

IMI

INTEGRITY MEASURING INSTRUMENT

SUMMARISED REPORT

A. IDENTIFICATION:

Name: LOUISE FRICK

ID: 4505255002085 Gender: F

Organisation: INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL Job Title: _____

B. INTEGRITY SCORE AND PROFILE

TEN SUBSTRUCTURES	SCORE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1. HONESTY	10	[Green bar]										
2. STEALING/THEFT	10	[Green bar]										
3. VIOLATION of policy., rules & regul.	5	[Yellow bar]										
4. RELIABILITY & DEPENDABILITY	8	[Green bar]										
5. LYING	8	[Green bar]										
6. DENIAL, PROJECTION & JUSTIFICATION	9	[Green bar]										
7. WORK ETHIC	9	[Green bar]										
8. MANIPULATION	5	[Yellow bar]										
9. VERIFIABLE ITEMS	10	[Green bar]										
10. LIE DETECTOR	7	[Green bar]										
C. INTEGRATED INTEGRITY RATING	8											
D. ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATING	7											

Attention: All scores are on a scale of 10; where 10 always represents the 'good' score.

Date of Administration: 2013/01/30

Scoring Date: 2/25/2013

DEVELOPER : DR. LOUIS J. FICK

CONFIDENTIAL

*REGISTERED TRADE MARK

IMI – EXTENDED DEFINED REPORT

Candidate : LOUISE FRICK

1. Honesty

10



This area assesses the candidate's perception of herself as well as how she believes she is been perceived by others regarding the three crucial dimensions in the composite concept of Honesty;

- Her Established **Reputation** in the field of honesty through the honour, morality, ethics and righteousness demonstrated by herself,
- Her Typical **Response** in presenting herself through her sincerity, frankness, candour and openness,
- Her Principle **Judgment** presenting itself through her fairness, legitimacy, impartiality and objectivity.

A High Score is indicative of an individual who is well orientated towards all aspects constituting Honesty and acts with high consistency towards all these aspects over time irrespective of situation or environmental conditions.

A Low Score on this factor-scale can be interpreted as reflecting a low self-esteem on the part of the candidate relative to the width and depth of the reputation she developed on the spread of the above-mentioned constituting factors. Her typical response to matters will speak loudly of her impoverished sincerity and openness and her judgment can be expected to be subjective and 'skewed'. Little consistency can be expected in the practical orientation and behaviour of such a person.

2. Stealing/Theft

10



This area assesses the candidate's orientation towards the sanctity of ownership in all its facets and under all circumstances; historically, presently and in future. This orientation does not only apply to herself, but also to how she believes this orientation applies to others.

A High Score is indicative of an unimpeachable positive attitude and approach towards the property of others with no disposition to take that which does not belong to her without permission.

A Low Score may be indicative of a rather poor history in this regard or a distinct and continuous effort on her part of providing the necessary self-justification to allow her to take/steal/embezzle that which is not rightfully hers – even when it is obviously wrong and not motivated by necessity or even a perceived need.

Please Note : The *colours* on the bars above indicate the degree to which there can be relied on the particular ability, i.e.,

- 1 to 3 is **red** - poor to no reliability
- 4 to 6 is **yellow** and - low reliability
- 7 to 10 is **green** - good reliability

Candidate : LOUISE FRICK

3. Violation of Policy Rules and Regulations

5

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

This area assesses the candidate's orientation and basic respect towards the value, need and use of structure, co-ordination and central guidance as applied in practice by law, policies, rules and regulations.

A **High Score** reflects the positive orientation of the person indicating that she is 'sold' on the importance, need and adherence to rules and regulations. The more extreme score is indicative of a person who is *typically and in principle proactively promoting the value of rules and regulations* and a strong desire for absolute adherence thereto whilst promoting the same from others. This person can be expected to support and honour rules and regulations at all times.

A **Low-Score** can be interpreted as representing the orientation and attitude of a typical rebellious personality; a person that would in principle rebel and revolt against any type and/or degree of rules and regulations – irrespective of the kind, purpose or need thereof. To the negative extreme, it may be concluded that this typical individual will not only disregard and ignore rules and regulations, but purposefully seeks to transgress or even abuse them in furthering her own interests, even to the detriment of others or the organization she belongs to.

4. Reliability and Dependability

8

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

This area assesses the degree to which the candidate lives up to two critical and closely related factors i.e., firstly her stability, consistency, steadiness and certainty that will determine, secondly, how trustworthy, faithful, devoted and conscientious she is perceived to be relative to her thinking, feelings, relationships and behaviour. The result of this is whether the person can be depended on with absolute confidence. Although there is a degree of inter-correlation between Honesty and Dependability, the latter reflects more on the practical application, e.g., a person may be very Honest, but not necessarily Stable, Consistent and Reliable.

A **High Score** is indicative of the high degree to which the candidate can be relied on, which also implies a high probability of loyalty to work and colleagues as well as respect for people in positions of authority and management per sé.

A **Low Score** reflects an inability (on the part of the individual) to function in a stable and consistent manner, perceived to be reliable, dependable or trustworthy. It suggests a lack of interest in, or commitment to being devoted, consistent and faithful for reasons other than the lack of personal ability or competency.

Candidate : LOUISE FRICK

5. Lying

8

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

This area assesses the candidate's specific orientation towards the concept of lying with its associated manifestations of deceit, falsification, perjury and the deliberate misleading of, and misrepresentation to others - usually to benefit herself and, in many instances, to the detriment of others! The opposite to this orientation is Trustworthiness and in a wider context, Honesty. The practical manifestation of a person's integrity is to a certain extent being covered here, but one should be aware that a person can claim to be honest and trustworthy, but the fact that she is lying, totally contradicts this claim.

A High Score is indicative of a person with a well-established norm- and value-structure; people who are guided by high moral conscientiousness and ethical standards. If they do lie, it will be the exception and usually with much trepidation on their part. These people generally will not easily fall prey to group pressure and engage in devious or corrupt behaviour.

A Low Score is indicative of a person with little or no respect for the truth; a person that has adopted a lying, conniving and corrupt way of life as her general norm and feels no remorse for such behaviour. These people tend to become, if not already are, pathological and compulsive liars; lying even when there is no need to; ultimately reaching the point where they are unable to differentiate between the lie and the truth anymore.

6. Denial, Projection and Justification

9

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

This area assesses the candidate's open and honest perception of her own shortcomings and accepting accountability for her own mistakes, or (by implication) her typical tendency to **deny** the existence thereof or to **project** the cause or responsibility thereof to someone or something also or to **justify** the fact that it did happen or exists by generating defense mechanisms or rationalizations.

A High Score is indicative of people with a well-developed and integrated value- and norm-structure. This is typical of a person with integrity who tends to take full responsibility for her own actions, both failure and success.

A Low Score is not only indicative a rather *generalized orientation* on the candidate's part, (i.e. becoming a 'way of life' to embrace the 'non-acceptance approach'), but also of the degree of deviant behaviour used in the process. In the more extreme cases it becomes problematic to give/delegate responsibility of any significant magnitude to such a person as she may even believe her own contradictions, rationalizations and projections, resulting in a loss of insight and objectivity.

Candidate: LOUISE FRICK

7. Work Ethic

9




This area assesses the values associated with the moral virtues of hard work and diligence. It speaks to characteristics like self-direction, self-governance, punctuality, initiative, motivation, positive attitude, high quality work, sense of duty, responsibility and loyalty.

A High Score reveals a person with a strong work orientation, one who is committed to making a meaningful contribution in her work as described above; a person that can be relied on at all times and under all conditions.

A Low Score is indicative of the opposite as described above. This person tends to harbour feelings of resentment which over a period of time, if unchecked, fester and have a demotivational effect on others and the work climate in general. In extreme cases one may be dealing with a time-bomb, not knowing what may go wrong next and a person with scores of 1 and 2 may even sabotage her employer and/or colleagues.

8. Manipulation

5



This area assesses the degree to which a candidate will tend to abuse any power at their disposal, using it to manipulate others in their self-serving quest, irrespective of whether such action will be to the detriment of others.

A High Score is indicative of people who use authority responsibly and are willing to build in checks-and-balances in order to prevent the abuse of power. If this person is to manipulate any situation it will generally be through an open process of negotiation.

A Low Score identifies a person who will 'use and abuse relationships' and manipulate others into a relationship of dependency, to serve her own purposes while being rather emotionally detached, calculative, non-susceptible to social pressure, not transparent, self-centered and rather unethical in her general approach/actions.

9. Verifiable Items

10



This area assesses in a more objective, tangible and verifiable way, deviations in the candidate's behaviour from the generally accepted day-to-day norms. This includes: Misrepresentations, Traffic Violations, Black-Listing, Rehabilitation, Frequency of Disciplinary Actions and Seriousness, Frequency of Arrest and Seriousness, Court Case Frequency and Seriousness of Penalty. In this case, attitude and general orientation to each factor is not being assessed, but rather 'recorded' history of misbehaviour in each of the above.

A High score represents an up-standing individual with little to no history of deviant behaviour.

A Low Score reflects a reported history of deviant behaviour.

Candidate: LOUISE FRICK

10. Lie Detector

7



This area assesses the degree to which the candidate completed the IMI honestly, objectively and openly; presenting a true and honest picture of herself. This Lie-Detector score is by implication, also indicative of the candidate's inherent orientation to honesty, basic trustworthiness and accountability.

A High Score indicates that the candidate has represented herself honestly and openly in completing the test, but at the same time indicates her general orientation to Integrity.

A Low Score reflects the degree to which the candidate deliberately manipulated her answers when completing the IMI after having been warned of the Lie-Detector mechanism built into the measuring process. Research shows that there is a significant correlation between a person's general orientation towards honesty, reliability and truthfulness on the one hand and the degree to which a person is trying to force/fake a measuring instrument to present a better image of herself, on the other hand. A score of less than 5 indicates extensive manipulation and means that the overall results are Invalid and have no or little practical value.

C. Integrated Integrity Rating (IIR)

8



In order to obtain one score that best represents the assessments on all the above constituting factors, an evenly weighted average is calculated of all ten factors as given. The practical value of the IIR is enhanced significantly when interpreted against relevant norm tables. In this regard, the question as to what IIR is considered good or sufficient for the appointment of a Cashier, is best answered by interpreting the score(s) obtained by a testee on the IMI with a the Norms reflected in a relevant Norm Table applicable to the Cashier's career group in the particular industry group the Cashier is to operate in – i.e., banking, retail, etc.

D. Adapted Integrity Rating (AIR)

7



The 'raw' Integrated Integrity Rating obtained in every report is adjusted to counter for the degree of 'forcing' a favourable image by the candidate as is established through the Lie- Detector in the IMI. If only a moderate degree of 'forcing' took place, the Adapted Integrity Rating can be used with confidence, but the lower the Lie-Detector score drops, the lower the probability that a reliable and valid assessment of Integrity is obtained.