AOSIS

Integrity and derailment of senior leaders in the Southern African context

CrossMark
click for updates

Authors:
Pieter Koortzen[1]
Rudolf M. Oosthuizen[2]

Affiliations:
[1]Organisation Development, Investec Bank PLC, London, United Kingdom

[2]Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, School of Management Sciences, College of Economic and Management Sciences, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

Corresponding author:
Rudolf Oosthuizen, Oosthrm@unisa.ac.za

Orientation: In recruiting and developing senior leaders for the organisation, great emphasis is placed on the personality of these individuals and on the resulting manifestations of their behaviour in the work context.

Research purpose: The objective of this study was to explore the relationship between integrity and derailment to identify the dimensions of integrity that may reduce the risks of derailing in a group of senior leaders.

Motivation for the study: As organisations become more complex, a higher quality of leadership is demanded. The quality of leadership is often determined by, among other things, the level of leaders' integrity and the manner in which they are able to manage their own derailment at work. In this study, integrity is defined as the conflict and balance between our instincts (i.e. vices) and our ability to reason (i.e. our virtues), while leadership derailment is defined as the way in which leaders behave under stress or when they overuse a particular strength. Both constructs are of particular concern when they manifest in the organisation's pool of high-potential leaders, who are the organisation's future successors. However, most derailment cases are predictable and can be managed effectively with proper intervention.

Research approach/design and method: A cross-sectional quantitative, correlational research design was followed. A non-probability purposive sample of 108 senior leaders in companies in Southern Africa participated in the study.

Main findings: The results enabled the researchers to assess the relationship between integrity and derailment in order to identify the dimensions of integrity that are associated with a lowered risk of derailing in a group of senior leaders. It is apparent from the results that several of the integrity dimensions measured in the current study acted as significant predictors of derailment. The results indicate that the Giotto scales predict five of the Hogan scales to a degree that could be regarded as practically significant and are associated with medium to large effect sizes). These are Excitable, Cautious, Leisurely, Bold and Colourful. The prediction of Cautious can be described as practically important, while the prediction of the remainder of the Hogan scales was practically non-significant.

Practical/managerial implications: From a practical point of view, the research findings allow leadership development practitioners, consultants and coaches to assist leaders in identifying the ways in which leaders will probably derail based on the results of the Giotto integrity test. Those involved in the development of leaders will also be able to develop the leaders' level of integrity in order to reduce unnecessary derailment at work.

Contribution/value-add: The study findings contribute valuable information on the relationship between integrity and derailment and the dimensions of integrity, which may reduce the risks of derailment of senior leaders.

Keywords: Integrity; Giotto integrity questionnaire; leadership derailment; Hogan Development Questionnaire; senior leaders; South Africa.

Introduction

Background of the study

In recruiting and developing senior leaders for the organisation, great emphasis is placed on the personality of these individuals and on the resulting manifestations of their behaviour in the work context. According to Perschel (2009, p. 1), the phrase 'executives are hired on experience and fired on personality' is well known in the executive search business and summarises the years of collective experience and the prevailing findings emanating from executive derailment research. The manifesting behaviour can be studied under normal circumstances, as well as during times

of stress when some leaders tend to derail. However, the authors believe that it is not all doom and gloom because there are ways to predict and avoid hiring a poor fit, as well as ways of detecting the early warning signs of derailment. As organisations are becoming more complex, a higher quality of leadership is demanded. In reality, however, it is estimated that the base rate for leadership failure is 30% – 50% (Gentry & Chappelow, 2009). Leadership derailment is of particular concern as it usually involves an organisation's pool of high-potential leaders (Prince, 2005), the organisation's future successors. However, most derailment cases are predictable and with proper intervention they can be overcome (Sejeli & Mansor, 2015).

Smart (1999) believes that the financial cost of a single failed senior leader can run into millions of rand. Moreover, according to Hogan, Hogan and Kaiser (2009), these financial losses do not include severance agreements, losses related to intellectual capital, the goodwill of the firm's reputation, unmet business opportunities and goals, damage to employee productivity and effectiveness, or the cost to the external environment. Gentry and Chappelow (2009), Kovach (1989) and Watkins (2003) make reference to nine independent studies that recorded an average failure rate of 47% for senior managers and executives. They also point out that the majority of these failures took place after the leaders transitioned into new roles. The most prevalent cause in these research projects was not a lack of technical skills or business acumen but personality factors. The dark side of senior leaders' personalities, which is not detectable during the interview process, only shows up later and can result in a number of negative outcomes (McCall & Lombardo, 1983; Shipper & Dillard, 2000).

Lombardo and McCauley (1988) from the Centre for Creative Leadership attempted to identify traits and behaviours associated with leaders who derail. The results of their studies indicate that successful leaders are very similar in some respects to those who derailed. Most of these leaders were visionaries, had strong technical skills, had a history of career successes and were frequently viewed as 'fast-risers' in their organisations. While every leader had both strengths and weaknesses, the research indicated six basic clusters of flaws in the leaders who derailed. These included problems with interpersonal relationships, difficulties selecting and building a team, difficulties in transitioning from the technical/tactical level to the general/strategic level, lack of follow-through, overdependence and strategic differences with management.

In some of their other studies, Lombardo and McCauley (1988) also found a number of personality traits that made leaders less likely to derail. These included diversity of experience, emotional stability, handling mistakes without defensiveness, interpersonal skills and integrity. With regard to integrity, it was found that many of the leaders who derailed were ambitious about advancing their career at the expense of others. They were also less dependable because

they were more likely to betray or break a promise. In contrast, successful leaders had strong integrity. These leaders were more focused on the immediate task and the needs of subordinates than on competing with rivals or impressing superiors. Furthermore, they demanded excellence from their people in problem solving and in so doing often helped develop them (Van Niekerk & May, 2019).

Business conditions today are different from what they were in the past. Public sectors are becoming more dynamic, intricate and ambiguous (Van Velsor, McCauley, & Ruderman, 2010). In addition, leaders in the public sector are facing greater scrutiny from various sources (Van Velsor et al., 2010). In fact, public sector environments are relatively more dynamic than the private sector. Leadership derailment is closely associated with change (Nazir & Shah, 2014; Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995), a process that most organisations today are experiencing (Marks, 2007).

Research purpose and objectives

The objective of this study was to explore the relationship between integrity and derailment to identify the dimensions of integrity that may reduce the risks of derailment in a group of senior leaders.

The potential value-add of the study

The findings of this study contribute valuable information regarding the relationship between integrity and derailment and the dimensions of integrity that may reduce the risk of derailment of senior leaders. Organisations require an optimal balance of characteristics among their senior leaders in order to utilise their strengths and accommodate their weaknesses. Integrity assessment is one of the best predictors of overall work performance and is more accurate than personality assessment in identifying counterproductive behaviour (Mauer, 2002). Findings obtained from the Giotto Integrity Questionnaire may be used with a considerable degree of confidence in identifying senior leaders with a risk profile of unethical behaviour. Findings obtained from the Hogan Development Questionnaire, on the other hand, provide the ability to develop high-potential leaders to become executive-level leaders, and determine ways to maximise productivity throughout the organisation. This questionnaire evaluates career derailers by identifying and mitigating performance risks that may decrease leadership success and damage relationships and professional reputation. Senior leaders could be developed by taking advantage of the self-awareness gained through the Hogan evaluation.

Literature review
Integrity

The term 'integrity' is originated from the Latin adjective *integer*, which means the state or quality of being complete or whole (Monga, 2016). Sackett, Burris and Callahan (1989) distinguish between two different conceptualisations of integrity and integrity tests. According to these authors,

integrity can be studied and assessed by using overt and personality-based integrity tests. Sackett and Wanek (1996) describe overt integrity tests (alternately labelled 'clear purpose tests') as commonly consisting of two sections. The first section focuses on theft attitudes and generally includes questions about beliefs about the frequency and extent of theft, the punitiveness associated with theft, ruminations about theft, perceived ease of theft, endorsement of common rationalisations for theft and assessments of one's own honesty. The second part focuses on requests for admissions of theft and other wrongdoing. However, this research does not focus on the other theft-related components of integrity. Instead the research is more aligned to the personality-orientated conceptualisations and measures (alternatively labelled 'disguised purpose tests'), which are closely linked to normal-range personality assessment devices. These approaches and assessment are considerably broader in focus, and include constructs such as dependability, conscientiousness, social conformity, thrill-seeking, trouble with authority and hostility. The second approach is also more indicative of the direction that integrity testing has taken in recent years.

In line with this view, Barnard, Schurink and De Beer (2008) define integrity as a multifaceted and dynamic phenomenon based on a set of moral beliefs and inner drives that is affectively and cognitively managed to produce context-appropriate, integrity-related behaviours. These authors, as well as Palanski and Yammarino (2007, 2009), agree that the accurate measurement of integrity depends on a scientific operationalisation of the workplace integrity construct. What is clear from their research is that integrity tests are complex and multidimensional, that is, personality research that is linked to a broad array of workplace behaviours, including both productive and counterproductive behaviours (Sackett & Wanek, 1996). This differs significantly from the earlier views of integrity testing, which regarded it as an activity on the fringes, removed from other mainstream psychological testings and linked to a very limited set of counterproductive behaviours. Although integrity tests could help to combat disruptive and counterproductive employee behaviour (Camara & Schneider, 1994; Cullen & Sackett, 2004), the goal posts have shifted and the need exists to predict job performance rather than disruptive behaviour. Thomassen, Strand and Heggen (2017) state that the concept of integrity is used as a psychosocial concept to describe the tensions and dilemmas experienced by professional and semi-professional workers in neoliberal working life. In general terms, the concept refers to the degree to which professionals experience that their internalised professional standards can be realised (Van Niekerk & May, 2019).

Sackett and Wanek (1996) mention that individuals scoring high on integrity tests tend to avoid counterproductive work behaviours and are more careful, persistent and productive workers. Sackett et al. (1989) point out that personality-based (also known as 'disguised purpose tests') integrity tests, in fact, measure components of personality and only differ from other personality tests in the nature of the traits being assessed. The case in favour of the use of integrity testing in predicting job

performance is also made by Ones and her colleagues (Collins & Schmidt, 1993; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993, 1995; Schmidt, Ones, & Hunter, 1992). These authors report a series of meta-analytic studies that reviewed the evidence for the validity of integrity testing and concluded that the evidence is substantial and that the broad construct of integrity is probably as good as or a better predictor of overall job performance than any one of the Big Five personality factors.

The classical integrity theory of Prudentius

Rust (1999) explains that many of the ideas of modern personality theory, including Eysenck's extraversion and neuroticism, can be traced back to ideas first explored in the classical period of Greece and Rome over 2000 years ago. Even the theories based on relatively new statistical techniques, such as factor analysis, are dependent on their interrelationships with the 'natural language trait descriptors' of human characteristics. Allport and Odbert (1936) listed about 18 000 words (or natural language trait descriptors) in four categories, namely, personal traits, temporary moods or activities, judgements of personal conduct and capacities and talents.

Before these trait descriptors existed, classical scholars used natural language personality descriptors to describe personality characteristics or traits. One of the most influential of these, according to Rust (1999), was the Psychomachia of Prudentius (348–405 AD) (Bergman, 1926; Thompson, 1949). This model was adapted by theologians and thinkers throughout Christianity and Islam, who referred to the traits as the vices (passions) and virtues (sentiments). While there are far more commonly used personality descriptors in English today than in the Latin of the 4th century AD, the conceptual framework established by Prudentius still underpins many of the relationships between them.

Aurelius Prudentius Clementis lived between 348 and 405 AD and, according to Rust (1999), one of Prudentius' writings, *Psychomachia* (*The Battle for the Mind*), was probably his most influential work. In this work, Prudentius describes the development of personality throughout the four stages of life in terms of a continuous battle between the human's rationality and basic animal nature. However, in spite of this conflict, there is an underlying trend towards a resolution where reason will ultimately reign supreme. Prudentius divided his battling entities into two camps, which he referred to as the vices (*vitium*) and the virtues (*virtute*). These vices and virtues were described as justice or injustice, hope or despair, charity or envy, faith or idolatry, temperance or anger, fortitude or inconstancy and prudence or folly. Rust (1999) used this structure as a framework for the traits specified in the integrity testing literature and the development of the Giotto integrity test.

Rust (1999) points out that the increased interest in integrity testing follows largely from a recognition that such tests address the attributes of candidates that are most important in the employment of new employees. The same can be said

of leaders. In contrast, most of the more traditional personality tests focus on psychiatric diagnosis and are more suitable for the general population than employee populations. Rust (1999) further believes that the medical model implies that a personality profile is merely diagnostic (there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers), and this may be less valuable in the work context. One way of avoiding clinical personality traits in occupational settings is by using assessments based on the Big Five. However, this may not uncover all the dimensions that affect job performance in light of the fact that only one trait, namely conscientiousness, seems to predict employment success. Organisations seem to require a more comprehensive way of predicting job performance and derailment, of which conscientiousness is but one.

Leadership derailment

According to Hogan et al. (2009), the economic literature clearly shows that good management enhances organisational performance and that some managers are better than others. Kramer (2008) and other critics agree that there is little consensus in the psychological literature on the characteristics of good managers (Hogan, 2007, pp. 106–109). In contrast, Khan, Yusoff and Khan (2014) have categorised derailment factors into five themes: (1) problems with interpersonal relationships, (2) failure to build and lead a team, (3) failure to meet business objectives, (4) inability to change or adapt during a transition and (5) a too narrow functional orientation (Sejeli & Mansor, 2015). This research is important for both economic and moral reasons. Not only does it cost thousands to replace a failed leader but organisational climate surveys also routinely show that about 75% of working adults report that the most stressful aspect of their job is their immediate boss (Khan, Imran, & Anwar, 2019).

In an online survey of 245 employed adults, Curphy (2008) asked employees about how many managers or leaders they had worked for and how many they would be willing to work for again, to which the respondents reported that they would be willing to work for only 38% of their former bosses again. These results are consistent with several published estimates of the frequency of managerial failure. Bentz (1967) pioneered the study of managerial derailment and McCall and Lombardo (1983) replicated and extended Bentz's study by conducting interviews with 20 senior executives from three different corporations. Each executive took part in two interviews, of which one was about a 'successful' executive and one about a 'derailed' executive. This research led to the definition of derailed executives as:

> … people who were very successful in their careers (spanning 20–30 years and reaching very high levels) but who, in the eyes of the organisation, did not live up to their full potential. One thing they had in common, however, was that their halted progression was not voluntary. (McCall & Lombardo, 1983, p. 1)

The reasons for derailment in this study corresponded largely with those for derailers identified in a group of female leaders by Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987), with the exception that females also struggled with the poor image they had in

the organisation. In contrast to men, women were less derailed with regard to poor relationships in the organisation.

Lombardo and Eichinger (2004) also identified five themes to classify behaviours associated with derailment. The first theme is 'does not relate well to others', which describes managers as insensitive, unable to adapt to differences, defensive and unwilling to learn from others. The second theme, 'self-centredness', examines whether a manager is overly ambitious, arrogant, apolitical, lacks composure, cannot be trusted and generally lacks appropriate ethics and values. The third theme, 'doesn't inspire or build talent', involves a manager's failure to build a team and staff effectively, and inclination to overmanage direct reports. The fourth theme is referred to as 'too narrow' and illustrates a manager who is non-strategic, overdependent on an advocate, overdependent on a single skill and is key-skill deficient. Finally, the fifth theme, 'doesn't deliver results', relates to a manager's performance problems and poor administrative skills (Tang, Dai, & De Meuse, 2013).

In more recent derailment research by the Centre for Creative Leadership, Gentry, Hannum, Ekelund and De Jong (2007) showed how relationship problems, leadership problems and failure to adapt led to the derailment of middle managers, while Gentry, Mondore and Cox (2007) identified how derailing behaviours are linked to personality. Gentry and Chappelow (2009) found with supporting research on the dynamics of derailment that derailment could, ironically, often result from strengths. Strengths that caused managers to be promoted in the initial phases of their careers could become liabilities in more senior jobs and weaknesses that were tolerated early in a career but eventually matter at more senior levels. Hogan et al. (2009) also warn that success that goes to one's head and events beyond a manager's control can overwhelm intention and effort.

The research findings over the last 30 years have thus produced consistent findings across time, organisations, organisational levels, national culture and even gender. Leadership derailment is a state in which a leader whom an organisation believes to be qualified and capable of assuming higher positions in the organisation, performs below expectation and eventually experiences a career plateau, demotion or job termination (Gentry & Chappelow, 2009). The reasons managers derail and ultimately fail stem from poor business performance, poor leadership, lack of self-control and, especially, lack of relationship management. Many of these include personality-related areas. These problems are often exacerbated by major change and periods of increased stress. This has resulted in more research on leadership and personality (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). The research into the Five-Factor Model (FFM) shows that the FFM themes characterise people when they are at their best and define the 'bright side' of personality (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Personality flaws characterise the 'dark side' of personality (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990). Both sets of

characteristics are in the realm of normal personality; the dark side characteristics are undesirable in managers but do not meet the clinical criteria for personality disorders.

Another facet of personality is the maladaptive personality-based behaviours or 'derailers', that is, tendencies that manifest under stressful conditions (Guenole, 2014; Hogan, Hogan, & Warrenfeltz, 2007; Khan et al., 2019). Although these scales are thought to be somewhat stable over time, they have also been described as being open to influence and coaching engagements (Dotlich & Cairo, 2003; Hogan & Kaiser, 2010; Nelson & Hogan, 2009). As a result, many organisational development interventions and talent management programmes that take full advantage of these types of measure (e.g. those that reflect observable manifestations of personality), might expect to see changes over time. Also, self-awareness, coaching and individual development efforts should be made with the feedback recipient and/or other environmental or situational factors present (e.g. reward systems used to reinforce behaviour change) (Church et al., 2016).

Studies on derailment therefore focus on traits or factors that can cause a leader to derail from the initial promising career path (Van Velsor & Leslie, 1996). Studies indicate that derailed leaders lack certain positive traits (Torregiante, 2005). These traits, according to researchers from the Centre for Creative Leadership (2013), include social, technical and adaptation skills (Sejeli & Mansor, 2015). Boredom and a lack of social vigilance are also associated with troublesome interpersonal behaviour, when one is 'just being oneself'. Dysfunctional behaviour is also more likely to appear in weak or ambiguous situations (Green & Sedikides, 2001; Koch, 2002) when leaders have too much discretion (Kaiser & Hogan, 2007). Organisational culture can also potentiate dysfunctional behaviour (Balthazard, Cooke, & Potter, 2006; VanFleet & Griffin, 2006). Thus, personality and situational and organisational influences interact to promote dysfunctional behaviours (Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000). According to Furnham and Taylor (2004), behaviours associated with the dark side include emotional outbursts, bullying, intimidation and excessive deference to authority. Persistently engaging in these behaviours will undermine a manager's ability to lead a high functioning team. Everyone has a bright side and a dark side, and most aspiring managers have attractive bright sides that effectively mask their dark sides.

Derailment can almost always be traced to relationship problems (cf. Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995). When relationships are strong, people will forgive mistakes, but when relationships erode, tolerance disappears and mistakes do get managers fired. Horney's (1950) taxonomy of flawed interpersonal tendencies refers to three general themes: (1) moving away from people – managing insecurities by intimidating and avoiding others; (2) moving against people – managing self-doubts by manipulating and charming others; and (3) moving towards people – managing insecurities by ingratiating others and building alliances.

Derailment occurs when leaders who were perceived to have the ability to move up the career ladder in an organisation, plateau early, and are demoted or fired (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1989). Historically, managerial derailment was conceptualised in terms of lacking critical characteristics for success. Recently, however, several researchers have suggested that derailment is related more to possessing undesirable behaviour rather than lacking desirable behaviour, (Bentz, 1985; Dotlich & Cairo, 2003; Gentry & Chappelow, 2009; Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Rasch, Shen, Davies, & Bono, 2008). In general, research and theories of derailment can be categorised into two types: the behavioural approach and the personality or trait approach (Hogan, Minnullina, Sheppard, Leith, & Crittenden, 2010). The behavioural approach investigates the surface level and observable behavioural patterns associated with management derailment. The personality approach, on the other hand, focuses on the underlying schemas that can be used to explain derailment behaviours. Hogan and Hogan's (2001) theory of the dark side personality is such an example (Tang et al., 2013).

Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005) propose that a combination of integrity, ethical standards and fair treatment of employees may reduce the risks of derailing in a group of senior leaders. Integrity can therefore be described as a component of leadership. Integrity is seen as a value, whereas leadership is a behaviour in the process of creating an ethical climate. If senior leaders' integrity is highly regarded, they will demonstrate consistency in personal behaviour that is based on moral values (Palanski & Yammarino, 2007). This characteristic of integrity will be a significant driver for senior leaders to engage in ethical behaviour and ethical leadership in an attempt to influence followers (Engelbrecht & Mahembe, 2015). According to Palanski and Yammarino (2007), different theories of leadership refer to a conceptual link between integrity and leadership. Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) also state that leaders integrate integrity, trust and shared values in their own identity. Therefore, a hypothesis can be formed that integrity may reduce the risks of derailing in a group of senior leaders.

In conclusion, Schabracq (2003) refers to integrity as a working life concept and relates integrity to the work stress debate. He argues that workers' sense of experiencing integrity at and in work is vital to expand the understanding of mechanisms causing stress/distress in modern working life, which could contribute to derailment in senior leaders. Schabracq (2003, p. 16) draws on Fromm and Erikson and their elaborations of integrity as the crown in the development of identity. Schabracq further defines integrity as a state of congruence, that is, a state in which we experience continuity and connectedness between our surroundings and ourselves: '[i]ntegrity is used here first in its meaning of an intact whole' (Schabracq, 2003, p. 14). A too narrow functional orientation could cause derailment in senior leaders (Thomassen et al., 2017).

Integrity is thus associated with a moral capacity to maintain and defend specific values. Pressure emanating from the

environment may cause leaders to abandon these values, which could derail senior leaders. In a similar vein, Cribb (2011) describes integrity as an 'inner moral compass' guiding the thoughts and actions of senior leaders. Cleary, Walter and Horsfall (2013) argue even more directly for the necessity of senior leaders to stand up for their personal integrity as a reaction to new forms of organising that undermine quality in work (Thomassen et al., 2017). The concept of 'professional derailment' describes the negative psychological experience, which arises when 'professional leaders' experience a discrepancy between integrity and what is practically achievable at work.

In view of the research findings discussed above, the central hypothesis that was investigated in the current study proposes that the components of integrity as positive personality characteristics correlate negatively with flawed interpersonal tendencies, as proposed by Horney (1950). These tendencies are the embodiment of the various undesirable behavioural causes of derailment in senior leaders. In other words, the components of integrity serve to act as meaningful predictors of derailment in senior leaders.

Research design
Research approach

A quantitative correlational research design with a cross-sectional survey as the method to collect data in pursuit of the research objectives was followed. In the study, the prevalence of the specific phenomena of integrity and derailment of senior leaders was investigated. Empirical data sets were used in the data analysis process.

Research method
Research participants and sampling

A non-probability purposive sample of senior leaders (N = 108) in companies in Southern Africa participated in the study. Men (88.9%) comprised the majority of the participants. The majority of participants were white people (61.1%), followed by black people (23.1%), Indians (10.2%) and mixed race (1.9%). In terms of the country of residence of the sample, South Africans (47.2%) formed the majority of the sample, followed by Malawians (7.0%), Swazis (6.0%), Tanzanians (5.0%) and Mozambicans (4.0%). The majority of participants were between 50 and 54 years of age (27.0%), followed by participants between 55 and 59 years (23.0%). The smallest group of participants were between 25 and 29 years of age (2.0%). The majority of participants had between 5 and 7 years of service (27.0%), followed by those with 3–4 years of service (17.0%). The smallest group of participants (3.0%) had more than 26 years of service experience in their work environment.

Measuring instruments

Giotto Integrity Questionnaire

Integrity was measured by using the Giotto Integrity Questionnaire, which is a work-based personality questionnaire consisting of 101 items. Scores are generated on seven scales based on the Prudentius model of personality. These are: (1) Prudence – related to work proficiency, conscientiousness, reliability, responsibility and consistency; (2) Fortitude – related to work commitment, working with enthusiasm as against only as necessary; (3) Temperance – related to patience, hostility, settling disputes through reconciliation or by aggression; (4) Justice – related to unbiased judgement, being trusting or suspicious in dealings with others; (5) Faith – related to dependability, loyalty, respect; (6) Charity – related to honesty, trustworthiness, openness; and (7) Hope – related to welcoming or resisting change, initiative and energy level. The questionnaire utilises an ipsative format in which forced choice items (Least like me; Most like me) are matched for social desirability. Examples of the items are Shallow, Threatening, Ethical and Unselfish. The intrinsic non-linearity of the ipsative framework is addressed using neural network programming techniques. Giotto has been standardised on 701 people in a variety of employment positions.

Several studies supporting the validity of the Giotto Integrity Questionnaire are reported. High scores on the questionnaire are indicative of high integrity. The questionnaire is registered in South Africa and uses local norms (Rust, 1999). The test has been standardised in South Africa on all race groups and across a broad range of occupational levels. The test conforms to South African labour and equity legislation. The Giotto SA test is classified as a psychological test by the Professional Board of Psychology of the Health Professions Council of South Africa. Professor Ricky Mauer conducted the research on the reliability and predictive validity of the South African version of the test. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient ranged between 0.71 and 0.78, with only that of the Hope scale being slightly lower at 0.65. The prediction validity of the test was explored using match samples of members of the public and perpetrators of financial crimes. Using discriminant analysis, the predictive validity was calculated at 94% (Mauer, 2002). The seven scales are presented in Table 1.

Hogan Development Questionnaire

The Hogan Development Survey (HDS) is an instrument with 154 items, designed to assess 11 'derailer' or maladaptive behavioural dimensions (Excitable, Sceptical, Cautious, Reserved, Leisurely, Bold, Mischievous, Colourful, Imaginative, Diligent and Dutiful) and 33 subscales to help senior leaders recognise shortcomings, maximise strengths and build successful teams (Hogan, 1997). In this scale, respondents indicate to what extent they 'agree' or 'disagree' with the items. Examples of the items are 'sometimes at work I get pretty discouraged', 'I have a reputation as a risk-taker' and 'I like to make a schedule and stick to it'. The measure has been cross-validated with measures of abnormal personality, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The internal reliabilities for the scales have been reported in the measure's manual at an average alpha of 0.67, with a test–retest reliability at an average of 0.75. This tool represents the behavioural manifestation type of personality assessment. Table 2 lists the categories described by Hogan and Hogan (2001).

TABLE 1: Classical virtues or vices and integrity traits measured by the Giotto Integrity Test.

Classical virtues or vices	Giotto scale	Integrity traits	Low score	High score
Prudence or folly	Prudence	Competence versus carelessness	• Being careless in carrying out given tasks • Making mistakes/negligent • Unreliable • Impulsive • Risk-taker	• Being prudent and cautious when carrying out tasks • Focused on detail • Work is accurate and meticulous
Fortitude or inconstancy	Fortitude	Work orientation versus absenteeism	• No long-term job commitment • Work only as necessary • Lazy • Dislikes work pressure • Often absent from work	• Being committed • Working hard • Coping well with work pressure • Goal orientated • Ambitious • Punctual
Temperance or anger	Temperance	Patience versus hostility	• Settling disputes by aggression • Lacks self-control • Bad tempered • Emotional • Poor interpersonal relationships	• Settling disputes by reconciliation • Self-controlled • Even tempered • Calm and compromising • Well mannered • Inoffensive
Justice or injustice	Justice	Fair-mindedness versus subversion	• Irrational judgement ability • Biased and partial • Bearing grudges • Dissatisfied • Unreasonable • Suspicious	• Rational judgement ability • Fair-minded • Unbiased/impartial • Ethical • Balanced • Satisfied
Faith or infidelity	Faith	Loyalty versus disloyalty	• Loyal only to oneself • Self-centred • Independent minded • Using company time and property for personal interests	• Loyal to company • Upholding company values and goals • Adherence to rules • Acceptance of authority • Dependable
Charity or envy	Charity	Openness versus disclosure	• Dishonest • Crafty/scheming • Shrewd • Covering up of mistakes • Excessive privacy	• Being open and honest in dealing with others • Trustworthy • Transparent • Sincere • Straightforwardness
Hope or despair	Hope	Initiative versus inertia	• Resist change • Inability to cope with change • Passive obstructive • Discouraged • Disheartened • Negative	• Welcoming change • Optimistic/positive • Innovative • Resourceful • Ability to adapt to change • Enthusiastic

Source: Adapted from Rust, J. (1999). The validity of the Giotto Integrity Test. Personality and Individual Differences, 27, 755–768. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00277-3

TABLE 2: The Hogan typology of Derailment.

Horney's (1950) orientation	Hogan derailing dimensions	Definitions
Moving away: Trying to succeed by intimidation and avoiding people	Excitable	High excitable people expect to be disappointed in relationships – as a result, they are alert to signs that others may treat them badly. When they think they have been mistreated, they erupt in emotional displays that may involve yelling, throwing things, and slamming doors. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their emotional eruptions; they are the people for whom the term 'Emotional Intelligence' (Goleman, 1997) was devised. Because they are so volatile and unpredictable, they have difficulty building and maintaining a team – the fundamental task of leadership.
	Sceptical	High sceptical people expect to be betrayed, cheated or deceived in some way. They specialise in conspiracy theories, stay alert for signs of mistreatment, and when they think they detect it, they retaliate directly. This may involve physical violence, accusations, or litigation, actions announcing that they are prepared to defend themselves. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their suspiciousness, argumentativeness and lack of trust in others.
	Cautious	High cautious persons fear being criticised, blamed or possibly disgraced; as a result, they are constantly on guard against making mistakes that might cause them public embarrassment. To avoid criticism, they follow rules and precedents, resist innovation and cling to that which worked in the past. Their cautiousness sometimes extends to their staff, whom they fear will embarrass them, and whom they often discourage from taking any initiative.
	Reserved	High reserved people seem indifferent to the expectations of others – especially their staff. As a result, they seem formal, aloof, introverted and lacking in social insight. They prefer to work alone, and are more interested in data and things than in people. They communicate poorly, if at all, they are unrewarding to deal with and they have trouble building or maintaining a team.
	Leisurely	High leisurely people seem overtly pleasant and cooperative, but privately they expect to be mistreated and unappreciated. They are stubborn and independent, cynical about the talents and intentions of others – especially superiors – and insist on working at their own pace. When pressed for additional output, they tend to slow down even more. They express their resentment indirectly, in the form of procrastination and excuse making.
Moving against: Trying to succeed by charm and manipulation	Bold (arrogant)	High arrogant people expect to be admired, praised, indulged and obeyed. They expect to be successful in everything they do, they believe in their own legacy, and when their expectations are frustrated, they explode with 'narcissistic rage'. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their self-assurance, which often gives them a certain social presence – they are the first to speak in a group, and they do so with great confidence even when they are wrong.
	Mischievous	High mischievous people expect other people will find them charming, clever and even irresistible – as a result, they are willing to ask for favours, exceptions, allowances and to do so without incurring obligations. In addition, they see themselves as bullet proof, they enjoy risk-taking for its own sake and they often live on the edge. From an observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is that they are bright, witty and engaging, which is why they are able to extract favours, promises, money and resources from other people with relative ease. They see others as utilities to be exploited and therefore have problems maintaining commitments, and are unconcerned about violating expectations.
	Colourful	High colourful people expect others will find them attractive and entertaining, and the natural focus of attention. They are good at calling attention to themselves – they know how to make dramatic entrances and exits, they carry themselves with flair, wear attention-grabbing clothes and are constantly on stage. Some elevation on this characteristic is essential for a career in sales, politics or the theatre. From an observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their stage presence – they perform well in interviews, in assessment centres and other public settings. They are also impulsive and unpredictable; that which makes them good at sales (and selling themselves) makes them poor managers – they are unfocused, distractible, over-committed and always in search of the spotlight.
	Imaginative	High imaginative people think about the world in different and often interesting ways, and they enjoy entertaining others with their unusual perceptions and insights. They are alert to new ways of seeing, thinking, and expressing themselves, and they enjoy the reactions they elicit in others with their unexpected forms of self-expression. From an observer's perspective, these people often seem bright, insightful, playful and innovative, but also as eccentric, odd and flighty.

TABLE 2 (Continues...): The Hogan typology of Derailment.

Horney's (1950) orientation	Hogan derailing dimensions	Definitions
Moving towards: Trying to succeed by ingratiating	Diligent	High diligent people expect their performance to be rigorously evaluated. As a result, they have high standards of performance for themselves and others; they are concerned with doing a good job, being a good citizen and pleasing authority. When they think they have not lived up to their standards, they redouble their efforts and try even harder. They are hard-working, careful and planful; they live by the rules and expect others to do so too, and become irritable when others do not follow their rules. From an observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their conservatism, their detail orientation, their risk aversion, and also the degree to which they are steady, dependable and predictable. They are model organisational citizens who can be relied upon to maintain standards, do their work competently and professionally, and treat their colleagues with respect.
	Dutiful	High dutiful people think others expect them to behave well. As a result, they are concerned about being accepted, being liked and getting along, especially with authority figures. They are alert for signs of disapproval, and equally alert for opportunities to ingratiate themselves, to be of service, to demonstrate their fealty and loyalty to the organisation. When they think they have given offense, they redouble their efforts to be model citizens. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their good nature, their politeness, their cordiality and their indecisiveness. As managers, they will do anything their boss requires; this means that they are reluctant to support their staff or challenge authority, but this inevitably erodes their legitimacy as leaders.

Source: Adapted from Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view of the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 40–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162

Research procedure and ethical considerations

The purpose of the study was explained to the participants in an email prior to commencing the administration of the questionnaires. This email positioned the assessments as part of a larger leadership development process. Both instruments were administered using the online versions. Participants completed the questionnaires voluntarily and received individual feedback on the assessment results. They also took part in a three-day leadership development programme, which allowed them to explore the results further and share them with their work teams. Based on the assessment results and the feedback they received from their colleagues, they developed their own development plans. Although the leadership development process was very personal in nature, the participants granted permission for the data to be used for research purposes, given that their anonymity was guaranteed. The researchers maintained confidentiality during the analysis and reporting process.

Ethical consideration

This article followed all ethical standards for a research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Results

In Table 3, the descriptive statistics of the Giotto Integrity Test and the Hogan Derailers Questionnaire are provided. With regard to internal consistency reliability, the Cronbach's alphas for the seven Giotto subscales and the 11 Derailment scales were not computed because of the fact that the item scores were not available, and only the total of the scales was available. The correlations between the scales of the Giotto Integrity Test and the Hogan Derailers Questionnaire were subsequently computed and the results are presented in Table 3.

The results presented in Table 3 show that there are a number of statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) correlations between the scales of the two instruments. Both statistically and practically significant correlations are reported. An inspection of Table 3 reveals that correlations with a medium or large effect size include the correlations of the Excitable and Leisurely scales of the Hogan with the Hope and Justice Giotto scales.

The Cautious and Colourful scales yielded medium to large effect sizes with the Hope Giotto scale, and Diligent yielded a medium effect size correlation with Prudence of the Giotto. The Hope Giotto scale appeared to yield the highest correlations with the various Hogan scales, with Justice in the second position. It is important to note that there were several statistically significant positive correlations that are indicative of high scores on the Giotto scales being associated with high scores on the Hogan scales.

A number of stepwise regression analyses were performed using SPSS24 to assess the degree to which the Giotto scales predict the Hogan scales, in other words, to determine whether the integrity measures may be used to predict derailment. Prior to the regression analyses, the assumptions of regression were assessed. Multicollinearity was assessed by requesting collinearity diagnostics. The normality of residuals was checked by requesting histograms of residuals, while linearity was established by plotting the observed cumulative probability against the expected cumulative probability. Lastly, homoscedasticity was assessed by requesting plots of the standardised predicted values against the standardised residuals. Inspection of these diagnostics showed that the assumptions for regression were met and the analyses were subsequently performed. A series of stepwise regressions was conducted, entering all the Giotto scales as independent variables and establishing which of these were significant predictors of each of the Hogan scales. Effect size measures were used as suggested by Ellis and Steyn (2003). R-squared values smaller than 0.13 were regarded as representing a small effect size or non-significant result. Values between 0.13 and 0.25 were regarded as a medium effect size or a significant result, whereas values larger than 0.25 were deemed to represent a large effect size or a practically important result. A summary of the regression analyses predicting each of the Hogan dimensions by means of the Giotto integrity traits is provided in Table 4.

Table 4 indicates that the Giotto scales predict five of the Hogan scales to a degree that could be regarded as practically significant and are associated with medium to large effect sizes (Ellis & Steyn, 2003). These are Excitable, Cautious, Leisurely, Bold and Colourful. The prediction of Cautious can be described as practically important. The prediction of

TABLE 3: Correlations between the scales of the Giotto Integrity Test and the Hogan Derailers Questionnaire.

Giotto Integrity Test	Mean	SD	Hogan Derailers Questionnaire										
			Excitable	Sceptical	Cautious	Reserved	Leisurely	Bold	Mischievous	Colourful	Imaginative	Diligent	Dutiful
Mean	-	-	45.39	41.44	51.42	49.66	44.19	40.19	39.5	46.05	45.05	51.35	51.64
SD	-	-	24.213	28.782	26.982	29.194	28.857	28.214	26.027	26.692	25.34	26.232	26.686
Charity	10.00	3.913	-0.105	-0.178	-0.007	-0.037	-0.098	0.141	-0.075	0.089	0.066	-0.095	0.03
Fortitude	11.01	3.824	0.09	0.281**	-0.07	-0.048	-0.045	0.15	0.258**†	0.155	0.02	0.218*†	-0.096
Hope	8.72	4.092	-0.336**‡	-0.173	-0.510**§	-0.184	-0.343**‡	0.193*	0.179	0.370**‡	0.250**†	-0.099	0.039
Faith	9.49	4.186	0.083	0.079	0.276**†	0.044	0.212*†	-0.094	-0.041	-0.234*†	-0.033	0.099	0.131
Justice	11.62	3.554	-0.372**‡	-0.176	-0.268**†	-0.081	-0.304**‡	-0.165	0.011	0.085	0.085	-0.149	-0.124
Prudence	9.07	4.175	-0.084	0.062	0.024	-0.188	0.063	0.243*†	0.011	0.053	-0.033	0.344**‡	0.07
Temperance	8.79	3.988	-0.148	-0.186	0.153	0.036	0.12	-0.11	-0.105	-0.14	-0.129	0.04	-0.018

SD, standard deviation.

*, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); **, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

†, small effect size; ‡, medium effect size; §, large effect size.

TABLE 4: Summary of regression analyses predicting each of the various derailing dimensions by means of the Giotto integrity traits.

Dependent variable	Significant independent variable	Regression summary					
		F significance	R square	Effect size R square	Beta	t-value	Predictor significance
Excitable	Hope	0.000	0.16	Significant	0.316	3.461	0.001
	Justice	0.000	0.16	Significant	-2.713	-2.713	0.008
Sceptical	Fortitude	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cautious	Hope	0.000	0.32	Practically important	-0.488	-5.962	0.000
	Faith justice	0.000	0.32	Practically important	0.209	2.555	0.001
Reserved	Prudence	0.026	0.05	Non-significant	-0.215	-2.264	0.026
Leisurely	Hope	0.000	0.14	Significant	-0.229	-2.299	0.001
	Justice faith	0.000	0.14	Significant	-0.219	-2.218	0.023
Bold	Prudence	0.000	0.16	Significant	0.270	3.036	0.003
	Justice	0.000	0.16	Significant	-0.302	-3.132	0.002
	Hope	0.000	0.16	Significant	0.296	3.062	0.003
Mischievous	Fortitude	-	0.06	Non-significant	0.252	2.680	0.009
Colourful	Hope	0.000	0.19	Significant	0.363	4.063	0.000
	Faith	0.000	0.19	Significant	-0.187	-2.093	0.039
Imaginative	Hope	0.005	0.07	Non-significant	0.268	2.886	0.005
Diligent	Prudence fortitude	0.001	0.09	Non-significant	0.302	3.260	0.001
Dutiful	None	-	-	-	-	-	-

the remainder of the Hogan scales was practically non-significant. Fortitude, Justice and Hope were significant predictors of Excitable. Low scores on Justice and Hope and high scores on Fortitude were associated with high scores on Excitable.

Hope, Faith and Justice predicted the Cautious scale, with low scores on Hope and high scores on Faith being associated with high scores on the Cautious scale. Low scores on both Hope and Justice were associated with high scores on Leisurely, while low scores on Justice and high scores on Prudence and Hope were associated with high scores on the Bold scale. High scores on Hope and low scores on Faith were associated with high scores on the Colourful scale.

Discussion
Outline of the results

In this research, the focus was on the personality of senior leaders, as measured by a personality-based integrity test and the relationship with certain manifestations of behaviour, called derailers, as measured by the Hogan development report. The manifesting behaviour can be studied under normal circumstances but is more commonly identified during times of stress or when leaders overuse a strength (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Research into leadership derailment is particularly important because it usually involves an organisation's pool of high-potential leaders (Prince, 2005). Other researchers believe that most cases of leadership derailment are predictable and can even be overcome (Sejeli & Mansor, 2015). It is also clear from the available research that derailment tends to occur among senior leaders when they transition into new roles. Gentry and Chappelow (2009), Kovach (1989) and Watkins (2003) agree that derailment is not the result of a lack of technical skills or business acumen, but it is directly related to personality factors.

While it is widely accepted that leaders have both strengths and weaknesses, some of the earliest research seems to indicate that there are six basic clusters of personality flaws associated with leaders who derail. These are described as problems with interpersonal relationships, difficulties in selecting and developing their teams, difficulties in transitioning from a tactical level to a strategic level of work, a lack of follow-through, an overdependence on others and strategic differences with other members of their leadership team (Lombardo & McCauley, 1988). Work-related personality research has also shown how relationship

problems, leadership problems and failure to adapt lead to the derailment of managers. In related studies, a number of personality traits were identified that made leaders less likely to derail. In particular, diversity of experience, emotional stability, handling mistakes without defensiveness, interpersonal skills and integrity seem to prevent many leaders from derailing at work (Lombardo & McCauley, 1988). This research was of particular interest to the authors and provided some initial evidence for the relationship between integrity (as part of personality) and derailment at work. The question that arose now was how integrity could prevent leaders from derailing.

The authors were not only interested in how higher levels of integrity could prevent derailment but also how lower levels could potentially lead to derailment. With regard to the latter, it was found that many of the leaders who derailed were ambitious about advancing their careers at the expense of others and that they were also less dependable because they were more likely to betray a trust or break a promise. On the other hand, successful leaders had strong integrity. These leaders were found to be more focused on the immediate task and on subordinates' needs than on competing with colleagues and impressing superiors. They also demanded excellence in problem solving from their subordinates, which they often used as one of the vehicles to develop them (Van Niekerk & May, 2019). The research on the topic has thus progressed significantly over the last 40 years and the authors aspired to contribute to it.

An overview of the literature led the authors to the following conclusions about derailment: (1) derailed senior leaders can be defined as 'people who were very successful in their careers but who, in the eyes of the organisation, did not live up to their full potential' (McCall & Lombardo, 1983). There is also a theme of poor relationships in the organisation, which runs through all the research (Gentry & Chappelow, 2009). (2) The reasons why senior leaders derail and ultimately fail, arise from poor performance, which in turn results from personality dynamics. (3) These problems are often exacerbated by major change and periods of increased stress (Gentry & Chappelow, 2009). (4) Gentry and Chappelow (2009), Kovach (1989) and Watkins (2003) agree that derailment is not the result of a lack of technical skills or business acumen but it is directly related to personality factors. (5) Gentry and Chappelow (2009) found supporting research on the dynamics of derailment to show that derailment could often, ironically, result from strengths or from the overuse of a personality strength which becomes a defence.

The authors further concluded that derailment can be categorised into two types: the behavioural approach and the personality or trait approach. The behavioural approach focuses on the surface level and observable behavioural patterns associated with management derailment. The personality approach, in contrast, focuses on the underlying schemas that can assist in explaining derailment behaviours.

This is also commonly called the dark side personality. These maladaptive personality dynamics can be linked directly to work behaviours or 'derailers', which commonly manifest under stressful conditions and are defined as such.

Lombardo and Eichinger (2004), in our opinion, were the first to illustrate that derailment had both behavioural and personality components by identifying the five themes of derailment. These include 'does not relate well to others', 'self-centredness', 'doesn't inspire or build talent', 'too narrow' with regard to strategy and 'doesn't deliver results' (Tang et al., 2013). Gentry and Chappelow (2009) similarly believe that managers derail and ultimately fail as a result of poor business performance, and a lack of leadership, self-control and, especially, relationship management. These are a combination of behavioural and personality elements.

With the realisation that derailment arises from personality characteristics, it was the logical next step to conduct research on the FFM, which shows the characteristics of people at their best, defined as the 'bright side' of personality and the personality flaws as the 'dark side' (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et al., 1990; Hogan et al., 1994). Both sets of characteristics are however still within the realm of normal personality because the dark side characteristics, even though undesirable in senior leaders, do not meet the clinical criteria for personality disorders.

Derailment as a result of these personality flaws can almost always be traced to relationship problems (Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995). When relationships are strong, people will forgive mistakes, but when relationships erode, tolerance disappears and mistakes are found, senior leaders are fired. Horney's (1950) taxonomy of flawed interpersonal tendencies refers to three general themes: (1) moving away from people – managing insecurities by intimidating and avoiding others; (2) moving against people – managing self-doubts by manipulating and charming others; and (3) moving towards people – managing insecurities by ingratiating others and building alliances.

The literature also provided valuable information on how integrity could, theoretically, reduce derailment. Brown et al. (2005), for example, propose that the combination of integrity, ethical standards and fair treatment of employees will reduce the risks of derailment and support the importance of investigating integrity as part of a multidimensional perspective of personality. Integrity is thus seen as an integral part of the values component of personality, whereas leadership produces the manifesting behaviour in, for example, the process of creating an ethical climate. If senior leaders' integrity is highly regarded, they will demonstrate consistency in personal behaviour that is based on moral values and this will make them less likely to derail in stressful situations.

With this theoretical understanding at hand, the authors then decided to use an integrity test rather than a personality test because integrity tests represent the complex and

multidimensional nature of personality and the results can be linked to both productive and counterproductive behaviours. The authors thus hypothesised about the relationship between integrity and derailment. Are the counterproductive behaviours (derailments) related to lower levels of integrity? Or, in other words, how can the results of an integrity test assist the researchers in predicting some of the derailing behaviours? Can personality dimensions such as conscientiousness lead to counterproductive behaviour or derailment as suggested by Sackett and Wanek (1996)? This seems to happen when senior leaders experience stress in a changing organisation and, in an attempt to maintain control, they overuse a strength by being more conscientious than usual, which ultimately may lead to burnout. In the context of this research, one may, for example, ask whether a high level of fortitude on the Giotto integrity test relates to a high level on dutiful or diligent, which are derailers as measured by the HDS.

The empirical results suggest that the Giotto scales predict five of the Hogan scales to a practically significant degree and are associated with medium to large effect sizes. These are Excitable, Cautious, Leisurely, Bold and Colourful. Cautious was predicted at a level that may be described as practically important. The rest of the Giotto scales did not predict any of the derailers in a significant way, while Fortitude, Justice and Hope were found to be significant predictors of Excitable.

Low scores on Justice and Hope, and high scores on Fortitude, were associated with high scores on Excitable. The Excitable derailer manifests when a person expects to be disappointed in relationships and is on the alert to signs that others may treat them badly. When they think they have been mistreated, they erupt in emotional displays that represent a lack of emotional intelligence (EQ). This behaviour is predicted to manifest when the person has a lower justice or judgement ability, is biased or partial, and is generally dissatisfied, unreasonable and suspicious. They also have low hope, resist change and are easily discouraged. This behaviour may manifest even though the person is generally committed and loyal to the organisation and is a hard worker.

Hope, Faith and Justice predicted the Cautious scale, with low scores on Hope and high scores on Faith being associated with high scores on the Cautious scale. This implies that individuals who derail because of being overly cautious follow the rules and stick to tried and tested ways for themselves and their teams in an attempt not to be criticised, blamed or possibly disgraced can possibly be identified through their low levels of Hope (resisting change, inability to cope with change, passive obstructiveness, being discouraged and disheartened and generally being negative) even if they are fiercely loyal to the organisation and committed to their work (faith).

Low scores on both Hope and Justice were associated with high scores on Leisurely. People who derail on the leisurely dimension seem overtly pleasant and cooperative, but privately they expect to be mistreated and often feel unappreciated. These individuals come across as stubborn and independent minded, with a cynical view on the talents and intentions of others (superiors), and insist on working at their own pace. When pressed for extra output, they slow down instead of speed up. The results seem to indicate that this form of derailment will be observed in people who are low on Hope (a negative future orientation and an inability to cope with change), as well as low on Justice, which includes poor judgement, being biased or partial, bearing grudges and being dissatisfied, unreasonable and suspicious. The bearing of grudges may be of particular importance if this behaviour manifests in relationships that have been in existence for a long time.

While low scores on Justice and high scores on Prudence and Hope were associated with high scores on the Bold scale, people who are high on Bold (arrogance) expect to be admired, praised, indulged and obeyed. They generally believe that they will excel at whatever they do, they believe in their own legacy, and when their expectations are frustrated they explode with 'narcissistic rage'. To others they come across as self-assured which often gives them a certain social presence. They are often the first to speak in a group, and they do so with great confidence, even when they are wrong. This form of derailment can be predicted by low Justice (poor judgement, being biased or partial, bearing grudges and being dissatisfied, unreasonable and suspicious), high Prudence or work proficiency and cautiousness (being prudent and cautious when carrying out tasks, focused on the detail and working accurately and meticulously), which may explain some of their assuredness, and high Hope, which includes being welcoming of change, being optimistic or positive, innovative, resourceful and enthusiastic and having an ability to adapt to change.

High scores on Hope and low scores on Faith were associated with high scores on the Colourful scale. Highly colourful people expect others to find them attractive and entertaining and expect to be the natural focus of attention. They are good at drawing attention to themselves because they know how to make dramatic entrances and exits; they have flair, wear attention-grabbing clothes and act as if they are constantly on stage. They are also impulsive and unpredictable, unfocused, distractible, over-committed and always in search of the spotlight. The results seem to indicate that this form of derailment can be predicted in a high level of Hope (welcoming change, being optimistic or positive, innovative and resourceful, having the ability to adapt to change and enthusiasm) and exists with a low level of Faith, which implies that the person is loyal only to himself or herself, as well as being self-centred and independent minded.

It is also worth mentioning that Hope appears to be a strong predictor of the HDS because it appeared as a predictor in four of the five significant predictions. Justice played a role in

three significant predictions and Faith in two. Prudence and Fortitude were present in one significant regression analysis each. In conclusion, the empirical findings confirm the hypothesis and support the general theoretical idea that derailment is associated with integrity.

Practical implications

From a practical point of view, the research findings allow leadership development practitioners, consultants and coaches to assist leaders in identifying the ways in which they will probably derail based on the results of the Giotto integrity test results. Those involved in the development of leaders will also be able to develop the leaders' level of integrity in order to reduce unnecessary derailment at work.

Limitations and recommendations

Some limitations of the research reported should be noted. The first one is the cross-sectional nature of the data of the current study. The observation regarding how dimensions of integrity may reduce the risk of derailment among senior leaders should be validated, using a longitudinal research paradigm. The second one is the sample size of the study. Future studies should also use a larger sample chosen on the basis of greater probability and randomness to ensure that the sample is more representative of senior leaders in companies in Southern Africa. The third limitation is that this study was a single-source study. Multiple sources of data could be considered in future studies, such as leaders' self-assessments of their own integrity and ethical leadership, as well as peer ratings.

Future research and interventions will hopefully empirically examine, refine and expand our theorising to better understand that several of the integrity dimensions measured in the current study acted as significant predictors of derailment. Future studies should also include an integrity framework that has practical implications for organisations and senior leaders. It could be used as a guide or checklist when framing organisational policies and procedures to facilitate behaviour with integrity. For senior leaders it emphasises the need for the alignment of personal values and organisational values in order for a senior leader to act with integrity to curtail the risk of derailment. Secondly, future studies should explore other mediating and moderating variables (e.g. integrity-related personality traits, altruism, psychological empowerment, ethical climate and organisational justice) that may influence integrity in senior leaders. It is also recommended that situational antecedents should be assessed and managed to help identify and minimise the risk of derailment of senior leaders, especially when integrity is low.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the limitations pointed out, this study makes an important contribution in terms of the significance of the relationship between integrity and derailment. In light of the paucity of research on integrity and derailment, the value-add of the present findings lies in the dimensions of integrity that may reduce the risks of derailment in senior leaders. It is apparent from the results that several of the integrity dimensions measured in the current study acted as significant predictors of derailment.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this article are the authors' own views and not an official position of the organisations.

References

Allport, G.W., & Odbert, H.S. (1936). Trait names: A lexical study. *Psychological Monographs, 47*(1), 211. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093360

Balthazard, P.A., Cooke, R.A., & Potter, R.E. (2006). Dysfunctional culture, dysfunctional organization: Capturing the behavioral norms that form organizational culture and drive performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 709–732. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610713253

Barnard, A., Schurink, W., & De Beer, M. (2008). A conceptual framework of integrity. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 34*(2), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v34i2.427

Bentz, V.J. (1967). The Sears experience in the investigation, description, and prediction of executive behavior. In F.R. Wickert, & D.E. McFarland (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness* (pp. 147–206). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bentz, V.J. (1985). *A view of the top: A thirty-year perspective of research devoted to the discovery, description and prediction of executive behavior.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA, August 23–27.

Bergman, J. (1926). Aurelli Prudenti Clementis. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecceliasticorum Latinorum 61.* Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky A.G.

Brown, M.E., Trevino, L.K., & Harrison, D. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 97*, 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Camara, W.J., & Schneider, D.L. (1994). Integrity tests: Facts and unresolved issues. *American Psychologist, 49*, 112–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.2.112

Centre for Creative Leadership. (2013). *360 By design: Library of competencies and derailment factors.* Retrieved from http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/assessments/360BDLibraryCompetencies

Church, A.H., Fleck, C.R., Foster, G.C., Levine, R.C., Lopez, F.J., & Rotolo, C.T. (2016). Does purpose matter? The stability of personality assessments in organization development and talent management applications over time. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 52*(4), 450–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886316668748

Cleary, M., Walter, G., & Horsfall, J. (2013). Promoting integrity in the workplace: A priority for all academic professionals. *Contemporary Nurse, 45*(2), 264–268. https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.2013.45.2.264

Collins, J.M., & Schmidt, F.L. (1993). Integrity, personality and white-collar crime: A construct validity study. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 295–311. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00875.x

Cribb, A. (2011). Integrity at work: Managing routine moral stress in professional roles. *Nursing Philosophy, 12*, 119–127. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-769X.2011.00484.x

Cullen, M.J., & Sackett, P. (2004). Integrity testing in the workplace. In J.C. Thomace (Ed.), *The comprehensive handbook of psychological testing* (Vol. 4). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Curphy, G.J. (2008). *Dr Gordy test results*. Retrieved from http://www.leadershipkeynote.net/on.

Den Hartog, D.N., & Belschak, F.D. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*, 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1296-4

Dotlich, D.L., & Cairo, P.C. (2003). *Why CEOs fail*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ellis, S.M., & Steyn, H.S. (2003). Practical significance (effect sizes) versus or in combination with statistical significance (p-values). *Management Dynamics, 12*(4), 51–53.

Engelbrecht, A.S., & Mahembe, B. (2015). The influence of integrity and ethical leadership on trust in the leader. *Management Dynamics, 24*(1), 2–10.

Furnham, A., & Taylor, J. (2004). *The dark side of behaviour at work: Understanding and avoiding employees leaving, thieving, and deceiving*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gentry, W.A., & Chappelow, C. (2009). Managerial derailment: Weaknesses that can be fixed. In R.B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 97–114). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

Gentry, W.A., Hannum, K.M., Ekelund, B.Z., & De Jong, A. (2007). A study of the discrepancy between self- and observer-ratings on managerial derailment characteristics of European managers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 16*, 295–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320701394188

Gentry, W.A., Mondore, S.P., & Cox, B.D. (2007). An exploratory study of managerial derailment characteristics and personality preferences. *Journal of Management Development, 26*, 857–873. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710710819348

Goleman, D. (1997). Beyond IQ: Developing the leadership competencies of emotional intelligence, in *2nd International Competency Conference*, 10-11 October 1997, London: n.p.

Green, J.D., & Sedikides, C. (2001). When do self-schemas shape social perception? The role of descriptive ambiguity. *Motivation and Emotion, 25*, 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010611922816

Guenole, N. (2014). Maladaptive personality at work: Exploring the darkness. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 7*, 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12114

Hogan, R. (1997). *Hogan development survey manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R. (2007). *Personality and the fate of organizations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hogan, E.J., Minnullina, G., Sheppard, L.J., Leith, I.D., & Crittenden, P.D. (2010). Response of phosphomonoesterase activity in the lichen Cladonia portentosa to nitrogen and phosphorus enrichment in a field manipulation experiment. *New Phytologist, 186*(4), 926–933.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G.J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493–504. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.6.493

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 40–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162

Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2009). Management derailment, personality assessment and mitigation. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (vol. 3, pp. 555–575). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2007). *The Hogan guide: Interpretation and use of Hogan inventories*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 169–180. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.169

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2010). Personality. In J.C. Scott & D.H. Reynolds (Eds.), *The handbook of workplace assessment: Evidenced based practices for selecting and developing organizational talent* (pp. 81–108). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership.

Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth*. New York: Norton.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765–780. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Kaiser, R.B., & Hogan, R. (2007). The dark side of discretion: Leader personality and organizational decline. In R. Hooijberg, J. Hunt, J. Antonakis, & K. Boal (Eds.), *Being there even when you are not: Leading through strategy, systems and structures. Monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 4, pp. 177–197). London: Elsevier Science.

Khan, F., Yusoff, R.M., & Khan, A. (2014). Job demands, burnout and resources in teaching a conceptual review. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 30*(1), 20–28.

Khan, N.Z.A., Imran, A., & Anwar, A. (2019). Destructive leadership and job stress: Causal effect of emotional exhaustion on job satisfaction of employees in call centres. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management, 11*(1), 135.

Koch, E.J. (2002). Relational schemas, self-esteem, and the processing of social stimuli. *Self and Identity, 1*, 271–279. https://doi.org/10.1080/152988602760124883

Kovach, B.E. (1989). Successful derailment: What fast-trackers can learn while they're off the track. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(2), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(89)90041-7

Kramer, R.J. (2008). Have we learned anything about leadership development? *Conference Board Review, 45*, 26–30.

Lombardo, M.M., & Eichinger, R.W. (1989). *Preventing derailment: What to do before it's too late.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Lombardo, M.M., & Eichinger, R.W. (2004). *The leadership machine*. Minneapolis, MN: Lominger.

Lombardo, M.M., & McCauley, C.D. (1988). *The dynamics of management derailment*. Technical Report No. 34. Greensboro, NC: Center For Creative Leadership.

Marks, L.M. (2007). Framework for facilitating adaptation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(5), 721–739. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810710779126

McCall, M.W. Jr., & Lombardo, M.M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed*. Technical Report No. 21. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Monga, M. (2016). Integrity and its antecedent: A unified conceptual framework of integrity. *The Journal of Developing Areas, 50*(5), 415–421.

Morrison, A.M., White, R.P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Mauer, K.F. (2002). *A comparison of tests of integrity registered with the Professional Board for Psychology*. Prepared for Nedcor, January, pp. 1–79.

Nazir, T., & Shah, S.F.H. (2014). Mediating effect of knowledge sharing between participative decision making, transformational leadership and organization performance. *Journal of Management Info, 1*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.31580/jmi.v1i1.2

Nelson, E., & Hogan, R. (2009). Coaching on the dark side. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 4*, 9–21.

Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F.L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 679–703. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.679

Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F.L. (1995). Integrity tests: Overlooked facts, resolved issues, and remaining questions about predictive validity, construct validity, and in-house research. *American Psychologist, 50*, 456–457. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.6.456

Palanski, M.E., & Yammarino, F.J. (2007). Integrity and leadership: Clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal, 25*(3), 171–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2007.04.006

Palanski, M.E., & Yammarino, F.J. (2009). Integrity and leadership: A multi-level conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(3), 405–420. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.008

Perschel, A. (2009). Avoiding the high cost of executive mis-fits. *ZurickDavis Great People, Great Results*, pp. 2–4.

Prince, D.W. (2005). Avoiding executive derailment: Individual and organisational responsibilities. *Business Leadership Review, 2*(1), 99–121.

Rasch, R., Shen, W., Davies, S.E., & Bono, J. (2008). *The development of a taxonomy of ineffective leadership behaviour*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA, April 10–12.

Rust, J. (1999). The validity of the Giotto Integrity Test. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27*, 755–768. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00277-3

Sackett, P.R., Burris, L.R., & Callahan, C. (1989). Integrity testing for personnel selection: An update. *Personnel Psychology, 2*, 491–529. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb00666.x

Sackett, P.R., & Wanek, J.E. (1996). New developments in the use of measures of honesty, integrity, conscientiousness, dependability, trustworthiness and reliability for personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(4), 787–830. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb02450.x

Schabracq, M.J. (2003). *Everyday well-being and stress in work and organisations*. In M.J. Schabracq, J.A.M. Winnubst, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The handbook of work & health psychology* (pp. 9–36). West Sussex: Wiley.

Schmidt, F.L., Ones, D.S., & Hunter, J.E. (1992). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 43*, 627–670. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.43.020192.003211

Sejeli, D.S., & Mansor, N.A. (2015). Leadership derailment: Does self-leadership matter? *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 5*, 22–26.

Shipper, F., & Dillard, J. (2000). A study of impending derailment and recovery of middle managers across career stages. *Human Resource Management, 39*, 331–347.

Smart, B.D. (1999). *Topgrading.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tang, K.Y., Dai, G., & De Meuse, K.P. (2013). Assessing leadership derailment factors in 3601 feedback differences across position levels and self-other agreement. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34*(4), 326–343. https:doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2011-0070

Tett, R.P., & Burnett, D.B. (2003). A personality trait based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 500–517. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.500

Tett, R.P., & Guterman, H.A. (2000). Situation trait relevance, trait expression, and cross-situational consistency: Testing a principle of trait activation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*, 397–423. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2000.2292

Thomassen, O.J., Strand, R., & Heggen, K. (2017). Exploring the concept of integrity: Toward a craft-inspired interpretation. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 7*(2), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.18291/njwls.v7iS2.96694

Thompson, H.J. (1949). *Prudentius* (Latin with an English translation). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Torregiante, K.M. (2005). *Destructive personality traits and leadership performance: A pattern-oriented approach.* Master's dissertation. North Carolina University.

VanFleet, D.D., & Griffin, R.W. (2006). Dysfunctional organization culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysfunctional work behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21,* 698–708. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610713244

Van Niekerk, A., & May, M.S. (2019). Co-constructing integrity: A conceptual framework. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde, 45*(0), a1498. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v45i0.1498

Van Velsor, E., & Leslie, J.B. (1995). Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Review, 9*, 62–72. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1995.9512032194

Van Velsor, E., & Leslie, J.B. (1996). Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Executives, 9*(4), 62–73. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1995.9512032194

Van Velsor, E., McCauley, C.D., & Ruderman, M.N. (2010). *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass-Wiley.

Watkins, M. (2003). *The first 90 days.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.