



*GIP

GENERAL INTEGRITY PROFILE

REPORT

Louise van der Frick

ID: 020566xxxxxxx

Assessment Date: 2020-03-30



INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL

Learnership

Report date: 2022-07-26



*GIP

GENERAL INTEGRITY PROFILE

SUMMARIZED REPORT

ORG: INTEGRITY INTERNATIONAL
JOB TITLE: LEARNERSHIP

Assessment Date: 2020-03-30

NAME: Louise van der Frick
ID: 020566xxxxxxx

INTEGRITY PROFILE

Eight Substructures of Integrity		Poor	Average	Adequate	Good	Excellent					
1. Honesty	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Responsibility & Conscientiousness	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Dependability/Reliability	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Leniency	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. Fairness	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. Active Conscience	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. Verifiable Real-Life Factors	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. Monitor	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
INTEGRATED INTEGRITY RATING (IIR)	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

C. TEST RESULTS

(3)

1. HONESTY	(2)	7
1.1 Current Practical Honesty-Orientation	8	
1.2 Historical Dishonesty	7	
1.3 Opportunistic Dishonesty (Futuristic)	7	
2. RESPONSIBILITY & CONSCIENTIOUSNESS		8
3. DEPENDABILITY/RELIABILITY		6
4. LENIENCY – TOLERATING OF, & ORIENTATION TO DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR		6
4.1 Theft	8	
4.2 Lying	5	
4.3 Denial, Rationalisation, Justification, Projection & Defence Mechanism – in essence ILC	8	
5. FAIRNESS		5
6. ACTIVE CONSCIENCE		9
7. VERIFIABLE REAL-LIFE FACTORS		9
7.1 Education	10	
7.2 Stability	8	
7.3 Defaulting	8	
7.4 Disciplinary Action	10	
7.5 Deviant History	10	
D 8. MONITOR		9
8.1 Lie Detector	10	
8.2 Consistency	7	
8.3 Unnatural Exaggeration	10	
E. INTEGRATED INTEGRITY RATING (IIR)		8
F. ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATING (AIR)		8

INTEG

- Registered Trademark**
- First Order Factors** – Reflecting the primary areas the Second Order Factors consists of.
- Second Order Factors** – Reflecting the composite fields assessed by the GIP.
- Integrated Integrity Rating (IIR)** – Reflecting the weighted integrated scores calculated from the preceding eight Second Order Factors and representing thus the best single Integrity Rating of the candidate.
- Adapted Integrity Rating (AIR)** – Reflecting the amended (IIR) according to the degree of 'Lying' (manipulating the results of the test) on the part of the candidate.

(4)

(5)

Report Date: 2022-07-26

1. HONESTY



Honesty, representing a core factor relative to the entire concept of integrity, is here assessed from three dimensions and the resultant weighted integrated score reflected as being the best single assessment representing the subject – the higher the score the better.

1.1 Current Practical Honesty-Orientation



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.

1.2 Historical Dishonesty



This is reflecting the **historical** aspect of the subject – i.e., whether the person did involve himself in deviant behaviour in the **past** and the extent thereof.

1.3 Opportunistic Dishonesty (Futuristic)



The **lower the probability** of the candidate submitting to **future** deviant behaviour and the greater the degree of 'enticement' it would require/take to bring this about, the higher the score on this scale would be.

2. RESPONSIBILITY & CONSCIENTIOUSNESS



This is the extent to which the candidate is able and willing to demonstrate a sense of duty, take responsibility and be conscientious in performing the tasks/responsibilities assigned to him and reach his goals and complete his objectives - the higher the better. This scale proves to correlate closely with a candidate's **Work Ethic**; now and in the future.

3. DEPENDABILITY/RELIABILITY



This is the degree to which the candidate can be depended/relied on in terms of his good **timekeeping**, keeping **his word**, dealing with **confidential** matters and **honouring** his undertakings under all circumstances.

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

A high score on any of these scales always reflects the 'good side of behaviour' of the candidate on the particular subject covered in the scale.

4. LENIENCE – TOLERATING OF, & ORIENTATION TO DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR



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, or even condone, in others) – i.e., the **lower** the probability that the candidate would tolerate deviant behaviour in others, the **higher** the score on this scale tends to be.

4.1 Theft



This area assesses the candidate's orientation towards the sanctity of ownership in all its facets and under all circumstances; historically, presently and in the future. This orientation does not only apply to himself, but also to how he believes this orientation applies to others – i.e., a typical behaviour disposition of *"not taking something that does not belong to oneself"*, elicits higher scores on this scale.

4.2 Lying



This area assesses the candidate's specific orientation towards the concept of lying (not telling the truth or deliberately reporting information incorrectly) with its associated manifestations of deceit, falsification, perjury and the deliberate misleading of, and misrepresentation to others – usually to benefit himself and, in many instances, to the detriment of others! A higher score on this scale thus means that the candidate is not submitting to 'lying' in general terms.

4.3 Denial, Rationalisation, Justification, Projection & Defense Mechanism – in essence ILC



This is the extent to which the candidate is willing to accept responsibility, or be accountable for, his own (wrong/deviant) life/situations rather than contradicting it or blaming the cause thereof on others or justifying/rationalising it in some way or another. The essential role the candidate's **Internal Locus of Control (ILC)** is playing in his perception of his present situation and/or how he will react in dealing with future situations – i.e., does he see himself as an ('unfortunate') 'given product' of his present and past or is he a person that can take a stance in life and be in control of his own future/destiny; not allowing others or fate to guide his behaviour. The better developed and used the candidate's ILC, the higher the score on this scale will be.

5. FAIRNESS



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

6. ACTIVE CONSCIENCE



This is the extent to which the candidate's conscience is developed and is actively and effectively serving as a guide to the person's day-to-day behaviour – with special reference to moral and deviant matters.

7. VERIFIABLE REAL-LIFE FACTORS

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the candidate's integrated response on the following five selected verifiable factors that proved to differentiate in terms of the general concept of Integrity for a large population representing a wide variety of sub-populations in terms of geography, gender, age, language, culture, race:

7.1 Education

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Representative of the level of education the candidate possesses.

7.2 Stability

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Representing the period(s) which the candidate spent in specific allocation/capacities, e.g., address, employment, etc.

7.3 Defaulting

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Representative of the extent to which the candidate has proven to honour specific agreements.

7.4 Disciplinary Action

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Representing the number of times in the candidate's history that he has been accused of deviant behaviour.

7.5 Deviant History

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Representing the candidate's history of being found guilty of deviant behaviour and the degree of deviation applicable.

EXTENDED DEFINED REPORT

D 8. MONITOR



This is a composite score reflecting on the degree of objectivity, open-mindedness, accuracy and truthfulness with which the candidate completed the instrument/test; including a '**Lie-Detector**' and '**Consistency-Measurement**' as well as the degree to which a person tends to inflate the 'scores' through his '**Unnatural Exaggeration**' demonstrated during the assessment process.

8.1 Lie Detector



This score reflects the honesty, objectivity and open-mindedness with which the candidate completed the integrity questionnaire. The higher the score, the more truthful the candidate was in providing current information about himself. A high score must not be interpreted to indicate an honest person per sé. A **low score** is, however, a strong indication of a **dishonest-orientation** on the part of the candidate, considering the fact that the testees are warned against misrepresenting themselves during the completion of the questionnaire – misrepresentation is a deliberate action in this instance; and honest people do not make themselves guilty of such blatant deviant and fraudulent behaviour.

8.2. 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 is in command of the language* used and understands the *purpose* the test serves.

8.3 Unnatural Exaggeration



This is the degree to which the candidate tends to *inflate* his responses on the test items as a typical behavioural disposition on his part, with the obvious intent to enhance his own image.

E. INTEGRATED INTEGRITY RATING (IIR)



This composite rating is obtained from the weighted integrated scores calculated from the seven main Substructures and the Monitor 'score' and represents the best single Integrity Rating of the candidate.

F. ADAPTED INTEGRITY RATING (AIR)



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