Standards and Indicators of Organizational Integrity in Educational Organizations in Saudi Arabia in Light of the Kingdom's 2030 Vision

Safar Bakheet Almudara[1]

Abstract

While most research approaches in the field of integrity primarily focus on the non-ethical aspect and addressing corruption, there is a need for a more comprehensive investigation of the ethical dimension. This is precisely the foundation upon which this study is built. The current study aimed to reveal the most significant standards and indicators of organizational integrity for educational organizations in Saudi Arabia in light of the Kingdom's 2030Vision. The study surveyed the opinions of a deliberate sample consisting of (76) experts in public and educational administration utilizing the remote conference technique (Delphi method) on the most important standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational organizations. The data was analyzed and interpreted. One of the key findings of the study was the identification of four standards for organizational integrity in educational organizations in Saudi Arabia in light of the 2030 vision. Each standard has a number of indicators as follows: The cultural standard included (12) indicators, the procedural standard included (14) indicators, the behavioral standard included (13) indicators, and the distributional standard included (12) indicators. Based on the study findings recommendations were presented and suggestions for implementation procedures were proposed.

Keywords: *Standards, Indicators, Organizational Integrity, Educational Organization, Kingdom's 2030 Vision.*

1. Introduction

Values in organizations are exposed to diverse variables affecting their work. These variables generate regressive and divergent behaviors such as compromising integrity, diminishing justice, and corruption. These risks threaten the organizations' integrity and their future, representing some of the most severe obstacles to their plans and objectives. Therefore, there have been numerous calls to establish and protect integrity in organizations through undertaking, reviewing, examining, and measuring them and then strengthening them to overcome these risks.

Integrity is an ancient human behavior that has been present throughout history. It is a human phenomenon that is influenced by the cultures, values, laws, professions, and positions of individuals and societies. It is a characteristic of both individuals and organizations. In general, integrity is synonymous with adherence to values and ethics. Linguistically, it means to avoid anything ugly or unethical. It can contribute to the sustainability and success of organizations, as well as enhance their performance and

---

[1] Associate professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University - Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

productivity. Conversely, the loss of integrity can undermine institutions within societies, and even the societies themselves.

Organizational integrity is a relatively new administrative term, so there is no consensus on its concept Al Azmi, 2021). It is the alignment of values and behaviors within the organization (Dunn, 2009). Organizational integrity is an approach that integrates operational systems with ethical standards to mitigate corruption within organizations (Kaptein, 2003). On the other hand, Palazzo (2007) indicated that organizational integrity means the integrity of individuals' actions and the quality of their interactions, in addition to the standards of activities and procedures within the organization. It reflects a combination of ethical and unethical traits and practices that make individuals and organizations coherent and consistent (Petre et al., 2018).

Integrity in general is the path in which unethical behavior is avoided and ethical values are upheld (Santoro, 2003). Definitions concentrated on the positive behavioral dimension of integrity state that it means the safety, completeness, and purity of something (Dunn, 2009), while other definitions focus on motivational aspects defining it as acting intentionally and willingly in accordance with ethical principles (Al-Azmi, 2021).

According to Choi et al. (2018), organizational integrity reflects the behavior of individuals and the organization following the law, emphasizing that it encompasses a set of ethical behaviors of individuals within the institution, influenced by its culture, system, and even its members. Literature linked it to the organization's mission and goals, stating that it is the alignment of ethical values within the organization with positive decisions and standards in harmony with the organization's vision, mission, and goals (Dobbs et al., 2019). The legal and psychological aspects of integrity were connected in other writings defining it as the link between organizational commitment and personal ethical standards within the system (Merley, 2021).

While there is a need to build comprehensive organizational integrity in public organizations to create corruption-resistant entities (Boardman & Klum, 2001), there is disagreement, regarding whether regulatory frameworks, systems, and instructions are sufficient as the main components of integrity (Gorsira et al., 2018). There is debate on whether it is necessary to incorporate values, beliefs, and informal elements into the components of integrity. Organizational integrity should likely be a combination of these two main elements, and both aspects should be considered when implanting, promoting, measuring, and evaluating organizational integrity.

In Merley's (2018) qualitative study, interviews were employed to examine the role of formal and informal organizational rules and standards in promoting integrity and combating corruption. The findings indicated a heavy reliance on formal systems for organizational integrity but also highlighted the significance of often overlooked informal standards that can have an equal impact on decision-making. In some instances, these informal standards even superseded formal ones. The study further revealed that interviewees perceived formal sanctions to be less effective than anticipated, leading to the emergence of personal interests and corrupt behavior. The results underscored the importance of ensuring compliance with formal regulations while emphasizing the insufficiency of this alone in effectively managing organizational integrity and reducing corruption. The study emphasized the necessity of implementing managerial and structural changes, as well as abandoning certain formal and informal organizational rules.

Silverman (2000) identified two dimensions of organizational integrity: organizational culture and values, and organizational infrastructure, which includes systems, structures, and processes. In addition, Petre et al. (2018) identified two fundamental dimensions of organizational integrity: structural integrity and ethical integrity. While as, Santoro (2003) defined three dimensions of organizational integrity: collaboration with non-

governmental organizations, human rights training programs addressing human rights issues, and integration of human rights into the organization's strategy.

Kayes et al. (2007) identified four practices for building organizational integrity: operational controls, purposes and principles, core values, and culture. Besides, Baxter et al. (2012) proposed four dimensions of organizational integrity: personal dimension, ethical dimension, social dimension, and identity dimension. Meanwhile, Moon & Hamilton (2013) identified eight dimensions of organizational integrity: critical mission, leadership, procedures, assurance of competence, work management, communications, improvement, and change.

Based on that, organizational integrity is composed of several components. Organizational integrity includes a number of ethical elements that result in behaviors and procedures aimed at achieving balance and discipline within the organization. Its goals include affirming ethical behavior, preventing corruption, and combating it (Dossing, 2011). Others state that important components of organizational integrity are having a vision, mission, and strategic priorities that establish internal and external trust with stakeholders, built on values such as transparency, fairness, freedom, and openness (Rawlins, 2008).

One such study that addressed this is the study conducted by Zahari et al. (2022) which aimed to understand the core components of integrity and examine their significance. This was achieved through interviews with a number of experts and practitioners from both government and non-government sectors, as well as analysis of the existing literature in the field. The key findings indicate that integrity goes beyond honesty, conscience, and principles. Other influential factors contribute to integrity, such as responsibility, loyalty, commitment, social norms, policies, and systems.

Al-Azmi (2021) adds that it is essential to promote ethical awareness, instill honest behavior, foster an open culture, and support ethical decision-making. Abdulhak (2017) includes a set of values in organizational integrity, including honesty, integrity, loyalty, justice, respect, trust, and accountability. Vision 2030 in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia also emphasizes the need for certain measures to enhance integrity in public institutions, such as promoting transparency, activating governance, and accountability, utilizing advanced methods to achieve integrity, and using measurement indicators with a focus on electronic domains.

Indeed, the establishment of organizational integrity in organizations involves many procedures and steps (Boardman & Klum, 2001). These include identifying a set of organizational values, leaders adhering to these values, supporting these values within the organization as a whole, and activating these values in the organization's decisions and procedures. Besides, The Chartered Insurance Institute (2022) highlights the importance of leaders' commitment to and support for integrity, promoting and reinforcing ethical behavior, punishing violators, building ethical decision-making processes, empowering and developing employees in the field of integrity, and emphasizing monitoring, oversight, and ethical evaluation.

Building integrity includes several measures, such as identifying the organization's values, applying these values by the leaders themselves, and then disseminating them to everyone, linking all systems and procedures of the organization to organizational integrity (2021). Kayes et al. (2007) explain that building organizational integrity in organizations involves several steps, starting with assessing the importance and significance of organizational integrity, understanding it, identifying the risks associated with its absence or lack, and subsequently applying integrity behaviors and procedures in the organization's work reality.

Many organizations are keen on achieving integrity due to its importance in preserving their savings, optimizing resource utilization, and achieving their goals while increasing

their gains. This has garnered significant interest from most researchers in the organizational field, and its importance extends beyond that (Al- Tai & Hussien, (2021). Integrity is considered one of the intangible assets of organizations (Molina, 2016) and organizations that adhere to integrity are aligned with their goals, more distinctive and flexible than others, and more successful and progressive (Huberts et al., 2007).

 Organizational integrity can lead to the achievement of a good reputation and the establishment of strong internal and external relationships (Camps, 2015) that highly-integrity organizations are cooperative, constructive, innovative, transparent, and loyal to their customers, form strong partnerships, and build teams that create value and commitment. The presence of integrity makes an organization more governed, higher in ranking, competitiveness, quality, profits, and returns, and preferable as a workplace (Duggar, 2009).

Organizations that effectively implement organizational integrity are more balanced in their values, more open, cohesive, and adaptable to reality compared to others (Klarus, 2013). The availability of organizational integrity enhances the organization's capacity for internal and external control, increases the adoption of the organization's identity, and promotes community engagement in its operations (Sezgi, 2012) as it is a fundamental factor for the survival, continuity, efficiency, and effectiveness of organizations (Al-Azmi, 2021). Organizational integrity plays several roles within organizations. It contributes to the cohesion of the organization's culture and system and supports the organization's commitment to its members. It also serves as a foundation for leaders to adhere to and disseminate values, integrating them into the organization's practices (Mintrop, 2012). It provides a new perspective that enhances organizations' responsiveness to pressures. By activating its values, the organization can better meet the needs of adapting to the environment, alleviating work pressures, and solving problems (Ekberg, 2017).

The role of organizational integrity lies in identifying key commitments, clarifying their organizational effects, and establishing procedures for addressing violations (Iltis, 2005). It helps in confronting emerging challenges, developing employees, and promoting the positive reputation of the organization (Abdulhak, 2017). Moreover, it facilitates decision-making, supports the commitment of subordinates, and provides them with development opportunities (Najm & Karim, 2018). Al-Tai and colleagues (2017) add that organizational integrity promotes positive behaviors such as respect for others and dialogue. According to Molina (2016), integrity can be a significant factor in employee happiness, satisfaction, focus, and productivity. Al-Tai and Hussein (2021) explain that employees who work with integrity without compromising their principles experience increased happiness. It strengthens individuals' effectiveness, enhances teamwork, and improves the performance of individuals and institutions (Bani Sakhr, 2017).

Integrity is one of the most important barriers to combat corruption. It serves as an indicator of the quality of behavior in accordance with the values, standards, and ethical rules accepted by political and public institutions (Salminen& Mäntysalo, 2013). The Kingdom's Vision 2030 believed in the significance of integrity and worked towards achieving it. This is because it is a vision for the future of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, seeking to capitalize on the sources of strength bestowed upon the country, from a distinguished strategic position, pioneering investment power, and Arab and Islamic depth. All of this cannot be realized without integrity. The website of the Salam Program for Cultural Communication (2015) adds that the 2030 Vision of the Kingdom recognized the danger of corruption and made governance, transparency, integrity, and anti-corruption as its main pillars. The programs for achieving the vision included the best practices in this regard.

Organizational integrity in the public sector has become a crucial and necessary issue. It operates continuously and permanently, through the partnership and integration between

its two pillars (individuals and systems), based on the principles of prevention and remedy. This gives organizational integrity special importance, manifested in its central role, as it is not a temporary or marginal role (Alam et al., 2018).

In addition, The International Centre for Academic Integrity (2022) highlights that organizational integrity encompasses important values such as honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Thus, the development and management of organizational integrity have become increasingly impactful in contemporary organizations. Organizational integrity is one of the most significant factors that can help organizations establish good ethics, enabling them to understand the benefits of positive actions while avoiding negative consequences and risks. It serves as a guiding framework for making sound decisions and adopting ethical positions and beliefs driven by values and conscience, free from corruption (Mayasari et al., 2012).

Despite the significant role and effectiveness of organizational integrity in organizations, it may face certain obstacles that limit its role and impact. These obstacles, as mentioned by Goodstein (2015), include the lack of clear goals for organizational integrity, power struggles, the absence of collective action, short-term profit targeting at the expense of strategic objectives, lack of alignment between the operational system and the organization's values, and external pressures and response conditions. Based on the reviewed elements, components, dimensions, roles, and obstacles of organizational integrity, the researcher has derived insights to construct standards and indicators for organizational integrity. These standards and indicators are designed to be comprehensive, yet concise, encompassing the essential elements of organizational integrity sequentially and progressively.

Integrity serves as a cornerstone of excellence in educational organizations, playing a pivotal role in upholding ethical values, fostering trust, and ensuring the highest standards of academic rigor. Educational institutions such as schools, colleges, or universities are entrusted with the responsibility of nurturing intellectual growth, character development, and the pursuit of knowledge. By embracing and promoting integrity, educational organizations create an environment that fosters intellectual integrity, fosters a culture of trust and respect, and prepares individuals to become responsible and ethical contributors to society (Ertas, 2021).

Several studies concentrate on investigating the issue of organizational integrity in educational institutions. The study conducted by Alam et al. (2018) evaluated integrity practices among public sector employees using surveys. The study found that 92.6% of the participants engaged in integrity practices to varying degrees within their departments. The study also indicated that integrity practices in the finance and auditing departments were higher than the average, although they fell below general standards. Morris (2018) identified several areas for achieving integrity in educational organizations, including defining an academic integrity strategy, reviewing institutional policies, recurring evaluation practices, and their impact on the professional development of employees. Furthermore, the study by De Graaf et al. (2018) found that nearly one-third of the respondents reported experiencing integrity violations in their direct work environment in the past two years. A significant proportion of the respondents were subjected to inappropriate behavior, unethical conduct, and violations such as profiting at the expense of the organization, fraud, misuse of resources, and non-compliance with regulations and working hours.

Different studies also shed light on the significance of organizational integrity in educational institutions and the public sector. Klarus (2013) examined the implementation of integrity programs in educational institutions and found variations in their adoption, highlighting the importance of balanced values and cohesion. Sezgi (2012) emphasized the role of integrity in leaders' control and community engagement. Rosli et al. (2015) evaluated integrity systems in the public sector, revealing a commitment to integrity in

daily management. Kaiser and Hogan (2010) focused on the impact of managerial integrity on trust and performance, and Kayes et al. (2007) underscored the comprehensive approach required for building a culture of organizational integrity. Together, these studies provide insights into implementation variations, assessment frameworks, and the need for ethical considerations in fostering organizational integrity.

The Saudi Arabia 2030 Vision highlights the importance of integrity, transparency, and governance, as they explain the developments in transactions and decisions, provide progress data, eliminate ambiguity, and uncover irregularities, and abuses of power. From this, the significance of organizational integrity and its effectiveness can be observed, as it is a crucial aspect in all aspects of organizations at all administrative, financial, social, and personal levels. Therefore, Vision 2030 has prioritized this aspect, emphasizing the fight against corruption in all its forms and levels.

As a reflection of this importance, the study of organizational integrity, especially its standards, and indicators, has been the subject of rigorous research practices that delve deep into the field. These standards are abstract properties used to make evaluative judgments by establishing them as reference points and frameworks for comparing performance. They often encompass the major components of work and serve as an envisioned or achieved model of what something should be. Thus, they serve as benchmarks or standard specifications for the levels that should be present within the working system or its individuals. Indicators, whether quantitative or qualitative, are detailed components of the standards. They are observable and measurable data that determine the extent of compliance with the standards and the achievement of work objectives and performance levels.

Therefore, studying the standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions is an attempt to identify the characteristics of this field and draw attention to its importance. It also aims to address the cultural, behavioral, and regulatory complexities surrounding it at both the personal and organizational levels. Additionally, it serves as an effort to uncover the areas of integrity flaws in educational organizations, assist in improving their practices, and ultimately create an educational organizational environment that aligns with the requirements of integrity. This environment ensures the care for integrity values and ethics, enhances them, and fosters a more reliable and efficient education system. Ultimately, this leads to administrative, financial, social, and general developmental benefits.

In this regard, numerous studies have reported an increase in unethical and illegal activities in the public sector (Kebede & Lemma, 2020) and also highlighted that corruption cases in the public sector have become very common (Escaleras, 2010). Recently, the rising cases of corruption in institutions have become concerning and perplexing causing a lack of integrity and leading to non-compliance and dissatisfaction among employees (Abu Elanain, 2010). A low level of integrity often serves as a major cause for the decline in service quality in public institutions (Ferial, 2021). Integrity failures in the public sector can result in governance failures, increased fraud, and inefficient financial management (Huberts, 2018).

The loss of integrity has a negative impact on the goals and objectives of organizations due to the unethical behaviors and actions that result from it, affecting their inputs, processes, and outputs (Attia, 2015). Besides, a lack of integrity leads to bias, delays, and problems in providing services impartially, disregarding rules and regulations, and exhibiting illogical behaviors by the organization and its employees (Kebede & Lemma, 2020).

The review of studies in this field has revealed a lack of comprehensive research on the standards and indicators of organizational integrity. Mayasari et al. (2020) highlighted that integrity studies are still partial in nature, emphasizing the need for their development and a broader understanding of integrity dimensions. Similarly, Polanski et al. (2015)

mentioned that research on integrity is still very limited in terms of understanding the dimensions that explain integrity. Kebede & Lemma (2020) also pointed out the scarcity of studies approached from an integrity perspective. Additionally, Zahari et al. (2022) identified a gap in defining the core elements of integrity.

Despite the variations in location, methodology, and tools among the reviewed studies, their results confirm the importance of the study area and the serious research interest in it. The current study focused on proposing standards and indicators for organizational integrity in educational institutions in Saudi Arabia in light of the Kingdom's Vision 2030. This aspect was not addressed by any of the reviewed studies. The current study benefited from previous research in enriching the theoretical aspect and deepening the understanding of the research topic. It also utilized previous studies in determining the appropriate research methodology. Furthermore, the findings of the reviewed studies were used to interpret and justify the results of the current study, and to compare them with those findings. Despite the researcher's attempts to access previous studies on the subject, no study was found that specifically addresses the proposal of standards and indicators for organizational integrity in educational institutions at the local or regional level.

With the need for further framing and theorizing, the complexity increases due to the nature of the value-laden emotional field and the surrounding conceptual ambiguity and contextual factors. Based on what has been mentioned and in reflection of the importance of the field, in alignment with the objectives of Vision 2030, and in accordance with the findings and recommendations of scientific research, this study aims to contribute to the field and make a scientific addition by identifying the key standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, in light of 2030 Vision. The problem of the study can be summarized in the following main question:

What are the key standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, in light of the Kingdom 2030 Vision?

The following sub-questions arise from it:

1.   What are the key (cultural) standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in Saudi Arabia in light of the Kingdom's Vision 2030?

2.   What are the key (procedural) standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in Saudi Arabia in light of the Kingdom's Vision 2030?

3.   What are the key (behavioral) standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in Saudi Arabia in light of the Kingdom's Vision 2030?

4.   What are the key (distributional) standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in Saudi Arabia in light of the Kingdom's Vision 2030?

2. Methodology

2.1   Research Model

To answer the study questions, the Future Analysis method was utilized through the Delphi technique, using a purposive sampling strategy that served the objectives of the study.

2.2   Participants

The sample consisted of experts and specialists in public and educational administration from Saudi universities, along with some experts practicing leadership in educational organizations.

2.3   Data Collection

Electronic communication was conducted with them in three rounds as follows:

-    In the first round, an open-ended questionnaire consisting of the study questions was designed and distributed to 76 individuals, of whom 41 responded.

-    In the second round, the responses from the first round were utilized along with a review of the literature and previous studies in the field to construct a closed list of standards and indicators. The face validity of the list was ensured by presenting it to experts and testing its stability using Cronbach's alpha equation, which yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.79. The list was then distributed to 41 individuals, of whom 35 responded. They were asked to evaluate the standard and indicators using a Likert three-point scale.

-    In the third round, the revised list was distributed to the 35 respondents from the second round, of whom 25 responded. They were asked to reconsider any indicator for which they disagreed with the acceptance or rejection criteria compared to others' opinions and provide justifications. In both stages, responses were received, sorted, and coded based on the acceptance or exclusion criteria, which were organized as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Data Coding and Determination of Acceptance or Exclusion Criteria

Response	Degree	Range	Acceptance	Procedure
Agree	3	From (2.34) to (3.00)	High	Adopt the indicator and not be reconsidered by experts again.
Neutral	2	From (1.67) to less than (2.34)	Moderate	Reverting the indicator to experts in the third round for comparison with others' opinions.
Disagree	1	From (1.00) to less than (1.67)	Low	The indicator is excluded and not reconsidered by experts again.

2.4   Data Analysis

The data were analyzed and tabulated using appropriate statistical methods for each stage as follows: Cronbach's alpha equation is used to ensure reliability, frequencies, and percentages are calculated to assess the experts' agreement on the standard and indicators, and Kendall's agreement coefficient is used to determine the degree of agreement among opinions in the third round and the extent of change compared to the second round. According to these results, the standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational organizations in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia were formulated based in light of Vision 2030.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1   The Results of the First Question

The first question stated: "What are the key standards and indicators (cultural) of organizational integrity in educational institutions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in light of Vision 2030?"

Table 2: Analysis of Responses (Second Round) for the "Cultural" Standard Indicators of Organizational Integrity in Educational Organizations

Order	N.	The indicators of the "Cultural" Standard of organizational integrity are as follows	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean	Agreement
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
1	6	The vision and mission enhance the values of organizational integrity.	34	97.1	1	2.9	0	0	2.971	High
2	4	The organization's objectives include the values of integrity.	33	94..3	1	2.9	1	2.9	2.714	High
3	3	Organizational integrity is a key strategic priority.	30	85.7	5	14.3	0	0	2.857	High
4	10	The values of organizational integrity dominate the work environment.	29	82.9	5	14.3	1	2.9	2.800	High
5	7	Everyone recognizes the individual and organizational benefits of integrity.	28	80.0	5	14.3	2	5.7	2.743	High
6	11	There is no justification for compromising the principles of integrity.	26	74.3	6	17.1	3	8.6	2.657	High
7	1	Emphasize the values of prevention before treatment.	23	65.7	9	25.7	3	8.6	2.571	High
8	2	Adhering to the values of integrity does not contradict flexibility.	22	62.9	9	25.7	4	11.4	2.514	High
9	9	Personal interests are compatible with the values of integrity.	21	60.0	8	22.9	6	17.1	2.429	High
10	8	The balance	21	60.0	6	17.1	8	22.9	2.371	High

		between the principles of transparency and privacy.								
11	5	There is a commitment to objectivity and rejecting discrimination.	21	54.3	6	17.1	8	22.9	2.371	High
12	12	All parties are considered in integrity discussions.	19		7	20.0	9	25..7	2.286	Moderate
13	13	Advising and warning before integrity punishment.	6	17.1	10	28.6	19	45.3	1.629	Low

According to the results of the first round, this axis consists of 13 indicators. After conducting the second round and analyzing its data, Table 2 shows that 11 indicators had a high level of agreement, with their averages ranging from 2.971 to 2.371. These indicators were adopted as indicators for the "cultural" standard of organizational integrity. However, one indicator had a low level of agreement, with an average of 1.629, and it was excluded. Additionally, one indicator had a moderate level of agreement, with an average of 2.286, and it required further review by experts in the third round. The number of experts who agreed with the indicator and their main justifications were considered to determine the final position based on a comparison with the answers of others. Some of the notable justifications included: "This does not weaken the management," "a solid foundation for achievement," "trust in the work of management," "supportive of results," "increased conviction in the outputs," "reducing the risks of differences," "multiple participation styles in thinking," and "expanding the decision-making base." After the retrieval process, the Kendall agreement coefficient was calculated as shown in table 3.

Table 3: Association Table and Kendall's Agreement Coefficient for Expert Opinions in Rounds 2 and 3 on Indicators of the "Cultural" Standard of Organizational Integrity in Educational Organizations

Indicators	Round		Third				Kendall Coefficient	Sig.
			Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total		
All parties are considered in integrity discussions	Second	Agree	16	0	0	16	0.464	0.000
		Neutral	4	1	1	6		
		Disagree	2	0	1	3		
		Total	22	1	2	25		

Table 3 shows the opinions of the experts who responded in Rounds 2 and 3, with a total of 25 experts, regarding the indicator. The Kendall coefficient value is 0.464, which is a low value indicating a change in the experts' opinions between the two rounds. The number of experts who agreed on this indicator increased from 16 in Round 2 to 22 in Round 3, as 4 neutrals and 2 disagree changed their positions to agreement. Table 4 illustrates the frequencies, percentages, and arithmetic means of their responses in Round 3.

Table 4: Analysis of Responses in Round 3 for Indicators of the "Cultural" Standard of Organizational Integrity in Educational Organizations.

Indicator	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean	Agreement Degree
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
All parties are considered in integrity discussions	22	88.8	1	4.0	2	8.0	2.800	High

Thus, the indicators of the organizational integrity standard (cultural) in educational organizations in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia are formed based on Vision 2030, consisting of 12 indicators. From this result, the importance of this standard in building organizational integrity becomes evident. The culture of integrity is an integral part of the organizational integrity environment, serving as a conceptual framework and an active influencer in the performance level of individuals and organizations as it represents a guiding framework for individual behavior, it influences their relationships, actions, and decisions. It also facilitates the management of integrity tasks and assists in implementing strategies and achieving objectives. This is supported by numerous studies, illustrating that social norms are influential factors of integrity and it can be enhanced through ethical upbringing for all employees, aiming to achieve optimal organizational goals (Zahari et al., 2022; Febrina & Syamsir, 2020; Martin et al., 2013;)

Similarly, the transformation of integrity into a culture and the promotion and development thereof is a means to reduce corruption (Momani, 2020; Kayes et al., 2007). In this regard, Pulay's study (2017) indicated the potential for enhancing public organizations' resistance to corruption and influencing the decisions of their members through the creation of a culture of integrity. The study by Kebede & Lemma (2020) emphasized the importance of maintaining and enhancing an organization's culture of integrity to avoid ethical issues and understand and manage its members effectively. It also highlighted that an organizational culture of integrity adds value to the organization. Additionally, upholding integrity promotes core responsible values such as honesty, fairness, and trustworthiness (Transparency International, 2009).

3.2   The Results of the Second Question

The second question stated: "What are the key standards and indicators (procedural) of organizational integrity in educational institutions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in light of Vision 2030?"

Table (5): Analysis of Responses in the Second Round for the Indicators of the Organizational Integrity (Procedural) Standard in Educational Organizations

Order	N.	The indicators of the organizational integrity standard (Procedural) include the following:	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean	Agreement
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
1	3	Clear and flexible structure regulating integrity.	34	97.1	1	2.9	0	0.0	2.971	High
2	7	Full independence of integrity	32	91.4	3	8.6	0	0.0	2.914	High

		decisions.								
3	4	Powers and responsibilities that meet the requirements of integrity.	30	85.7	4	11.4	1	2.9	2.829	High
4	10	Protection systems for whistleblowers reporting integrity violations.	30	85.7	1	2.9	4	11.4	2.743	High
5	8	Scheduled monitoring and auditing of integrity procedures.	28	80.0	4	11.4	3	8.6	2.714	High
6	2	Operational guidelines for integrity rules and behaviors.	25	71.4	8	22.9	2	5.7	2.657	High
7	9	Systems that criminalize integrity violations.	23	65.7	9	31.4	3	2.9	2.571	High
8	13	Steady and clear policies and procedures for integrity.	21	57.1	11	42.9	3	0.0	2.514	High
9	1	Future plans for integrity are based on realistic outcomes.	19	54.3	13	37.1	3	8.6	2.457	High
10	12	An effective methodology for addressing obstacles and challenges to integrity.	19	54.3	10	28.6	6	17.1	2.371	High
11	5	Direct and smooth communication facilitates integrity processes.	21	60.0	6	17.1	8	22.9	2.371	High
12	6	There are sufficient and accessible sources of information for integrity.	20	57.1	7	20.0	8	22.9	2.343	High
13	11	Assessment and preparedness for integrity risks.	20	57.1	7	20.0	8	22.9	2.343	High
14	14	Enhancement of social oversight for integrity.	17	48.6	8	22.9	10	28.6	2.200	Moderate

According to the results of the first round, this dimension consists of 14 indicators. After conducting the second round and analyzing its data, Table (5) shows that 13 indicators

received a high level of agreement, with average scores ranging from 2.971 to 2.343. These indicators are considered suitable for the Organizational Integrity (procedural) Standard. However, one indicator received a moderate level of agreement, with an average score of 2.200, which falls within the range for reconsideration by experts in the third round.

The experts' feedback and justifications, along with the number of experts who agreed with the indicator, were taken into account to determine the final position based on a comparison with others' answers. The prominent justifications included: ensuring neutrality, objectivity, and fairness; safeguarding rights; mitigating the damages of corruption; benefiting from the efforts of others; being proactive in prevention rather than cure; evaluating realistic systems, procedures, and practices, etc. After the retrieval process, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was calculated as shown in table 6.

Table (6): Association Table and Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance for Expert Opinions in the Second and Third Rounds for the Indicators of the Organizational Integrity (Procedural) Standard in Educational Organizations.

Indicators	Round		Third				Kendall Coefficient	Sig.
			Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total		
Enhancement of Social Accountability.	Second	Agree	12	0	0	12	0.446	0.000
		Neutral	4	1	2	7		
		Disagree	3	0	3	6		
		Total	19	1	5	25		

Table 6 shows the opinions of the experts who participated in the second and third rounds, totaling 25 experts, regarding the indicator. Kendall's coefficient of concordance value was (0.446), indicating a low value that suggests a change in experts' opinions between the two rounds. The number of experts who agreed on this indicator increased from 12 in the second round to 19 in the third round. Four neutrals and three opponents changed their positions to agree. Table 7 illustrates the frequencies, percentages, and mean scores of their responses in the third round.

Table (7): Analysis of Responses in the Third Round for the Indicators of the Organizational Integrity (Procedural) Standard in Educational Organizations

Indicator	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean	Agreement Degree
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Enhancement of Social Accountability	19	76.0	1	4.0	5	20.0	2.560	High

The indicators of the organizational integrity (procedural) standard in educational organizations in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, in light of Vision 2030, consist of 14 indicators. Based on these results, the importance of this standard and its indicators becomes evident, as they play a crucial role in implementing organizational integrity goals, making sound decisions, adhering to systems and laws, ensuring role performance and evaluation of achievements, detecting and addressing deviations, and promoting a more efficient and effective culture of integrity.

This result is in line with different previous study results emphasizing the need of the inclusion of controls and systems in the process of building integrity (Kayes et al., 2007; Merley, 2021; Zahari et al., 2022). Studies also agreed that integrity should be supported with management tools, strategies, and organizational structures (Pulay, 2017; Said et al., 2016; Boardman & Klum, 2001, Khadra and Farhi, 2022; Febrina and Syamsir, 2020). In addition, reviewing current institutional policies and procedures related to integrity is the fundamental starting point for integrity (Morris, 2018; Transparency International, 2019; Asencio, 2019; Sezgi, 2012).

3.3   The Results of the Third Question

The third question stated: "What are the key (behavioral) standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in light of Vision 2030?"

Table (8): Analysis of Responses in the Second Round for the Indicators of the Organizational Integrity (behavioral) Standard in Educational Organizations

Order	N.	The indicators of the organizational integrity (procedural) standard includes the following:	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean	Agreement Degree
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
1	3	Leadership is characterized by integrity traits and is supportive of integrity.	33	94.3	2	5.7	0	0	2.943	High
2	5	Collective participation in formulating integrity frameworks.	32	91.4	2	5.7	1	2.9	2.886	High
3	11	Relationships with beneficiaries guided by ethical integrity.	30	85.7	4	11.4	1	2.9	2.829	High
4	7	Care for stakeholders regarding integrity risks.	29	82.9	4	11.4	2	5.7	2.771	High
5	8	Fair and objective treatment of integrity violators.	28	80	5	14.3	2	5.7	2.743	High
6	13	Ongoing guidance to enhance integrity behaviors.	26	74.3	6	17.1	3	8.6	2.657	High
7	14	Continuous dialogue and respectful discussion about integrity.	26	74.3	6	17.1	3	8.6	2.657	High
8	1	Integration of integrity principles into operational practices.	23	65.7	9	25.7	3	8.6	2.571	High
9	2	Commitment and satisfaction with ethical	22	62.9	9	25.7	4	11.4	2.514	High

		integrity policies.								
10	12	Comprehensive documentation of integrity events and activities.	21	60	8	22.9	6	17.1	2.429	High
11	9	Protection and acceptance of whistleblowers reporting integrity violations.	21	60	6	17.1	8	22.9	2.371	High
12	10	Continuous addressing of pressures on integrity values.	21	60	6	17.1	8	22.9	2.371	High
13	4	Direct criticism of integrity violations.	18	51.4	5	14.3	12	34.3	2.171	Moderate
14	6	Immediate and confidential response to integrity reports.	14	40	7	20	14	40	2.000	Moderate

Based on the results of the first round, this axis consists of 14 indicators. After conducting the second round and analyzing its data, Table 8 indicates that 12 indicators received a high level of agreement, with average scores ranging from 2.943 to 2.371. These indicators were considered as adopted indicators for the standard of behavioral organizational integrity. However, two indicators received a moderate level of agreement, with average scores ranging from 2.171 to 2.000. These indicators were subjected to expert review in the third round, along with the number of experts who agreed with each indicator and their main justifications. This review was conducted to determine the final position in light of the comparison with others' answers.

The prominent justifications for the indicator "Direct criticism of organizational integrity violations" were as follows: (criticism is a personal opinion and not an official procedure, criticism can act as a deterrent to violators, personal criticism serves as the first line of defense, criticism can be positive, direct criticism is effective if used correctly, ...).

The prominent justifications for the indicator "Immediate and confidential response to organizational integrity reports" were as follows: (immediacy does not necessarily imply hastiness, there can be controlled immediacy through official procedures, confidentiality can yield more results than transparency, confidentiality should be balanced with precautions against malicious reports, ...). After retrieving the questionnaires, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was calculated as shown in table 9.

Table 9: The association table and Kendall's coefficient of concordance for expert opinions in rounds two and three on the indicators of the organizational integrity behavior standard in educational organizations

Indicators	Round		Third				Kendall Coefficient	Sig.
			Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total		
Direct criticism of organizational integrity	Second	Agree	7	0	4	11	0.391	0.001
		Neutral	1	1	3	5		
		Disagree	1	0	8	9		

violations.		Total	9	1	15	25		
Immediate and confidential response to organizational integrity reports.	Secon d	Agree	9	0	0	9	0.472	**0.00 1**
		Neutral	4	2	0	6		
		Disagre e	5	0	5	10		
		Total	18	2	5	25		

Table 9 demonstrates the opinions of the experts who responded in both rounds, totaling 25 experts, regarding the indicator "Direct criticism of organizational integrity violations." Kendall's coefficient of concordance (0.391) indicates a low value, suggesting a change in experts' opinions between the rounds. The number of opponents to this indicator increased from 9 experts in the second round to 15 experts in the third round, as 2 approvers and 4 neutrals changed their positions to become opponents.

As for the opinions regarding the indicator "Immediate and confidential response to organizational integrity reports," Kendall's coefficient of concordance (0.472) indicates a low value, suggesting a change in experts' opinions between the rounds. The number of approvers for this indicator increased from 9 experts in the second round to 18 experts in the third round, as 4 neutrals and 5 opponents changed their positions to become approvers. Table 10 illustrates the frequencies, percentages, and mean scores of their responses in the third round:

Table 10: Analysis of responses in the third round for the indicators of the organizational integrity (behavioral) standard in educational organizations

Indicator	**Agree**		**Neutral**		**Disagree**		**Mean**	**Agreement Degree**
	Frequency	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**		
Direct criticism of organizational integrity violations.	9	36.0	1	4.0	15	60.0	1.760	Moderate
Immediate and confidential response to organizational integrity reports.	18	82.0	2	8.0	5	20.0	2.520	High

Thus, the indicators of the organizational integrity behavioral standard in educational organizations in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia are formed, in light of Vision 2030, by a total of 13 indicators. This highlights the importance of this standard as a component of organizational integrity and the significance of its indicators, which shape the behavior of individuals and groups toward organizational integrity. They contribute to defining and regulating this behavior and interaction, which in turn influences the formation of an organizational integrity environment. These indicators determine the behavior, motives, and pressures related to integrity, facilitating their management and direction toward the organization's integrity objectives. This is achieved by utilizing capabilities and resources, guiding interactions and conflicts, improving integrity, and serving the organization's interests while fulfilling the goals of integrity.

This is supported by a study conducted by Zahari et al. (2022), which stated that understanding human behavior provides different ways to assess and enhance integrity while reducing corruption. Additionally, a study by Marley (2021) highlighted the

existence of informal systems that rely on organizational integrity, and they have the same impact as formal systems. Accordingly, the process of building organizational integrity must include examining and auditing organizational practices and daily behaviors (Kayes et al., 2007, Ferial, 2021; Khedhera & Farahi, 2022).

Pulay's study (2017) indicated that commitment to integrity affects guiding, interpreting, and motivating employee behavior to embrace organizational integrity values (Pulay, 2017; Transparency International, 2009, Morris, 2018). Additionally, Boardman and Klum's study (2001) emphasized that organizational integrity requires a commitment to striving for best practices within the framework of ethical boundaries and continuous implementation. Hassan's study (2020) also suggested that positive interactions and behavior towards subordinates can enhance integrity behavior.

3.4 The Results of the Fourth Question

The fourth question stated: "What are the key (distributional)standards and indicators of organizational integrity in educational institutions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in light of Vision 2030?"

Table 11: Analysis of responses in the second round for the indicators of the organizational integrity (distributional) standard in educational organizations

Order	N.	The indicators of the organizational integrity (procedural) standard include the following:	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean	Agreement Degree
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
1	1	Linking performance evaluation with integrity.	34	97.1	0	0	1	2.9	2.943	High
2	2	Linking appointment opportunities with the integrity of applicants.	31	88.6	3	8.6	1	2.9	2.857	High
3	3	Balancing job promotion with integrity.	29	82.9	4	11.4	2	5.7	2.771	High
4	5	Integrity values as a fundamental leadership competency.	25	71.4	10	28.6	0	0	2.714	High
5	6	Fair allowances for integrity burdens.	25	71.4	10	28.6	0	0	2.714	High
6	7	Appropriate compensation for integrity risks.	25	71.4	8	22.9	2	5.7	2.657	High
7	8	Financial and moral support for whistleblowers.	24	65.7	7	28.6	4	5.7	2.571	High
8	9	Linking bonuses to	19	54.3	14	40	2	5.7	2.486	High

		integrity efforts.								
9	10	Intensive empowerment of integrity practitioners.	19	54.3	14	40	2	5.7	2.486	High
10	11	Recognition of contributors to supporting integrity.	19	54.3	10	28.6	6	17.1	2.371	High
11	12	Appreciation for disclosing conflicts of interest.	19	54.3	10	28.6	6	17.1	2.371	High
12	4	Facilities for those who abstain from integrity violations.	17	17	2	5.7	16	45.7	2.029	Moderate

According to the results of the first round, this axis consists of 12 indicators. After conducting the second round and analyzing its data, Table 11 indicates that 11 indicators received a high level of agreement, with average scores ranging from 2.943 to 2.371. These indicators were considered as adopted indicators for the standard of distributional organizational integrity. However, one indicator received a moderate level of agreement, with an average score of 2.029. This indicator was subjected to expert review in the third round, along with the number of experts who agreed with it and their main justifications. This review was conducted to determine the final position in light of the comparison with others' answers. The prominent justifications for this indicator were as follows: (this provides an incentive for confessing the violation, it offers a new opportunity, the waiver can be conditional on future compliance, it increases supervision and monitoring of violators, firm handling of the situation would not encourage violations,). After retrieving the questionnaires, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was calculated as shown in Table 12.

Table 12: The association table and Kendall's coefficient of concordance for expert opinions in rounds two and three on the indicators of the organizational integrity distributional standard in educational organizations

Indicators	Round		Third				Kendall Coefficient	Sig.
			Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total		
Overlooking integrity violations were reported.	Second	Agree	14	0	0	14	0.373	0.001
		Neutral	0	1	1	2		
		Disagree	4	0	5	9		
		Total	18	1	6	25		

Table 12 presents the opinions of the experts who responded in both rounds, totaling 25 experts, regarding the indicator. Kendall's coefficient of concordance (0.373) indicates a low value, suggesting a change in experts' opinions between the rounds. The number of approvers for this indicator increased from 14 experts in the second round to 18 experts in the third round, as 4 opponents changed their positions to become approvers. The frequencies, percentages, and arithmetic means of their responses in the third round, as illustrated in Table 13.

Table 13: Analysis of responses in the third round for the indicators of the organizational integrity distributional standard in educational organizations

Indicator	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Mean		Agreement Degree
Overlooking integrity violations were reported.	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	18	72.0	1	4.0	6	24.0	2.480		High

In light of Vision 2030, the indicators of the organizational integrity distributional standard in educational organizations in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia are formed by a total of 12 indicators. This highlights the importance of this standard as a fundamental element of organizational integrity and the significance of its indicators in determining and regulating processes related to grants, compensations, and organizational integrity. These indicators contribute to achieving justice, equality for individuals within the organization, and stakeholders. They result in improving the quality and quantity of performance, enhancing individuals' trust in the performance evaluation system, increasing motivation, fostering team spirit and teamwork, and promoting organizational loyalty.

The result of this question is in line with different studies such as Judeh (2012) who affirmed that distributional integrity is linked to three criteria: fairness, equality, and need. Integrity within organizations necessitates having a grant system that is free from impractical considerations and that emphasizes equality and fairness among individuals within the organization (Al-Halaybeh, 2013; Samuel, 2014]. Additionally, Boardman & Klum (2001) stated that building organizational integrity requires reviewing and changing the ways employees are managed, trained, and supported. This may involve policies and procedures related to conflict of interest, gifts, benefits, recruitment, performance management, and disciplinary systems. The importance of distribution based on practical grounds and ensuring fairness and transparency were discussed in different studies affirming that regulating individual incentives, balancing their evaluations, and bridging performance gaps are necessary to make organizational members more effective (Saudi, 2013; Transparency International, 2009; Khadra & Farokhi, 2022; Farooq & Farooq, 2014; Said et al, 2016; Poon, 2012).

4. Conclusion

Based on the study, several key findings can be summarized in the following points:

1 Defining the cultural standard of organizational integrity and proposing (12) indicators that received high estimation from respondents, with average scores ranging between (2.971) and (2.371).

2 Defining the procedural standard of organizational integrity with (14) indicators that received high estimation from respondents, with average scores ranging between (2.971) and (2.343).

3 Defining the behavioral standard of organizational integrity with (13) indicators that received high estimation from respondents, with average scores ranging between (2.943) and (2.371).

4 Defining the distributional standard of organizational integrity with (12) indicators that received high estimation from respondents, with average scores ranging between (2.943) and (2.371).

5. Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations can be summarized:

1.   Promoting Ethical Awareness: Efforts should be made to enhance ethical awareness among individuals within the educational organization. This can be achieved through:

-        Defining and consistently highlighting core values of integrity.

-        Emulating exemplary models and ethical role models.

-        Activating guidance, awareness, and counseling efforts to articulate and clarify the culture of integrity within the educational organization.

-        Activating media, publishing, and social communication channels to highlight the values and practices of integrity.

2.   Developing systems and procedures for integrity in educational organizations can be achieved through:

-        Regularly updating integrity systems and procedures to align with changing circumstances.

-        Clearly defining the responsibilities and duties of integrity, ensuring a balanced distribution of authority.

-        Monitoring and implementing the findings of studies and research related to organizational integrity.

-        Leveraging the experiences and expertise of others to enhance the development of integrity systems and guidelines.

3.   Encouraging adherence to ethical practices and fostering positive interactions for integrity within the internal and external organizational environment can be achieved through:

-        Building personal and professional capacities for practitioners of integrity in educational organizations.

-        Facilitating channels of interaction and communication at all levels.

-        Activating the role of codes of conduct and behavior guidelines to guide individuals and groups toward desirable behavior.

-        Regulating and defining the type and extent of relationships within and outside the organization.

4.   Monitoring, evaluating, and updating the components of integrity in distribution in educational organizations can be achieved through:

-        Reviewing the principles and guidelines of distribution in educational organizations.

-        Striving to achieve a balance between work responsibilities and material and moral returns.

-        Regulating and controlling appointment and career advancement processes in educational institutions.

-        Monitoring and evaluating the processes of grants and allowances in educational institutions.

6. Further Research

1.   A study on the factors influencing the organizational integrity culture and strategies for its establishment and adoption.

2.   An evaluation and development study of integrity systems that align with their requirements and meet the needs of organizations.

3.   Analysis and study of organizational integrity behaviors and the factors influencing adherence to them.

4.   A study on the impact of distribution integrity on performance and outcomes.

5.   Designing and constructing measures for the elements of organizational integrity and testing and standardizing them.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

Abdul Haq, H. (2017). The Degree of Practicing Administrative Control Methods and Its Relationship to the Level of Organizational Integrity for Secondary School Principals in Amman. Master's thesis. Hashemite University, Zarqa, https://cutt.us/BUzmo

Abu Elanain, H. M. (2010). Testing the direct and indirect relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes in a non-Western context of the UAE. Journal of management development, 29(2), 5-27.

Alam, M. M., Johari, R. J., & Saied, J. (2018). An empirical assessment of employee integrity in the public sector of Malaysia. International Journal of Ethics and Systems, 34 (1), 458-471.

Al-Azmi, N. (2021). Organizational integrity as an input to improve management of administrative performance in secondary schools in the State of Kuwait: an analytical study. Educational and psychological studies, 113(11), 165-208. https://2u.pw/XPCnf1

Al-Tai, Y., & Hussein, Z. (2021). Administrative reform and its role in enhancing organizational Integrity An applied study in the Health Department of Najaf. Al-Ghary Journal of Economic and Management Sciences, 17(1), 313-347.

Al-Taie, Y. H., Abdulla, D. F., & Rasheed, W. N. (2017). Ethical leadership and its role in organizational integrity to reduce the nutrients of administrative corruption: An Applied Study on a Sample of Najaf Governorate Departments. Journal of University of Human Development, 3(2), 272-311. http://dx.doi.org/10.21928/juhd.v3n2y2017.pp272-311

Asencio, H. D. (2019). The effect of ethical leadership on bribing and favoritism: A field research study. Public Integrity, 21(3), 263-285. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2018.1468204

Attia, K. (2015). Academic Corruption: Its Causes, Effects, and Ways to Combat It, Lessons Learned from Selected Countries. Community Partnership Forum in the Field of Scientific Research, Scientific Integrity, Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University, Riyadh, 5-6/5/2015.

Bani Sakhr, M. (2017). The degree of ethical leadership practice by department heads and its relationship to their level of organizational integrity in Jordanian universities. Master thesis, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. https://2u.pw/yUN8MD

Baxter, J. D., Dempsey, J. A. M. E. S., Megone, C. H. R. I. S., & Lee, J. (2012). Real Integrity: Practical solutions for organisations seeking to promote and encourage integrity. London, UK. https://cutt.us/0mROA

Boardman, C., & Klum, V. (2001). Building organisational integrity. Corruption and anti-Corruption, 82, 82-96.

Camps, V. (2015). Ethical values of the healthcare profession. Educación Médica, 16(1), 3-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edumed.2015.04.001

Choi, H., Hong, S., & Lee, J. W. (2018). Does increasing gender representativeness and diversity improve organizational integrity?. Public Personnel Management, 47(1), 73-92. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017738539

Cording, M. P. (2004). Organizational integrity and acquisition performance: The role of values in value creation. Master Thesis, University of Virginia. https://cutt.us/tcHrL

De Graaf, G., Huberts, L., & Strüwer, T. (2018). Integrity violations and corruption in Western public governance: Empirical evidence and reflection from the Netherlands. Public Integrity, 20(2), 131-149. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1350796

Dobbs, J. M., Jackson, R. J., & Lindsay, D. R. (2019). The impact of perceived leader and organizational integrity on extra-role behaviors in a military context. Military Behavioral Health, 7(2), 135-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/21635781.2018.1515132

Døssing, H. (2011). Mapping transparency, accountability and integrity in primary education in South Africa. Transparency International. https://www.transparency.org

Duggar, J. W. (2009). The role of integrity in individual and effective corporate leadership. Journal of Academic and Business Ethics, 3(1), 1-7.

Dunn, C. P. (2009). Integrity matters. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 5(2), 102-125.

Ekberg, S. (2017). The role of organizational integrity in responses to pressures: A case study of Australian newspapers. Doctoral dissertation, Jönköping University, Jönköping International Business School.

Ertas, N. (2021). Administrative corruption and integrity violations in the charter school sector. Public Integrity, 23(1), 15-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2020.1758535

Escaleras, M., Lin, S., & Register, C. (2010). Freedom of information acts and public sector corruption. Public Choice, 145, 435-460. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11127-009-9574-0

Farooq, M., & Farooq, O. (2014). Organizational justice, employee turnover, and trust in the workplace: A study in South Asian telecommunication companies. Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 33(3), 56-62. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21539

Febrina, D., & Syamsir, S. (2020). The influence of integrity and commitment organizational on employee performance. International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews (IJRAR),, 7(1), 799-805.

Ferial, R. M. (2021). The Influence of Integrity on Employee Performance. Asian Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 3(1), 97-104. https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ajbs/article/view/12911

Goodstein, J. (2015). Philip Selznick and the problems of organizational integrity and responsibility. In Institutions and ideals: Philip Selznick's legacy for organizational studies (Vol. 44, pp. 175-197). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://cutt.us/HVBFs

Gorsira, M., Steg, L., Denkers, A., & Huisman, W. (2018). Corruption in organizations: Ethical climate and individual motives. Administrative Sciences, 8(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci8010004

Hallabiya, G. (2013). The impact of incentives on improving the performance of workers in public sector institutions in Jordan. Master thesis, Middle East University.

Hassan, M. U. (2020). Analyzing teachers' preferences for Organizational Integrity and Obligation in Public Sector Universities of Punjab, Pakistan. Epistemology, 7, 184-199.

Huberts, L. W. (2018). Integrity: What it is and Why it is Important. Public Integrity, 20(sup1), S18-S32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2018.1477404

Huberts, L. W., Kaptein, M., & Lasthuizen, K. (2007). A study of the impact of three leadership styles on integrity violations committed by police officers. Policing: an international journal

of police strategies & management, 30(4), 587-607. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13639510710833884

Iltis, A. S. (2005). Values based decision making: organizational mission and integrity. HEC F., 17, 6. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10730-005-4947-3

Judeh, M. (2012). Examining the relationship between organizational justice, job security, and organizational citizenship behavior in the Jordanian banks: A structural equation modeling perspective. Jordan Journal of Business Administration, 8(3), 581-602.

Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, R. (2010). How to (and how not to) assess the integrity of managers. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62(4), 216. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0022265

Kaptein, M. (2003). The diamond of managerial integrity. European Management Journal, 21(1), 99-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(02)00157-3

Kayes, D. C., Stirling, D., & Nielsen, T. M. (2007). Building organizational integrity. Business Horizons, 50(1), 61-70. https://ssrn.com/abstract=955355

Kebede, D. A., & Lemma, M. (2020). Phenomenological study of exploring integrity culture during covid-19 in Ethiopia. International Journal of Commerce and Finance, 6(2), 33-39.

Khadra, S., & Farakhi, I. (2022). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Performance. Master's Thesis, University Center Abdel Hafeez Bousouf.

Klarus, S. (2013). Holistic Organizational Integrity for Accountability Procedures and Professional Values Unbiased: Empirical Study in the Malaysian Educational Institutions. Doctor Dissertation, Torino University School of Global Integrity & Entrepreneurship level.

Martin, G. S., Keating, M. A., Resick, C. J., Szabo, E., Kwan, H. K., & Peng, C. (2013). The meaning of leader integrity: A comparative study across Anglo, Asian, and Germanic cultures. The Leadership Quarterly, 24(3), 445-461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.02.004

Mayasari, I., Haryanto, H. C., Wiadi, I., & Risza, H. (2020). Leadership Integrity Measurement Development. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Anti-Corruption and Integrity, Jakarta. http://dx.doi.org/10.5220/0009401701770186

Mayasari, I., Wiadi, I., Maharani, A., & Pramono, R. S. (2012). Application of integrity values and gender perspective in ethical behavior. PERFORMANCE, 16(2), 153-179. http://dx.doi.org/10.24002/kinerja.v16i2.364

Merley, M. (2021). Organizational Integrity and Corruption Decision-Making in the Ghanaian Public Service. Doctoral dissertation, University of Ghana. https://cutt.us/zJvw1

Mintrop, H. (2012). Bridging accountability obligations, professional values and (perceived) student needs with integrity. Journal of Educational Administration, 50(5), 695-726. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211249871

Molina, A. D. (2016). Ten recommendations for managing organizational integrity risks. Center for the Business of Government. https://2u.pw/g3Ev4v

Momani, T.R. (2020). The role of faculty members in the official Jordanian universities in promoting academic integrity from their own perspective. Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, 4(2), 20-1.

Moon, G., & Hamilton, W. I. (2013). Developing an Organisational Integrity framework for nuclear safety. Cognition, technology & work, 15(1), 39-45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-012-0217-8

Morris, E. J. (2018). Academic integrity matters: five considerations for addressing contract cheating. International journal for educational integrity, 14(1), 15-35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0038-5

Najm, N., & Karim, K. (2018). The role of organizational trust in promoting organizational citizenship behavior, a diagnostic and analytical study of the opinions of a sample of workers in the municipality of Kirkuk. Master Thesis, University Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences.

Palanski, M. E., Cullen, K. L., Gentry, W. A., & Nichols, C. M. (2015). Virtuous leadership: Exploring the effects of leader courage and behavioral integrity on leader performance and image. Journal of Business Ethics, 132, 297-310. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10551-014-2317-2

Palazzo, G. (2007). Organizational integrity—understanding the dimensions of ethical and unethical behavior in corporations. In Corporate ethics and corporate governance (pp. 113-128). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70818-6_9

Petre, J. T., Heineman, D. S., & La Valley, A. G. (2018). Fostering Organizational Integrity through Departmental Program Reviews. Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 37(2), 2.

Poon, J. M. (2012). Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Affective commitment, and turnover intention: A mediation–moderation framework 1. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42(6), 1505-1532. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00910.x

Pulay, G. (2017). The three legged system of organisational integrity. Review of Economic Studies and Research Virgil Madgearu, 10(1), 159-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.24193/RVM.2017.10.14

Rawlins, B. R. (2008). Measuring the relationship between organizational transparency and employee trust. The Public relations journal, 2(2), 1-12.

Rosli, M. H., bin Abd Aziz, M. A., Mohd, F., & Said, J. (2015). Integrity systems in Malaysian public sector: an empirical finding. Procedia Economics and Finance, 28, 260-265. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01109-0

Said, J., Alam, M. M., & Khalid, M. A. (2016). Relationship between good governance and integrity system: Empirical study on the public sector of Malaysia. Humanomics, 32(2), 151-171. https://doi.org/10.1108/H-02-2016-0008

Salam Program for Cultural Communication. (2015). From: https://salam4cc.org/who-we-are/

Salminen, A., & Mäntysalo, V. (2013). Exploring the public service ethos: Ethical profiles of regional and local managers in the Finnish public administration. Public Integrity, 15(2), 167-186. https://doi.org/10.2753/PIN1099-9922150204

Samuel, O. S. (2014). Justice as the End of Politics: A Critical Discourse. KRITIKE: An Online Journal of Philosophy, 8(2), 12-30. https://cutt.us/QA9Rt

Santoro, M. A. (2003). Beyond codes of conduct and monitoring: An organizational integrity approach to global labor practices. Hum. Rts. Q., 25, 407.

Saudi Vision 2030. (2023). From: https://cutt.us/OZxzO

Saudi, M. (2013). The impact of material incentives on job satisfaction among workers in the Jordanian Social Security Corporation: a field study. Studies: Administrative Sciences, 40, 18-34.

Sezgi, F. (2012, July). Organizational Integrity in Hybrid Identity Organizations: A Study of a social enterprise. In Academy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 2012, No. 1, p. 17665). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.

Silverman, H. J. (2000). Organizational ethics in healthcare organizations: proactively managing the ethical climate to ensure organizational integrity. HEC F., 12, 202. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1008985411047

The chartered insurance institute. (2022). From: https://www.cii.co.uk/

The independent commission against corruption. (2021). From: https://cutt.us/a7ONt

The International Centre For Academic Integrity. (2022). From: https://cutt.us/Yp1bN

Transparency International. (2009). Building Corporate Integrity Systems to Address Corruption Risks. From: https://2u.pw/qi3YKY

Yeşil, S., & Dereli, S. F. (2013). An empirical investigation of the organisational justice, knowledge sharing and innovation capability. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 75, 199-208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.023

Zahari, A. I., Said, J., & Arshad, R. (2022). The influence of ethical culture on corruption: the public sector's perspective. International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management, 10(2-3), 236-257. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPSPM.2022.126231