THE PERCEPTION OF INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE: A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP INTEGRITY IN SABAH STATE AGENCIES IN KOTA KINABALU

AHMAD SUHAINI YACOB

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH
2011

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

BORANG PENGESAHAN STATUS DISERTASI

JUDUL   : **THE PERCEPTION OF INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE: A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP INTEGRITY IN SABAH STATE AGENCIES IN KOTA KINABALU**

IJAZAH   : **SARJANA PENTADBIRAN PERNIAGAAN**

SESI PENGAJIAN : 2008 – 2010

Saya, AHMAD SUHAINI YACOB mengaku membenarkan disertasi sarjana ini di simpan di Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Sabah dengan syarat-syarat kegunaan berikut:-

1. Disertasi adalah hak milik Universiti Malaysia Sabah.
2. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Sabah dibenarkan membuat salinan untuk tujuan pengajian sahaja.
3. Perpustakaan dibenarkan membuat salinan disertasi ini sebagai bahan pertukaran Institusi Pengajian Tinggi.
4. TIDAK TERHAD.

PERPUSTAKAAN
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Disahkan Oleh :

_____

Penulis : AHMAD SUHAINI YACOB

Alamat : Lot 596, Lrg. 15,

Taman Pasir Putih,

Putatan,

Kota Kinabalu.

_____

TANDATANGAN PUSTAKAWAN

Penyelia: Prof.Madya Dr.Janie Liew Heng Mei

Tarikh : 17 Ogos 2011

DECLARATION

The material in this thesis is original except the quotations, summaries and references, which have been duly acknowledged at the appropriate places.

Date: 20th July 2011

AHMAD SUHAINI YACOB
PE20088195C

CERTIFICATION

NAME	:	**AHMAD SUHAINI YACOB**
MATRIC NO.	:	**PE20088195C**
TITLE	:	**THE PERCEPTION OF INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE: A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP INTEGRITY IN SABAH STATE AGENCIES IN KOTA KINABALU**
DEGREE	:	**MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**
VIVA DATE	:	**11TH JULY 2011**

DECLARED BY

1.   **SUPERVISOR**

     Associate Prof. Dr. Janie Liew Heng Mei   ....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

ABSTRACT

THE PERCEPTION OF INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE: A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AND PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP INTEGRITY IN SABAH STATE AGENCIES IN KOTA KINABALU

Leadership with perceived effectiveness and integrity is important in today's organization particularly in the public service especially in reducing corruption, tackling unethical behaviours and addressing integrity issues apart from ensuring organization's success; ultimately creating public trust as public service is also public trust. The low level of public perception with regard to integrity in public service requires effective measures possibly from the exemplary role of leadership in order to bring the desired changes. Previous research indicated that there was no one size fits all approach to determine leadership effectiveness but integrity can be perceived using subordinates' assessment on leader's unethical behaviours. Hence, the purpose of this research is to study the statistical relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness (independent variable) and Perceived Leadership Integrity (dependent variable) using Leader Practices Inventory (LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner (1992,2002) and Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS) designed by Craig and Gustafson (1998) respectively in Sabah state agencies in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah. This study also attempts to find if the relationship between the independent and dependent variables can be moderated by age, gender and education. In a sample of 216 out of population parameters of 850 of different grades of subordinates in various ministries, departments and statutory bodies which comprise of Sabah state agencies in Kota Kinabalu, this research has successfully substantiated the findings done by previous researchers and found positive relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity in the said agencies. For Perceived Leadership Effectiveness, the sub-variable of Model the Way represents the strongest predictor and contributor to Perceived Leadership Integrity. However, this research found that all the three moderator variables have no moderating effects on the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity.

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

ABSTRAK

PERSEPSI INTEGRITI DALAM PERKHIDMATAN AWAM : SATU KAJIAN MENGENAI HUBUNGAN PERSEPSI KEBERKESANAN KEPIMPINAN DENGAN PERSEPSI INTEGRITI KEPIMPINAN DALAM AGENSI-AGENSI NEGERI SABAH DI KOTA KINABALU

Kepimpinan dengan persepsi keberkesanan dan integriti adalah penting dalam organisasi masakini khususnya di dalam perkhidmatan awam terutama dalam membenteras rasuah, salahlaku dan menangani isu integriti demi kejayaan organisasi disamping mewujudkan kepercayaan orang ramai memandangkan perkhidmatan awam juga mencerminkan kepercayaan orang ramai. Tahap persepsi yang rendah oleh orang ramai berhubung integriti dalam perkhidmatan awam memerlukan langkah berkesan kemungkinan daripada peranan kepimpinan bagi membawa perubahan yang diperlukan. Justru itu, tujuan tesis ini ialah untuk mengkaji hubungan statistik di antara Persepsi Keberkesanan Kepimpinan (pembolehubah tetap) dengan Persepsi Integriti Kepimpinan (pembolehubah bersandar) masing-masing menggunakan skala Inventori Praktis Kepimpinan (Leadership Practices Inventory) oleh Kouzes and Posner (2002) dan skala Persepsi Integriti Pemimpin (Perceived Leader Integrity Scale) oleh Craig dan Gustafson (1998). Kajian ini juga ingin mengetahui sama ada hubungan antara kedua pembolehubah tersebut boleh di pengaruhi oleh pembolehubah seperti umur, jantina dan pendidikan. Dengan menggunakan saiz sampel sejumlah 216 daripada lingkungan populasi seramai 850 meliputi pelbagai kategori pekerja bawahan di dalam agensi-agensi Negeri Sabah, kajian ini berjaya membuktikan dapatan terdahulu iaitu terdapat hubungan positif di antara Persepsi Keberkesanan Kepimpinan dan Persepsi Integriti Kepimpinan di agensi-agensi berkenaan. Bagi Persepsi Keberkesanan Kepimpinan, pembolehubah kecil iaitu Tunjukkan Cara (Model the Way) merupakan peramal dan penyumbang yang terbaik bagi Persepsi integriti Kepimpinan. Kajian ini juga mendapati bahawa kesemua pembolehubah umur, jantina dan pendidikan tidak mempunyai kesan pengaruh terhadap hubungan Persepsi Keberkesanan Kepimpinan dan Persepsi Integriti Kepimpinan.

TABLE OF CONTENT

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABA

LIST OF TABLE

UMS

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABA

UMS

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABA

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GLC	Government Linked Company
MACC	Malaysian Anti Corruption Commission
LPI	Leader Practices Inventory
PLIS	Perceived Leader Inventory Scale
OECD	Organisations of Economic Cooperation Development
MPSB	Merit System Protection Board
MLQ	Multifactor Leader Questionnaire
LBDQ	Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire
EBLQ	Essential Behaviour Leadership Questionnaire

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The Transparency International Perception of Corruption Index 2009 has put this country in the limelight of 56th most corrupt nation in the world with a score of 4.5 out of 10, a situation much worse than in 2008 when the country is in the 47th spot with score of 5.1 despite serious government's attempts and efforts to improve and to enhance governance, accountability, transparency, efficiency etc. through numerous reforms measures in the last two decades.

The finding from National Integrity Perception Index Report 2007 involving 14, 967 respondents in this country reported an index of 6.60 out of 10 of Malaysia's Public Service Delivery Quality compared to 6.76 of Malaysia's Perception of Corruption Index. This is of course above average, but it even gives bad impression regarding the public perception of quality of service delivery is even lower than public perception of corruption in this country (The Star, 3rd July, 2008, New Sunday Times, 6th July 2008). The researcher could not find another study done after that period. The low public perception indicates there is a lot to be done to improve integrity standing in public setting. If the perception is true, then the notion by OECD (2005) that "public sector is much less economic efficient and innovative than the private sector" and further assertion by Sarlak and Bali (2007) that the "public sector is the starting point of the spread of corruption" lend some credentials for investigation into integrity issues as OECD (2000) pointed out the public service also represents public trust.

The unprecedented case affecting one of the Malaysia's Government-Linked Companies (GLC) Sime Derby which is considered to be one of the largest companies in Malaysia has taken many people by surprise as the GLC is said to have suffered from 'leadership mismanagement' that had caused heavy losses to the tune of MYR2.0 billion (The Star, 22nd June 2010). The case of Teoh Beng

Hock who was found dead in 2010 in the midst of interrogation by Malaysia Anti-Corruption Commission (MACC) which is one of public agencies created to build public trust, and the case of one Custom's officer also found dead in almost similar incident sparked fear and anger among the general public the way the two cases have been handled. Hence, the question is "Where could have gone wrong and what must be done to address this big issue? Could it be due to the lack of ethics or aggressiveness on the part of the law enforcers, the police, or maybe lack of concern by the politicians, the public institutions, or could it be due to weaknesses of organizational framework or probably leaders helming the organizations?

In fact, numerous studies in the past revealed evidences of unethical behaviours in many organizations (McDonald & Nijhof, 1999) cited in Peterson (2002). There were other numerous issues as well which the researcher did not intend to express in depth in this study, but the statement contained in the National Integrity Plan (2004-2008) which stated that "The spread of corruption, incompetence, malpractices, abuse of power, fraud and other unethical behaviours as well as the lack of work motivation, have all been attributed to the decline in integrity among individuals, organizations and society at large" (Institute Integrity of Malaysia, 2005). To sum up, the word 'integrity' seems to be the root cause of impending problems and unethical issues affecting individuals, organizations and society as a whole.

Hence, this paper is attempted to understand the definition and interpretation of integrity specifically from the perspective of leadership as Lewis (1991) had stated that "leader sets the tone and conveys the public image of the agency". The researcher is of the opinion that in order to understand how leader establishes the tone and conveys the public image of the agency, the leader's roles and behaviours must first be investigated and the investigation should be related to integrity which is the problem area in this study. The researcher's desire to investigate the roles and behaviours of leadership in relation to integrity is also triggered by the notion that despite all reform measures and strict initiatives encompassing the rule-based and value-based approaches undertaken

2

by the government two decades ago, there seems to be no evidence of improvement and enhancement of integrity in public setting. In other words, whatever measures introduced and implemented previously by the government, no desired impacts had been produced and had resulted in the worse rating by Transparency International Perception of corruption Index of 2009.

Some public organizations are good, efficient and ethical while some are not and this notion must be supported with the prediction in this study that positive relationship exists between effective leadership with perceived integrity that is truly required in today's setting. For Sims and Brinkmann (2002), they asserted that integrity or unethical behaviour of organization's leader represented much of the differences on why some organizations were clean and some were not while Small and Dickie (1999) cited in Hooijberg, Lane and Diverse (2010) argued that managers embedded with values like integrity, trust and justice were mostly beneficial to an organization. The two statements clearly supported the notion that effective leadership with perceived integrity is most vital to bring the desired impact and to improve integrity at organisational level as well.

Previous researchers such as Garrett (1999); Hall (1980); O'Hara (2005); and McCabe (2005) cited in Schafer (2009) have also attributed organization's failure in the form of corruption, inefficiency, misconduct, and the like to the leadership's style and quality. Kouzes and Posner (2002) suggested on the need for an effective leadership to bring the desired impact due to changing business environment while Haberfeld (2006); Rowe (2006) cited in Schafer (2009) contended that "effective leaders are often lacking in organizations". Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan (1994); Hogan & Kaiser (2005); Van Vugt, Hogan & Kaiser (2008) also added that it was the pertinent aspect of leadership to act as influencing mechanism "to transcend their short-term selfish interests and work together for the long-term welfare of the group and leadership involves building a team and guiding it to outperform its competition".

All the above statements pinpoint to one important fact that is effective leadership embedded with moral values and integrity is needed to bring the

3

desired impact in public service. Other researchers like Abu-Tineh, Kasawneh and Al-Omari (2008) who studied effective leadership of high school principals in Amman, Jordan suggested that integrity in leadership itself was more important to act as a catalyst for reform. At the same time, the sort of pressures and dilemmas faced by leaders either in private or public organization must be duly recognized as there is no such thing for any organization immunes to ethical or integrity issues as managers or leaders are often confronted with ethical dilemmas at works. This was clearly stated in a finding in 1989 and subsequently in 1996 that 97 per cent of administrators virtually agreed the statement was true which was consistent with earlier finding by United State's Merits System Protection Board (MSPB) in 1993 on employee observance of fraud, waste and abuse (Bowman & Knox, 2008). Researcher like Fitsimmons (2008) also suggested the roles and behaviours of the administrators of the units or organizations were the single most influential factor to address corruption and improve efficiency as it involved the integrity of the individuals working there.

Hence, it is the role of effective leadership in public organization in relation to perceived leader integrity that the researcher attempts to investigate as previous studies indicated that combination of Perceived Leader Effectiveness and Perceived Leader Integrity was very important to address integrity issues from perspective of leadership as leaders set the direction and determined the future of the organization. In this study, integrity is regarded as the high-end construct based on its definition that constitutes 'wholeness' by Van der Wal; Huberts; Van Den Heuvel and Kolthoff (2006) and to the researcher the wholeness of leaders can be associated with perceived effectiveness and perceived integrity. Any leader can say he/she is effective but to possess integrity is something that can only be best perceived and assessed by subordinates or followers rather than by peers and super-ordinates managers. To this, the researcher desires to investigate the nature of relationship between Perceived Leader Effectiveness and Perceived Leader Integrity specifically on leader's behaviours and practices that can explain the variance in leader's perceived integrity which is the wholeness in order to bring the desired impact in public organization.

4

As the problem boils down narrowly to the issue of integrity, how did previous researchers define integrity? Previous literatures defined integrity as synonymous to ethics, honesty, and conscientiousness and often used interchangeably in the literature (Becker, 1998). This literature was also supported by Hogan and Kaiser (2010) who suggested that integrity, ethics, morals, and character were similar by the way these terms were normally applied. The study by OECD in 2005 defined integrity "as synonym of ethics management. It refers to the application of generally accepted public values and norms in daily practice". Most previous studies measured perceived integrity in leadership by way of perception by subordinates through conceptualization developed by Craig and Gustafson (1989) using his Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS) which has been found as a reliable way to measure perceived integrity in leaders.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) who had studied effective leadership for almost 20 years had conceptualized effective leadership using Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and suggested that "leadership is not a position, but a collection of practices and behaviours that can serve as guidance to accomplish extraordinary things done". For Kouzes and Posner, they defined effective leadership by virtue of five leadership practices: Model the Way, Inspire Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart. Thus, Kouzes and Posner's theory of effective leadership is used in this study though other researchers like Bennis and Nanus (1985) cited in Harung, Heaton and Alexander (1995) argued that after seventy-five years of empirical investigations of leadership, so far "no clear and unequivocal understandings exist as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders, and perhaps more specific, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders". To this, the researcher truly believes that effective leadership with perceived integrity can be measured using Leader Practices Inventory (LPI) and Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS) as the two methods had been applied before successfully and studies had shown strong positive relationship between Perceived Leader Effectiveness and Perceived Leader Integrity.

1.2. The Problem Statement

The gist of the problem is that leadership encompassing both perceived effectiveness and perceived integrity is hard to find in public service as what had been argued by OECD (2005) and is a crucial element to fight against corruption and all sorts of unethical practices and behaviours in order to instil and inculcate accountability, transparency, and integrity in government institutions. To support this, the National Integrity Plan (2004-2008) also clearly stated that "Leadership is extremely vital in developing the culture of any organisation or of a society as well as raising their level of integrity [...] Leaders must strictly adhere to laws, procedures and regulations. Any instructions issued by them that contradict or fly in the face of established laws, procedures and regulations will undermine integrity". This goes to indicate that leadership with perceived integrity just as Parry and Procter-Thomson (2002) clearly hinted that "ethical values is of indispensable to real leadership" is actually crucial to address integrity issues in public service which is in tandem with statement by Morgan (1993) that leadership must be seen to be effective and have integrity to carry out the job.

As stated by Isaksson (1997); Fawcett and Wardman (2008) that some leaders in position of authority behave shamefully and badly that damage public trust and confidence and this was further asserted by Freud (1921) that there were people who aspire to positions of power and authority most often motivated to pursue their own self-interest. This argument has added more insights as to how serious the problem with leadership being perceived to be effective in one instance but having no integrity or lack of integrity that the end result could damage the organization. Hogan and Kaiser (2010) also highlighted where public officials often placed self-interest and individual values on the frontline, and for Van de Walle (2008) quoted in Salminen and Norrbacka (2010) argued this could probably the reason why negative public attitude towards public agencies would most likely to cause discontentment about inefficiency, corruption or ineffectiveness of public administration. To this, the researcher believes that public service needs leadership who are effective and have integrity to instil public confidence in the service delivery.

6

Lewis (1991) had clearly stated that leaders set the tone and manifest the public image of the agency. But to agree with Lewis (1991) also contingent upon the argument by Trevino (1986) as to how leadership in organizations with the authority and power entrusted upon them would enable them to set the tone and establish ethical atmosphere in the organization. To the researcher, being effective alone is not enough to inculcate changes and reform and leadership must have values to contribute to enhancement of integrity and ensure organization's success. Hence, as the term integrity involves moral values such as honesty, trust, ethics, credibility, character and the likes (Becker, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Jennings, 2006; Palanski & Yammarino, 2007, 2009; Ciulla, 2004; Lawton, 1998), to the researcher's opinion, effective leadership with perceived integrity is badly required in public organization to win the followers' trust and confidence (Hogan & Kaiser, 2010) and to initiate changes and becomes a catalyst for reform (Abu-Tineh et al. 2008). A study done by Hogan and Kaiser (2010) using PLIS to measure perceived leader integrity and Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to measure perceived leader effectiveness found strong positive relationship between Perceived Leader Integrity and Perceived Leader Effectiveness and hence suggested for further research in applied setting in typical condition to confirm the result.

Thus, what represents a problem to be studied in this paper is the need for leader with perceived effectiveness in relation with perceived integrity as the high end construct that probably can address integrity issues and bring the desired impact in public service. For any leader to describe they are effective and to possess integrity is something that can only be perceived by followers or subordinates through leader's behaviours and actions. Hence, this study is attempted to understand how leaders in public service can be perceived by subordinates in different grades of position in different agencies in Sabah as being effective and have integrity. Therefore, the statement of the problem is "What is the nature of the relationship between Perceived Leader Effectiveness and Perceived Leader Integrity particularly in Sabah agencies in Kota Kinabalu"? Another problem that is worthy of investigation in this study is whether demographic factors such age, gender and level of education have moderating

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

influence on the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity.

1.3 The Research Objectives

The designation of the problem statement has led to the following research objectives which are:-

1. To understand the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity in Sabah state agencies in Kota Kinabalu.

2. To identify the best practices of leadership effectiveness (Model the way, Inspire vision, Challenge the process, Enable others to act, Encourage the heart) that have significant relationship with Perceived Leadership Integrity.

3. To identify which of the independent variables is/are the best predictors for Perceived Leadership Integrity.

4. To investigate the moderating effect (age, gender, education) on the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity.

1.4. Research Questions

To determine whether the research objectives can be investigated has led to the following research questions:-

1. What is relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity in Sabah state agencies in Kota Kinabalu?

2. Which practices of leadership effectiveness (Model the way, Inspire vision, Challenge the process, Enable others to act, Encourage the heart) have significant relationship with Perceived Leadership Integrity?

3. Which of the independent variable represents the best and strongest predictor for Perceived Leadership Integrity?

4. Can the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity be moderated by demographic factors of age, gender, education?

8

1.5. The Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is to investigate and to understand the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity in Sabah state agencies in Kota Kinabalu (ten ministries, twelve departments and five statutory bodies) and how subordinates in different grades of position in the identified agencies perceive their leaders as being effective and have integrity. This study also intends to examine which of the independent variables have high significant relationship with Perceived Leadership Integrity. Lastly, this study desires to investigate if age, gender and education have moderating effect on the relationship between Perceived Leadership Effectiveness and Perceived Leadership Integrity.

The rationale for choosing the selected agencies is because these agencies are central for the state public administration and being the central actors, they are in a position to build public trust. Definitely, this study will not look at how public trust can be created but at how leader's effectiveness can be perceived and understood in relation with perceived integrity in Sabah agencies as previous studies done in the United States have proven that effective leaders must have integrity in order to be able to address ethical and integrity issues and to bring the desired impact in public organizations.

1.6. Research Significance

This research is significant in the sense that empirical research on Perceived Leadership Effectiveness measured using Leader Practices Inventory (LPI) and Perceived Leadership Integrity measured using Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS) is so limited particularly in the state of Sabah. Previous research are those carried out by overseas and international researchers such as the one carried out by Clarkson (2009) in her published dissertation studying the relationship between effective leadership and leader's perceived integrity using both LPI and PLIS in a sample of 150 employees in large business organizations in the United States and found a strong positive correlation between effective leader with perceived integrity. The rest available are those conducted by Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2002) using PLIS to measure leader's perceived integrity

9

REFERENCES

Abu-Tineh, A.M.; Khasawneh, S.A. & Al-Omari, A.A. (2009). Kouzes and Posner's transformational model in practice: The case of Jordanian School. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* Vol. 29 No. 8, 2008 pp. 648-660

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Atwater, L., Roush, P., & Fischthal, A. (1995). The influence of upward feedback on self- and follower ratings of leadership. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(1), 35-59.

Badaracco, J.L. & Ellsworth, R.R. (1990), Quest for integrity, *Executive Excellence*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 3-4.

Bass, B. M. 1985, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (Free Press, New York).

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. 1999, Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior, *Leadership Quarterly,* 10(2), 181-217.

Becker, T.E. (1998), Integrity in organizations: beyond honesty and conscientiousness, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 154-61.

Bem, D.J. (1967), Self-perception: an alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena, *Psychological Review*, Vol. 74, pp. 183-200.

Bennis, Warren (1989), *On becoming a leader*, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. (2007), The challenges of leadership in the modern world, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 62 No. 1, pp. 2-5.

Bennis, W.G. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies of taking charge*. San Francisco: Harper-Collins.

Boomsma, A. (1982). The robustness of LISREL against small sample sizes in factor analysis models. In K. G. Joreskog & H. Wold (Eds.), *Systems under indirect observation: Causality, structure, prediction* (pp. 149-173). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Bowman, J.S. & Knox, C.C. (2008). Ethics in Government. No matter How Long and Dark the Night. *Public Administration Review;* Jul/Aug 2008; 68, 4; *ProQuest Education Journals* pg. 627

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S.: 1995, Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 80, 468-478.

Carlson, D.S. & Perrewe, P.L. (1995), Institutionalization of organizational ethics through transformational leadership', *Journal of Business Ethics,* Vol. 14 No. 10, pp. 829-38.

Ciulla, J. B. (1995). Leadership ethics: mapping the territory. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 5* (1), 5-28.

Ciulla, J. (2004). Ethics and leadership effectiveness. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Nature of leadership* (pp. 302–327). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Clarkson, J.(2009). *Perception of leadership and integrity. A correltion of followers' assessment.* Published dissertation for Ph.D. Capella University. June 2009. UMI Number: 3359817

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cohen, W. A. (2009). *Drucker on leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. (1992). *Learning to lead.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Conger, J.A., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building leaders.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations,* (Sage, London).

Covey, S.R. (1992), *Principle-centered Leadership,* Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.

Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived Leader Integrity Scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *Leadership Quarterly,* 9(2), 127-145.

Deaux, K & Wrightsman, L.S. (1988). *Social Psychology.* 5th Edition. Pacific Grove, CA. Brooks/Cole Publisihing Company

Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: an analysis of the MLQ, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 70(1), 19.

81

Dobbins, G.H. & Platz, S.J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: how real are they?, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 118-27.

Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: a meta-analysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 108 No. 2, pp. 233-56.

Fawcett, G. & Wardman, M. (2008), Ethical governance in local government in England: A regulator's view, in Huberts, L.W.J.C., Maesschalck, J. and Jurkiewicz, C.L. (Eds), *Ethics and Integrity of Governance: Perspectives Across Frontiers*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 123-42.

Fiedler, M. (1995). *Leading the Association*. Association – Management. 47(1). L-41. L-42.

Fields, D.L. & Herold, D.M. (1997). Using the Leadership practices inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* Vol. 57 (Aug. 1997) p. 569-79.

Fitsimmons, G. (2008). The foundational standard: Integrity, *The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances*, Vol. 21 No. 1, 2008 pp. 24-26

Ford, R.C. & Richardson, W.D. (1994). Ethical decision making: a review of the empirical literature, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 13, pp. 205-21.

Freud, S. (1921). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard ed. of the complete works of Sigmund Freud, Vol 19*. London: Hogarth Press.

Garrett, T.M. (1999), The Waco, Texas, ATF raid and Challenger launch decision: Management, judgment, and the knowledge analytic, *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 66-86.

Giampetro, M. A., Brown, T., Browne, M. N., & Kubasek, N. (1998). Do we really need more leaders in business?. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(15), 1727-1736.

Gray, S.T., (1985). *Fostering leadership for the new milleneum*. Association-Management. 47(1). L-78. L-82

Haberfeld, M.R. (2006), *Police Leadership*, Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, P. (1980), *Great Planning Disasters*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London

Harung, H.S., Heaton, D.P., & Alexander, C.N. (1995). A unified theory of leadership : Experiences of World Class leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 7, 1995, pp. 44-59

Heck, R.H., Johnsrad, L., & Rosser, V.J. (2000). Administrative effectiveness in higher education: improving assessment procedures. *Research in Higher Education*. 14(6), pp.663-684.

Herold, D.M. & Fields, D.L. (2004). Making sense of subordinate feedback for leadership development. Confounding effects of job role and organizational rewards. *Group & Organization Management, 29* (6), 686-703.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Personality and effectiveness. *American Psychologist, 49,* 493–504.

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Journal of General Psychology, 9,* 169–180.

Hogan, R. & Kaiser B. R., (2010). How to (and how not to) assess the integrity of managers. *Consulting Psychology Journal:* Practice and Research 2010, Vol. 62, No. 4, 216–234

Hooijberg, R., Lane, N, & Diverse, A. (2010). Leader effectiveness and integrity: wishful thinking? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis Vol. 18 No. 1, 2010 pp. 59-75*

Hooijberg, R. & Quinn, R.E. (1992). *Behavioral complexity and the development of effective managerial leaders*, in Phillips, R.L. and Hunt, J.G. (Eds), Strategic Management: A Multiorganizational-level Perspective, Quorum, New York, NY, pp. 161-75.

Howard, A., & Thomas, J. N. (2010). Executive and managerial assessment. In J. C. Scott & D. H. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace assessment* (pp. 395–436). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hughes, R.L., Ginnett, R.C., & Curphy, G.J.(1999). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Huse, F.M.(1998). *The Role of Integrity in Organizational Leadership: A case study based on Kweisi MFume as heard through his voice and the voices of important others.* A published dissertation for Doctor of Philosophy. Fielding Institute, US.

Isaksson, P. (1997), *Korruptio ja julkinen valta (Corruption and Public Power)*, Tampere University, Tampere.

Jaussi, K.S. & Dionne, S.D. (2004). Unconventional leader behaviour, subordinate satisfaction, effort and perception of leader effectiveness. *Journal of leadership & Organizational studies*. Winter 2004; 10, 3; *ProQuest Education Journals*, pp. 15

Jennings, M. M. (2006). *The seven signs of ethical collapse.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 36–51.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership.* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA

Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter?, *Academy of Management Executive,* Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 48-60.

Kolade, C. (1999). Working for business integrity in Nigeria: the role of the professional. *Management in Nigeria*, Vol. 35 No. 1.

Kolthoff, E., Erakovich, R. & Lasthuizen, K. (2010). Comparative analysis of ethical leadership and ethical culture in local government: The USA, The Netherlands, Montenegro and Serbia. *International Journal of Public Sector Management,* Vol. 23 No. 7, 2010 pp. 596-612

Kouzes, James & Posner, Barry. (1988). *The leadership challenge: how to get extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1992). Ethical leaders: an essay about being in love. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 11 No. 5, pp. 479-84.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1995), *The Leadership Challenge: How to Keep Getting Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. (2004). A prescription for leading in cynical times. *Ivey Business Journal, 68* (6), 1-7.

Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970), "Determining sample size for research activities", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 30, pp. 607-10.

Lawton, A. (1998). *Ethical Management for the Public Services*, Open University Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Lawton, A. (2010). Public Service Ethics: Developing the field. Guest editorial, *International Journal of Public Sector Management,* Volume 23, Issue 7

Lewis, C. (1991). *The Ethics challenge in public service: A problem-solving guide.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service.* Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An interactive model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20* (3), pp. 709-734.

McCabe, B. (2005). The disabling shadow of leadership. *British Journal of Administrative Management,* Vol. 46, pp. 16-17.

McDonald, G. & Nijhof, A. (1999). Beyond codes of ethics: an integrated framework for stimulating morally responsible behaviour in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* Vol. 20, pp. 133-46.

Merit System Protection Board (1993). *Whistle.Blowing in the federal government: An up-date.* Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Meyer, A., Chase, R., Roth, A. and Voss, C. (1999), "Service competitiveness – an international benchmarking comparison of service practice and performance in Germany, UK and USA", *International Journal of Service Industry Management,* Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 369-79.

Mintzberg, H. and Waters, J.A. (1985), "Of strategies, deliberate and emergent", *Strategic Management Journal,* Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 257-72.

Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology* ,pp. 333–352. Hillsdale, NJ

Morita, M. and Flynn, E.J. (1997), "The linkage among management systems, practices and behavior in successful manufacturing strategy", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management,* Vol. 17 No. 10, pp. 967-93.

Morrison, A. (2001). Integrity and global leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics,* Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 65-76.

Morgan, R. B. (1993). Self-and co-worker perceptions of ethics and their relationships to leadership and salary. *Academy of Management Journal,* 36(1), pp.200-214.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. M., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover,* (Academic Press, New York).

Integrity Institute of Malaysia (2005), *National Integrity Plan, (2004-2008).* Jalan Duta, Kuala Lumpur

Neal, A.G. (1983). *Social Psychology. A sociological perspective.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Nisbett, R., Borgida, E., Crandall,R. & Reed, H. (1982). Popular induction: information is not necessarily informative, in Kahneman, D., Slovic, P. and Tversky, A. (Eds), *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases,* University Press, Cambridge, pp. 101-16.

Nunally, J. C, & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

OECD (2000), *Building Public Trust: Ethics Measures in OECD Counties.* PUMA Policy Brief (7), OECD, Paris, available at: www.oecd.org/dataoecd/44/24/35061342.pdf (accessed 24 May 2007).

OECD (2005). *Public Sector Integrity: A framework for assessment* Paris: OECD.

O'Hara, P. (2005). *Why Law Enforcement Organizations Fail.* Carolina Academic Press, Durham, NC.

Oyinlade, A.O. (2006). A Method of Assessing Leadership Effectiveness: Introducing the Essential Behaviour. *Performance Improvement Quarterly;* 2006; 19, 1; *ProQuest Education Journals* pg. 25-40.

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, vulnerable followers, and conducive environments. *Leadership Quarterly, 18,* pp.176–194.

Paine, L.S. (1997). *Cases in Leadership, Ethics, and Organization Integrity: A Strategic Perspective,* Irwin Press, Chicago, IL.

Palanski, M.E. & Yammarino, F.J. (2007). Integrity and leadership: clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal,* Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 171-84.

Palanski, M.E. & Yammarino, F.J. (2009). Integrity and leadership: a multi-level conceptual framework. *Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 405-20.

Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics, 35*(2), January (II), 75-96. Kluwer Academic Publishing.

Peterson, D (2002). Perceived Leader Integrity and Ethical Intentions of Subordinates. *The leadership and organization development journal.* Vol.25,No.1. 2004 pp 7-23.

Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1984). Values and the American manager: An update. *California Management Review, 26*(3), 202-216.

Public Service Department of Sabah, *Sabah Emolument 2011*, Published by Printing Department, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah.

Randall, R., Ferguson, E., & Patterson, F. (2000). Self-assessment accuracy and assessment centre decisions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*(4), 443-459.

Reeves, D.B. (2004). *Assessing educational leaders.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rieke, M. L., & Guastello, S. J. (1995). Unresolved issues in honesty and integrity testing. *American Psychologist,* 50, 458-459.

Rowe, M. (2006), Following the leader: front-line narratives on police leadership, Policing: *An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 757-67.

Salminen, A & Norrbacka, R.I.(2010). Trust, Good Governance and Unethical Actions in Finnish Public Administration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* Vol. 23 No. 7, 2010 pp. 647-668

Sarlak, Z. & Bali, B.B. (2007). *Corruption in Turkey: is the donor content when the recipient is content?, Crime and Culture Discussion Paper Series No. 9, The Relevance of Perceptions to Crime Prevention. A Comparative Study in the EU-Accession States Bulgaria and Romania, the EU-Candidate States Turkey and Croatia and the EU-States Germany, Greece and the United Kingdom,* 6th Framework Programme of the European Commission, University of Konstanz, Konstanz.

Schafer, J.A. (2009). Effective leaders and leadership in policing: traits, assessment, development, and expansion. Policing: *An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* Vol. 33 No. 4, 2010 pp. 644-663

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R.,(2009), *Research Methods for Business.* 5th Ed. Published 2009. Wiley.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach.* New York:Wiley.

Sekaran, U. (1983). Methodological and theoretical issues and advancements in cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 14(2)*, 61-73.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Siegel, A. F. (2000). *Practical business research statistics.* Boston: Irwin.

Simons, T. (1999). Behavioural integrity as critical ingredient for transformational leadership. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* Vol. 12 No. 2, 1999, pp. 89-104.

Sims, R.R. & Brinkmann, J. (2002). Leaders as moral role models: the case of John Gutreund at Salomon Brothers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 35, pp. 327-39.

Small, M.W. & Dickie, L. (1999). A cinematograph of moral values: critical values for contemporary business and society. *Journal of Management Development,* Vol. 18 No. 7, pp. 628-38.

Spencer, L. & Spencer, S. (1993). *Competence at work.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Steers, R.M., Porter, L., & Bigley, G., (1996). *Motivation and leadership at work.* (6th. Ed.) New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership. A survey of literature. *Journal of Personality.* 25, 35-71.

Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII.* Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Stonestreet, S. P. (2002). *Perceived leadership practices and organizational commitment in the North American automobile industry.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.

Mohd.Sidek Hassan.(2009,March 25) *Civil - Military Relations: Integrity and Public Service Delivery Systems.* Available at http://www.pmo.gov.my/ksn/?frontpage/speech/detail/1512. Prime Minister's Office (accessed 5th April 2011).

Taylor, T.V. (2002). *Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Tepper, B. T., & Percy, P. M. (1994). Structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 54, pp.734-744.

Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? *Group and Organization Management,* 23(3), pp.220-236.

Trevino, L.K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review,* Vol. 11, pp. 601-17.

Transparency International (2010), *Annual Report,* Transparency International, Berlin.

Van Vugt, M., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2008). Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist,* 63, pp.182–196..

Van der Wal, Z., Huberts, W.J.C., Van den Heuvel, J.H.J., & Kolthoff, E.. (2006). Central Values of Government and Business: Differences, Similarities, and Conflicts. *Public Administration Quarterly,* 30:3 (Fall), pp. 314-364.

Van de Walle, S. (2008). Perceptions of corruption as distrust? Cause and effect in attitudes toward government, in Huberts, L.W.J.C., Maesschalck, J. and Jurkiewicz, C.L. (Eds), *Ethics and Integrity of Governance: Perspectives Across Frontiers,* Edward Elgar, Cornwall, pp. 215-36.

Yammarino, F. J., & Dubinsky, A. J. (1994). Transformational leadership theory: Using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions. *Personnel Psychology,* 47, pp.787-811.

Yukl, G. (1998), *Leadership in Organizations,* (4th ed.), Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Yukl, G. & Van Fleet, D.D. (1990). Theory and research on leadership in organizations, in Dunette, M.D. and Hough, L.M. (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA, pp. 147-97.

Zaccaro, S.J. (2007), "Trait-based perspectives of leadership", *American Psychologist,* Vol. 62 No. 1, pp. 6-16.