



* IP200 v III

INTEGRITY PROFILES 200

REPORT

Joe Cabu

ID: 620512xxxxxxx

Assessment Date: 2025-02-27



INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL

Distribution Manager

Report Date: 2025-09-17





***IP-200 VERSION III**

Org: INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL
Job Title: DISTRIBUTION MANAGER

INTEGRITY PROFILES 200

SUMMARIZED REPORT

Assessment Date: 2025-02-27

Name: Joe Cabu
ID: 620512xxxxxx

TEN SUB-STRUCTURES OF INTEGRITY	INTEGRITY PROFILE									
1. SOCIALISATION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. TRUSTWORTHINESS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. CREDIBILITY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. WORK ETHIC	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. ATTITUDES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. BEHAVIOUR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. MANIPULATION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. VALUES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. CORPORATE & MANAGERIAL INTEGRITY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10. MONITOR; LIE, CONSISTENCY & EXAGGERATION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
INTEGRATED INTEGRITY RATING (IIR)										7
ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATING (AIR)										7

1. SOCIALISATION	6	2. TRUSTWORTHINESS	6
1.1 Social Experience – from family to immediate society.	8	2.1 Reliability/Dependability.	5
1.2 The Significance of the Role Society Plays.	7	2.2 Honesty in Practice.	5
1.3 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)- People.	6	2.3 Discretion.	7
1.4 Empathy & Agreeableness.	4	2.4 Loyalty.	7
1.5 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)- Corporate.	7	2.5 (Moral) Conscientiousness.	8
3. CREDIBILITY	8	4. WORK ETHIC	8
3.1 Predictability – ‘Real Self’.	6	4.1 Perseverance, Commitment and Drive-Initiative.	9
3.2 Consistency & (Emotional) Stability.	8	4.2 Self-reliance, Self-Direction & Self-Control.	9
3.3 Capacity.	9	4.3 Co-op, Support & Belief in Work & Leader Legitimacy.	6
3.4 Legitimacy.	9	4.4 Responsibility and Sense of Duty.	9
3.5 Accountability.	7	4.5 Pride in Work and Organisation.	9
5. ATTITUDES	7	6. BEHAVIOUR	5
5.1 Attitude to Corporate Property, Image, Management & Goals.	9	6.1 History of Policy Violations.	4
5.2 Attitude to Corporate Policy Violations.	7	6.2 History of Dishonesty - including Theft.	6
5.3 Attitude to Rationalisation and Defence Mechanisms.	5	6.3 Opportunistic Dishonesty.	5
5.4 Attitude to Approval Needs & Group Dependency.	4	6.4 Impulsivity and Instant Gratification of Needs.	7
5.5 Attitude to Leniency - Tolerating Deviant Behaviour in Others.	9	6.5 Rule-Boundedness.	5
7. MANIPULATION	4	8. VALUES	6
7.1 Manipulation of Others.	3	8.1 Honesty; as a Central Guide.	4
7.2 Emotional Attachment/Involvement.	8	8.2 Dependability; as a Central Value.	6
7.3 Susceptibility to Pressure.	5	8.3 Fairness.	3
7.4 Transparency.	1	8.4 Respect.	10
7.5 Self-Centredness.	4	8.5 Courage of Conviction.	7
9. CORPORATE & MANAGERIAL INTEGRITY	7	9 (b) Management Integrity	6
9 (a) Corporate Integrity	7	9.6 Trustworthiness of Management.	6
9.1 Participation and Empowerment.	9	9.7 Credibility of Management.	5
9.2 Employment Conditions and Practice.	6	9.8 Manipulative Abuse of Power by Management.	5
9.3 Recognition and Reward.	3	10. MONITOR	10
9.4 Furthering Lifestyle Aspiration and Development of Staff.	6	10.1 Lie-Detector.	10
9.5 Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB).	9	10.2 Consistency Factor.	10
Report Date: 2025-09-17		10.3 Unnatural Exaggeration.	9

Please note:

A score lower than 5 on the Lie-Detector is considered a knock-out.

Integrated Labour Turnover Score (ILTS)

Adapted Labour Turnover Score (ALTS)

8

8



IP-200 VERSION III

INTEGRITY PROFILES 200

EXTENDED DEFINED REPORT

TEN SUBSTRUCTURES, INTEGRITY PROFILE AND INTEGRATED AND ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATINGS

THE PROFILE

The Extended Report covers the entire Summarized Report of the IP200. The **Integrity Profile** is being reflected at the top of the Summarized Report and is thus dealt with as the first subject to the Extended Report.

The IP200 Summarized Report is initiated by the **Ten Substructures** integrity consists of and the **profile** the ten relevant bar-charts provide in terms of the ten scores the test-taker obtained for each of the ten substructures used in scoring the test as well as the **Integrated and Adapted Integrity Ratings**.

The more integrated and consistent the profile is and the closer it tends to be to the particular 'requirements-profile' of the position the test-taker is being considered for, the 'better' the profile is considered to be in general terms

The Integrated and Adapted Integrity Ratings are preceding the detailed defined report and provide the most representative single scores of the entire integrity rating process. It will, however, also be reflected at the end of the Extended Defined Report to conclude the Extended Report and provide the user with a comprehensive, but also fuller perspective of the test-takers performance on the IP200.

Please Note:

1. For the ease of reading, the *male gender* is used in this document, but also refers in all instances to the *female gender*.

1. SOCIALIZATION



This expresses the degree of *socialization* the candidate was exposed to and the extent to which he internalized the values, standards, beliefs, cultures and traditions *transferred* on him associated therewith – and by implication, the probability and extent to which his behavior will be influenced by it in practice as well as his empathetic and supportive orientation to individual people as well as the organization in general.

1.1 Social Experience – from family to immediate society



The more comprehensive and stable the candidate's family and social setting and the more active and involved the role he is playing in them, the higher the score will be.

1.2 Significance of Role Society Plays



The higher the candidate's appreciation is of the right, and success society has in significantly influencing its members, the higher the score will be.

1.3. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) - People



The more the candidate is orientated to assisting co-workers in dealing with personal matters or being more effective in what they do without expecting anything in return, the higher the score will be – i.e. taking responsibility for others with the intent of helping them.

1.4. Empathy & Agreeableness



The more the candidate is open and willing to considering the (different) standpoints of other in a sympathetic and humane way, the higher the score will be.

1.5. Organisation Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) – Corporate/Organisation



The more the candidate is willing to serve the organisation's best interest in 'walking the extra mile', even if it is not 'officially' required of him, at all times and under all circumstances, the higher the score will be.

2. TRUSTWORTHINESS

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This expresses the degree of dependency, honesty, loyalty and conscientiousness the candidate developed as a 'guide-orientation' in his **day-to-day** behavior he is known for **at present/currently**.

2.1 Reliability/Dependability

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The better the candidate's general current orientation is to *time-keeping*, dealing with *confidentiality* and his history of honouring *undertakings*, the higher the score will be.

2.2 Honesty in Practice

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The more the candidate's current day-to-day behaviour is obviously guided by the wide variety of factors related to *honesty* (e.g. sincerity, morality, ethics, righteousness, honour, fairness, etc.) as a typical behavioural disposition, the higher the score will be.

2.3 Discretion

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The more effort the candidate is willing to invest in making his own choices/decisions, the higher the score will be – especially regarding what is right or wrong.

2.4 Loyalty

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The stronger, stable and consistent the faithfulness, patriotism and devotion are the candidate displays to others and institutions he is (or was) associated with, the higher the score will be.

2.5 (Moral) Conscientiousness

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The more well-developed the candidate's inherent level and set of norms and standards are regarding taking his duties and life serious, in terms of being dedicated, committed, reliable and morally and ethically soundly based in the process, the higher the score will be.

3. CREDIBILITY



Credibility as well as Work Ethic are closely associated with the concept of work – the first in more general terms, but the latter particularly so. Credibility, in particular, expresses the degree the candidate is considered predictable and consistent and possesses the skills to perform his work, his 'objective fit' to the job and his willingness and ability to being accountable for his actions/work.

3.1 Predictability - 'Real Self'



This is the degree to which the candidate presents himself as he really is and not pretending to be what he is not, in a consistent and predictable way, under different situations as a typical behavioural disposition.

3.2 Consistency & (Emotional) Stability



The more the candidate favours a consistent, steady, predictable, emotionally well controlled and proven way of life, the higher the score will be.

3.3 Capacity



This is the extent to which the candidate is skilled, competent and experienced to perform his (allocated) work well.

3.4 Legitimacy



This is the degree to which the candidate is truly, legally and fully equipped to fit the job well in terms of being the right person for the work/job – living up to the requirements of the job/position in an objective basis in his own right.

3.5 Accountability



This is the degree to which the candidate is prepared, willing and able to acknowledge and take responsibility for his own shortcomings and mistakes and lives up to all reasonable expectations others may have of him.

4. WORK ETHIC



This describes the candidate in terms of his degree of motivation, self-reliance, co-operation, responsibility and sense of duty in the work-structure as well as his pride in the work and the organization he is employed in – *his positive orientation to work per sé, is being measured.*

4.1 Perseverance, Commitment & Drive-Initiative



This is the degree of commitment, motivation and drive the candidate is bringing to the table in performing his work as a typical orientation in doing his job.

4.2 Self-Reliance, Self-Discretion & Self-Control



This is the degree to which the candidate is able and willing to act on his own at work when appropriate and to not always dependent on others/seniors to instruct, guide and control him and his work activities.

4.3 Co-operation, Support & Leader Legitimacy



This is the general and typical tendency of the candidate to co-operate and provide support to others in the work situation; including people in positions of authority (management).

4.4 Responsibility & Sense of Duty



This is the extent to which the candidate is able and willing to demonstrate a sense of duty and taking responsibility for the tasks and objectives allocated to him.

4.5 Pride in Work & Organization



This is the extent to which the candidate is positively orientated to the work he is doing and the organization he is employed at.

5. ATTITUDES



This expresses the orientation the candidate has developed over time and experience in different situations regarding specific critical subjects that have a guiding influence in how he deals with these and related issues.

5.1 Attitude to Corporate Property, Image, Management & Goals



This is the degree to which the candidate subscribes to and recognises the ownership of the organisation regarding its *property*, the *image* projected by the organisation, the *legitimacy* of its managers and supporting the *goals* of the organisation in general and specific terms.

5.2 Attitude to Corporate Policy Violation




This is the general typical orientation the candidate has regarding corporate policy and the violation thereof in the World of Work. A higher 'score' would be indicative of a positive attitude on the part of the candidate to being in support of adhering to policies and not violate it in practice as far as possible – please note, this represents his positive *attitude and belief*; not necessarily his real action in this regard.

5.3 Attitude to Rationalisation and Defence Mechanism



This is the degree to which the candidate is prepared and able to *justify* (even to the extent of misleading others) his action, even if he knows it may be wrong, in order to derive the required benefit from it. At the absolute extreme level, any action is acceptable, as long as it can be justified/rationalised by the person.

5.4 Attitude to Approval Needs - Group & Clique/Gang Dependency



This is the extent to which the candidate needs to belong to and obtains the approval of others at work for what the candidate does. The lower the 'score' on this scale, the more the candidate tends to be group-dependent for his action – at the extreme low level, the person becomes a mere puppet in the hands of others.

5.5 Attitude to Leniency – Tolerating Deviant Behaviour in Others



This is the degree to which the candidate would tend to accept deviant behaviour in others – in other words, the measure of deviant behaviour he would be prepared to tolerate in others (or even, condone in others).

6. BEHAVIOUR

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This expresses the candidate's historical, present and future behavioural and projected typical behavioural inclination – good and bad. This is not a 'once-off' behaviour, but a behaviour pattern that acquired a degree of permanency, influencing his present and future perception and behaviour.

6.1 History of Policy Violations

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the extent to which the candidate, irrespective of his relevant attitudinal orientation as displayed in 4.5.1 above, considered it necessary to violate policies in the *past*.

6.2 History of Dishonesty – including theft

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is whether the candidate did involve himself in deviant behaviour in the *past* and the extent thereof – this reflects the *historical* aspect of the subject.

6.3 Opportunistic Dishonesty

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is what the probability is that the candidate will submit to deviant behaviour and what degree of 'enticement' it would require/take - this reflects the *futuristic* (projected) aspect of the subject.

6.4 Impulsivity and Instant Gratification of Needs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the tendency demonstrated by the candidate to give preference to (selfishly) satisfying his own needs first and immediately without hesitation – *to live for today and for yourself*.

6.5 Rule-Boundedness

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the extent to which the candidate, in line with his overall internalized orientation to rules per sé, tends to willingly adhere to and be guided by rules or not; by 'working around' or breaking rules in the latter instance.

7. MANIPULATION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This expresses the candidate's proneness and inclination to resorting to manipulatively related attributes and behaviour when dealing with others in order to promote his own interest, e.g. by abusing the power to his disposal, not 'showing his hand', keeping matters 'close to his chest', not caring for (the interests of) others and, or allowing himself to become emotionally involved.

7.1 Manipulation of Others

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the extent to which the individual is prepared to make others believe his ideas are actually coming from them to get them to do things his way without them even knowing it.

7.2 Emotional Attachment/Involvement

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

That is indicative of the individual's lack of emotional involvement with, and concern for others – not caring for the interest of others and even be prepared to act in a way that would be detrimental to others.

7.3 Susceptibility to Pressure

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

That is the probability that the candidate would tend to 'give-in' to the demands/wishes of other people even if these wishes are in opposition to the views/standards of the candidate or what is in general terms expected of the candidate in this regard.

7.4 Transparency

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

That is the degree to which the candidate typically would tend to keep matters 'close to his chest' – i.e. not to share information (on personal or other critical matters) with others.

7.5 Self-Centredness

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10


This is the degree the individual is orientated to deviant and self-centred behaviour as a typical behavioural disposition – being a basic behavioural pattern rather than only a once-off action or reaction.

8. VALUES



This expresses the degree to which certain critical attributes evolved as central and well established 'role-players' in the candidate's total cognitive and emotional being to guide his way of thinking, feeling and behaviour on an ongoing basis in providing stability to the person's life.

8.1 Honesty as a Central Guide



This is the extent to which the concept of *honesty* became entrenched and internalized in the candidate's inherent Value Set; guiding the candidate's general and long term behavior role orientation and adding stability and predictability to his projected future behaviour.

8.2 Dependability as a Central Value



This is the extent to which the concept of *dependability* became entrenched and internalized in the candidate's inherent *Value Set* and reflects the role *dependability* is playing it this regard in determining and guiding the person's general and long term behavioural orientation - adding stability and predictability to an individual's projected future behaviour.

8.3 Fairness



This is the degree to which the candidate is considered to being just and fair in his perception of other people and/or groups of people and does not discriminate between them on the base of culture, language, nationality, age, gender, etc. in practice.

8.4 Respect



This is the degree the candidate has and shows appreciation and high esteem to other (senior) people and the basic things in life (e.g., discipline, authority and seniority) and that forms part of his internalized Value Set and is playing a determining role in his long term behavioural disposition.

8.5 Courage of Conviction



This is the extent to which the candidate is living by and according to his beliefs and is guided by his basic convictions (e.g., values and standards) rather than by his present situation - 'standing up' for what he believes in.

9. CORPORATE & MANAGERIAL INTEGRITY




This expresses the candidate's perception of how well his present or previous 'employer' lives up to providing an acceptable corporate and managerial environment, regarding a wide range of critical corporate and managerial factors, in terms of what could be rightfully expected of him.

9 (a) Corporate Integrity



This expresses the candidate's specific perception of how well his present or previous 'employer' succeeded in providing an acceptable corporate environment as can be rightfully expected of him.

9.1 Representation & Empowerment



This is the extent to which the organisation is perceived and experienced by the candidate to allow all (including himself) *to be involved, to participate and be empowered* in the functioning of the organisation (its decision-making, establishing of philosophy, strategy, values and standards, etc.).

9.2 Employment Conditions & Practice



This is the extent to which the organisation is perceived and experienced by its staff (including himself) to have a well-developed set of employment conditions that is fully adhered to in practice in a fair, objective and transparent way.

9.3 Recognition & Reward




This is the extent to which the organisation is perceived and experienced by its staff (including himself) to have a well-developed and fair reward and personal remuneration system that compares well with most other organisations.

9.4 Furthering Lifestyle Aspiration of Staff



This is the extent to which the organisation is perceived and experienced by its staff (including himself) to realise their aspirations in the work context, and in life in general, as well as offering a comprehensive and sophisticated development program to support such, according to the needs, interests and competencies of each employee.

9.5 Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB)



This is the extent to which the candidate demonstrates a loyal and positive orientation to promoting the best interest of the organisation, as opposed to demonstrating a negative disposition and work behaviour such as sabotage or aggression towards his boss or even colleagues with the intent to hurting the organisation and/or its employees.

9(b) Management Integrity

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the extent the management of the organisation is perceived to be honest, trustworthy, credible and not manipulatively abusing their powers in performing their basic managerial function and in their general attitude and behaviour on a day-to-day basis.

9.6 Trustworthiness of Management

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the perceived degree of dependability, honesty, reliability, moral of consciousness and courage of conviction with which management functions in the organisation.

9.7 Credibility of Management

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the extent to which managers are seen to earn their positions and respect from staff (including this candidate) because they are the right people for the position, doing the right things that are rightfully expected of them and treating people and situations absolutely fair in the process at work.

9.8 Manipulative Abuse of Power by Management

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10


This is the extent to which management is perceived by staff (including the candidate) to manipulate others to serve their own interest in a calculative, 'cold' and unemotional way, not being fully transparent, applying hidden agendas in the process and thus demonstrates 'unethical' and self-centred behaviour.

10. MONITOR




This is a composite score reflecting on the degree of objectivity, open-mindedness and truthfulness with which the candidate provided valid information on himself during the assessment process and consists of the following three scales which are reflected here together with their definitions and the sten scores the candidate obtained in each of them.

10.1 Lie Detector



This is the degree to which the candidate was accurate, truthful and honest in completing the IP200 questionnaire; especially considering the fact that the test-takers were warned about the consequences of not adhering to the build-in monitor in the assessment procedure. A score of '5' represents a rather high risk level, but in some exceptional circumstances, like existing staff in low 'sensitivity' and non-managerial jobs, the test-user may still decide to continue analysing the results generated by the test. A score of '4' or below is considered to be a knockout (especially for 'outside' candidates) in that the user of the test cannot rely on the truthfulness of the information supplied by the candidate. There is, however, no reason why the test-taker should not score at an '8' or even a higher level.

10.2 Consistency



This is the degree to which the candidate consistently tends to *deviate* in answering test-items covering like areas/subjects as well as the extent to which he *understood the items the test consists of and being* in command of the language used as well as the *purpose* the test serves. A score of lower than '4' is considered to be a knockout.

10.3 Unnatural Exaggeration



This is the degree to which the candidate tends to *inflate* his responses on test-items as a typical behavioural disposition on his part with the obvious intend to enhance his own image, rather than presenting a true and honest picture of himself. A score of lower than '4' is considered to be a knockout.



IP-200 VERSION II
INTEGRITY PROFILES 200
EXTENDED DEFINED REPORT

Org: INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL
 Job Title: DISTRIBUTION MANAGER

Name: Joe Cabu

INTEGRATED INTEGRITY RATING (IIR)



This composite scale best represents all above areas of assessment produced by the IP200 as a single weighted integrated score.

As a general guide a '6'-sten on the IIR is seen to represent a **'knockout score'** for considering the appointment of an applicant from outside the particular user-organization of the IP200 instrument. An '8'-sten would be considered as a **'perfect score'** - on condition that the test-taker scored at a sufficient level on the Lie Detector. What is then the meaning of a '7'-sten? A '7'-sten is considered to be a **Dividing-Line Score** in the sense that the applicant should score at a sufficiently high level on the most important job requirements related to the position at hand to 'stay in the run' for selection.

The scores in the body of the instrument should be considered individually and in correlation, where applicable, to determine whether they live up to the requirements of the job – the **best fit** between the **Job Requirements Profile (JRP)** and the relevant related scores on the scales reflected in the IP200 (the so-called **Integrity Job Profile-IJP**) will determine the degree of preference you would give to a particular test-taker.

ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATING (AIR)



This scale represents a converted score of the above IIR by adjusting it to the degree the candidate 'lied' in completing the IP200 as well as taking his Consistency and Unnatural Exaggeration scores in consideration – leaving the user with a much more reliable single score on the total IP200.

Integrated Labour Turnover Score (ILTS)



This specialized substructure score is construed from the relevant **ten scales**, reported on in the IP200 Summarized Report, that render the closest correlation with the test-taker's employment tenure. **The higher the 'score' the better** – i.e., the higher the integrated assessment (as a weighted average), the higher the probability the candidate will remain in the employ of the organisation for a considerable period of time. A '3'to'4' (or lower) on the integrated score is in most cases considered to represent an unacceptably low score, but a '2' or lower on any one of *the ten contributing scores*, is considered to be a **knockout score**. The probability that an employee will remain in the position that he was appointed in for more than a year or two, is being associated with a '5' (or higher) norm-score – **the higher (the score) the better!**

Adapted Labour Turnover Score (ALTS)



Considering the fact that the candidate might have boasted his scoring on the above for whatever reason (i.e., enhancing his image to obtain the position that he is applying for), the ILTS is adapted by the degree that the person might have made him guilty of such behaviour. For this purpose, the Lie Detector score (as well as taking his Consistency and Unnatural Exaggeration scores in consideration) obtained by the candidate during the completion of the IP200, is being used to adapt the integrated score – leaving the user with a much more reliable single score (ALTS) for predicting the candidate's probability to 'submit' to high labour turnover in practice. It must, however, always be remembered that this score is representing a probability assessment (based on related statistics) where a wide and unique set of impacting situational factors must always be taken into consideration – for example, his health, family, immediate superior, etc.



***IP-200 VERSION III**

INTEGRITY PROFILES 200

Org: INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL
Job Title: DISTRIBUTION MANAGER

RISK REPORT

Assessment Date: 2025-02-27

Name: Joe Cabu
ID: 620512xxxxxxx

I. Integrity Profile & Integrated Integrity Rating

	Elimination	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
I.1 Integrity Profile - Consistency		6	Medium	7	Low
I.2 Integrated Profile – Block Formation		9	Very Low		
I.3 Integrated Integrity Rating		7	Medium		

II. Monitor Substructure

	Elimination	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
II.1 Lie Detector		10	Very Low	10	Very Low
II.2 Consistency		10	Very Low		
II.3 Unnatural Exaggeration		9	Very Low		

III. Honesty Pattern (HP)

Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
4 Support Scales { 8.1 Honesty; as a Central Guide. 2.2 Honesty in Practice. 6.2 History of Dishonesty. 6.3 Future Opportunistic Dishonesty			5	High

IV. High Risk Square (HRS)

Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
6 Support Scales { 9.5 Counterproductive Work Behaviour. 5.3 Rationalization. 5.5 Leniency. 5.2, 6.1 & 6.5 Rules & Policies.			7	Low

V. Internalized Strength (IS)

	Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
V.1 Internal Locus of Control (ILC)	5 Support Scales	7	Low	7	Low
V.2 Vulnerability to Influence (VI)	5 Support Scales	6	Medium		
V.3 Drive Orientation (DO)	7 Support Scales	8	Very Low		

VI. Higher Order (Personality) Factor (HOF)

	Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
VI.1 Conscientiousness (C)	3 Support Scales	7	Low	7	Low
VI.2 Agreeableness (A)	4 Support Scales	6	Low		
VI.3 Stability (S)	4 Support Scales	7	Very Low		
VI.4 Socialized Control (SC)	5 Support Scales	7	Low		

VII. Devious Disposition (DD)

Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
5 Support Scales { 7.1 Manipulation. 5.3 Rationalization. III Honesty. 3.1 & 7.4 Secretiveness.			4	Very High

VIII. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
4 Support Scales { 1.3 OCB People. 1.5 OCB Corporate/Organization. 4.3 & 7.5 Cooperation & Assistance.			6	Low

IX. Managerial Triangle (MT)

Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
4 Support Scales { 4.2 Self-Reliance, -Direction & -Control. 4.4 Responsibility. 2.1 & 8.2 Reliability & Dependability.			8	Very Low

X. Corporate & Managerial Integrity (CMI)

	Support Scales	Individual Score	Risk Level	Integrated Guide Score	Risk Level
X.1 Corporate Integrity (CI)	5 Support Scales	7	Very Low	7	Very Low
X.2 Management Integrity (MI)	3 Support Scales	6	Low		



Report Date: 2025-09-17

Please Note:

- The above risk profile should be interpreted against the requirement-profile of the particular job at hand.
- If an 'ELIMINATION' or 'INVALID' Risk Level is found on any of the first two Guides, the analysis-process is by implication stopped.
- The higher the score reported, the better.



www.integtests.com



MID

Org: INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL
Job Title: DISTRIBUTION MANAGER

MANAGERIAL & INTEGRITY DISPOSITION

SUMMARIZED REPORT

Assessment Date: 2025-02-27

Name: Joe Cabu
ID: 620512xxxxxxx

B. SUBSTRUCTURES AND PROFILE

Four Substructures of MI		Poor	Average	Adequate	Good	Excellent					
1. INTERNALIZED STRENGTH & CONTROL	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. WORK PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. HUMAN RELATION ORIENTATION	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. CORPORATE ORIENTATION	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
INTEGRATED MANAGERIAL & INTEGRITY DISPOSITION											7

C. SUB & SUPPORT STRUCTURES

1. INTERNALIZED STRENGTH & CONTROL	7	3. HUMAN RELATIONS ORIENTATION	5
1.1 Accountability	7	3.1 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)- People	6
1.2 Attitude to Approval Needs & Group Dependency	4	3.2 Empathy & Agreeableness	4
1.3 Attitude to Leniency-Tolerating Deviant Behaviour in Others	9	3.3 Honesty – Integrated as per Risk Report	5
1.4 Impulsivity & Instant Gratification of Needs	7	3.4 Fairness	3
1.5 Self-Reliance, Self-Direction & Self-Control	9	3.5 Respect	10
1.6 Susceptibility to Pressure	5	3.6 Self-Centeredness	4
2. WORK PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION	8	4. CORPORATE ORIENTATION	6
2.1 Reliability/Dependability (2.1 - 5) & (8.2 - 5)	5	4.1 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) – Corporate	6
2.2 Conscientiousness	8	4.2 Loyalty	7
2.3 Perseverance, Commitment & Drive-Initiative	9	4.3 Pride in Work and Organisation.	9
2.4 Responsibility and Sense of Duty	9	4.4 Attitude to Corporate Property, Image, Managerial & Goals	9
2.5 Courage of Conviction	7	4.5 Rule-Boundedness	5
2.6 Consistency & Stability	8	4.6 Transparency	1

IP200 v III ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATING (AIR)

7

Composed from the IP200 v III.

Report Date: 2025-09-17