of this measure is debatable even doubt the accuracy and validity. In addition, practitioners in the field of assessment and selection is usually using Behavior Event Interview (BEI) to explore the tendency of one’s integrity (Rahman, 2006). This method has disadvantages in term of limited number of sample size as so the findings are less accurate.

Recognizing the importance of personal integrity in the individual and social life and the lack of measurement tools or instruments standard to determine the level of one’s personal integrity, the need for developing personal integrity scale becomes an urgent need. This measure would have predictive ability against someone in a variety of situations to carry out its duties and responsibilities, whether someone has the integrity level of low, medium, or high.
II. RESEARCH PROBLEM

Based on the background of the study as described above, the problem of this study can be formulated as follows: "What kind of instrument that can measure the type of traits that one should have to be an individual with a high level of personal integrity?"

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Definition of Integrity

Many definitions of personal integrity have been given by experts in the field of psychology. However, the existing definitions is not conclusive, there for the writer needs to redefine the meaning of personal integrity. The word integrity comes from the English language. In English Thesaurus (UK), the term integrity has some synonym such as honesty, truthfulness, honor, veracity, trustworthyness, and sincerity. The opposite of integrity is dishonesty.

According to Robert (1999) “the word integrity means "wholeness," wholeness of virtue, wholeness as a person, wholeness in the sense of being an integral part of something larger than the person—the community, the corporation, society, humanity, the cosmos”.

Another interesting definition of integrity is given by Becker (2009) who said that personal integrity is consistency between one's personal principles and moral respect to people. This requires both a commitment to establish ourselves as moral subjects (like what we should be) and to let the moral autonomy of others. Furthermore Becker (2009) asserts that personal integrity is a moral obligation to respect others as human and moral standards to everyone to judge whether a person is immoral or not.

From the above discussion, it can be understood that the term integrity has multiple keywords, such as honesty, real situation, sincerity, accuracy, reliability, perfection, harmony, safety, and consistency. Given these keywords, in the current study the personal integrity can be defined as individual’s
consistency between his or her thoughts, words and actions characterized by honesty and sincerity.

B. Integrity Dimensions

The results of a literature review on the dimensions of personal integrity over the last decade (2005-2015) indicate that there have been no conclusive conclusions related to the number of personal integrity dimension. In other words, there are perspectives in the dimensions of integrity as given by experts. This dimensional variation indicates that the terms of personal integrity has its own complexity. The following sections will explain some of these variations.

ICAEW (2007) identified five aspects of integrity, which includes moral values, motives, commitment, quality and achievement. Unlike the ICAEW (2007), Barnard, Schurink, & Beer (2008), identified 10 aspects of personal integrity which include, self-motivation and encouragement, moral courage and decisiveness, honesty, consistency, commitment, diligence, self-discipline, responsibility, trust, and fairness.

A recent study by Baxter, Dempsey, Megone, & Lee (2012) shows that personal integrity consists of four aspects as follow:

1. Wholeness of character: consistency between individual’s action and words;
2. Ethical value: individual’s action on task commitment;
3. Identity: Individual’s definition on ethical commitments; and

Taking into account the variations in the dimensions of personal integrity as described above, in this study the dimensions of personal integrity as the focus of this study are as follows:

1. honesty,
2. keeping promises,
3. loyalty,
4. responsibility,
5. persistence,
6. kindness and caring,
7. respect,
8. fairness, and
9. citizenship.

C. Factors Affecting Integrity

According to Paajenen (in Murphy, 1993) personal integrity in relation to dishonesty, not only influenced by individual factors, but also influenced by the factor of the situation. He identified a number of individual variables considered as factors affecting dishonesty. These factors are:

1. undependability, the individual irresponsible, impulsive, careless, and so are considered to be associated with dishonesty and fraud,
2. problems in socialization, individuals with values that have not evolved, or has a history of delinquency,
3. attitudes regarding deviance and theft, individual who have a positive attitude towards thieves and delinquent behavior (naughty).
4. problems with authority relationships, individuals who have difficulty for interaction or relationship with the authorities.
5. excitement seeking, individuals who engage in thrill-seeking behavior or other courageous.
6. work motivation, individual with low level of work motivation.
7. social influences; individuals are easily influenced by a friend of the same age or others
8. unstable upbringing, individuals with unstable family life.
9. drug use, individuals with a history of drug abuse.
10. unmet need, individuals with low self-esteem, low job satisfaction, and so on associated with dishonesty and fraud.
IV. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a mixed research method, i.e. combining a quantitative and a qualitative method. The former is used in order to get the respondents’ opinions on the dimensions and indicators of personal integrity. The latter is used in order to deepen and widen the research problems and it was done through Focused Group Discussion (FGD) involving certain figures such as academicians, professionals, politicians, and businessmen.

The respondents of this study were 442 people, consisted of 216 (49%) online survey respondents and 226 (51%) field study respondents. The first category of respondents consisted of people ages between 19 to 50 years, such as teachers, lecturers, professionals, housewives, and students. Their educational background also varied, ranging from senior secondary school to tertiary level with Ph.D holder (S3).

As for the field study respondents, it consisted of 226 people with 60 (27%) male and 166 (73%) female, aged between 21 to 24 years. They were students of Faculty of Psychology UIN Jakarta.

In collecting the data, this study used Personal Integrity Scale developed by the researchers with reference to the theories and concepts of personal integrity. It has nine parts in line with the personal integrity aspects as explained in the conceptual framework of this study. Each dimension has 30 items, making a total of 270 items for the whole instrument. The items were written in both favorable and unfavorable statements.

The instrument was developed in a Likert Scale Model with four different responses for each statement (item). For items measuring respondents’ cognitive response, the response options were given from Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. For items measuring respondents’ behavior, the response options were given from Very Unsuitable, Unsuitable, Suitable, and Very Suitable. Finally, for items measuring respondents’ frequency response, the response options were given from Never, Some times, Often, Very Often.
V. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In general, the findings of the study indicate that personal integrity has a broad meaning and a varied definition. Given the key words, definitions, terms, and meanings gained from FGD, online survey, and field study, the researchers come up with the conclusion that personal integrity is simply defined as individual's consistency between his or her thoughts, words and actions characterized by honesty and sincerity.

More specifically, the findings of this study indicate that personal integrity has nine dimensions as follows:

a. honesty,
b. keeping promises,
c. loyalty,
d. responsibility,
e. persistence,
f. kindness and caring,
g. respect,
h. fairness, and
i. citizenship.

Given the above mentioned definition and nine dimensions of personal integrity, this study has produced a Personal Integrity Scale with 152 items constructed in both favorable and unfavorable statements. Below is the sample of items for Personal Integrity Scale.

Table 1 Sample of Items for Personal Integrity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Total item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I left work early without permission even though it is cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Promises</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I am careful to say promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I recommend the company as a good place to build a career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I think of every action so that I can give an account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I know what my purpose in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness And</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>In my opinion, showing concern for others is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>right thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect 17</td>
<td>I was able to understand my mind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness 5</td>
<td>I never expect a reward for what I did.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship 22</td>
<td>I was recognized as part of a community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in the conclusions of this study, the term personal integrity has a very broad meaning and significance. Therefore, in this study, to obtain conclusive definitions of personal integrity, the researchers carried out in-depth literature review, focus group discussions (FGD), and an online survey. Based on the data gathered in this study, the researchers defined as individual's consistency between his or her thoughts, words and actions characterized by honesty and sincerity. This definition needs to be studied further so that it can be widely accepted by many people and professions. In this context, the researchers want to discuss how this research could come to such a conclusion.

It is important to note that consistency between the individual's words and actions has become a vital element for defining personal integrity. From the religious perspective, inconsistency between individual's words and action is called *nifaq* or hypocrisy. The word *munafiq* is derived from *nifaq* which has three characteristics, namely, being a liar when he or she said something, denying the promise he or she has made, and not keeping the trust given to him or her. The three traits of *munafiq* are very dangerous for individuals and for others.

In short it can be concluded that there are three characteristics or traits that became the main feature for individuals to have personal integrity. They are honesty, sincerity and consistency. One question that arises is whether these three characteristics or traits show the hierarchy or not? If showing a hierarchy, there may be those who say that honesty or sincerity should be in the first position, so the order becomes sincerity, honesty, and consistency. In this respect, sincerity becomes the foundation of all actions and behavior of
individuals. Without sincerity, all the actions and deeds of individuals will be meaningless.

After sincerity, the second attribute associated to personal integrity is honesty. Honesty is simply defined as being genuine and objective in all aspects of individual behavior. Honest people tend to show good conduct and behavior, while dishonest people tend to cheat and misbehave. In the modern life, honesty has became very rare attribute found in individual’s characteristics. Therefore honesty is a major asset in achieving one’s success. Honesty is the best policy.

The third trait is consistency. The word consistency in religious perspective is called *istiqomah* which means steady and unchanging behavior under any circumstances. In this context, the individual’s sincerity and honesty should be done consistently.

Another aspect that needs to be addressed in this study is the nine dimensions of personal integrity, which include honesty, keeping promise, loyalty, responsibility, persistence, kindness and caring, respect, fairness and citizenship. Given these characteristics, one will most likely ask a question: How this research could come to the conclusion that personal integrity consist of nine dimensions? To what extent the relationship between one dimension and another dimension? Is every dimension really unidimensional or multidimensional?

The answers to these questions may be given through analytical techniques used in this study, that is the exploratory factor analysis (EFA). With EFA researchers could detect the structure within the relationships between variables, so that we can classify the variables. In addition, using EFA, we are able to reduce the big number of variables into a relatively smaller variables. However, this kind of analysis needs to be performed repeatedly with a large sample to make the result valid and accurate.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research findings as presented in the previous chapter, in this section, the researchers would like to give both theoretical and practical recommendations.

a. Theoretical Recommendations

Since this study is a preliminary study which aims to develop a measuring tool of personal integrity and considering the limitations of the present study, the researchers give the following theoretical recommendations.

1. Further study needs to be done in a comprehensive way to formulate the concept of integrity in the context of Indonesia. The study should be conducted using two approaches, namely the psychological and religious approach.
2. The need for further study to explore the local wisdom associated with personal integrity. Local knowledge can be formulated in terms of the properties that can describe the high level of integrity for individuals with attention to cultural and ethnical diversity in Indonesia.

b. Practical Recommendations

For researchers interested in undertaking further research, the following practical recommendations might be taken into account.

1. The present study is limited to the study of integrity as an individuals trait, therefore further research is needed to examine the integrity of a conditional state that makes someone show personal integrity.
2. Given the sample is limited to students, therefore further research is needed with a broader sample involving several elements, for example, samples of teachers, lecturers, government or private employees, professionals, businessmen, and politicians.
3. Need to do further research using the scale of personal integrity that have been developed to measure the level of employee integrity of an institution. For the initial stage, a further study can be done internally at the State Islamic University (UIN) Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
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