

The relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness mediated by cognitive trust and affective trust

P. Maharani & C.D. Riantoputra

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Leadership theories have shifted over the last few decades from focusing on objective measures of performance towards subordinates' evaluation of their leaders' behavior, relevant to team performance. Behavioral integrity, which refers to subordinates' perception of the patterns of word-deed alignment, is one of the most important factors that influence subordinates' evaluation of their leaders' effectiveness. We extend previous research by arguing that the importance of behavioral integrity on leader effectiveness is mediated by two forms of trust: cognitive trust, which refers to trust that is based on performance-relevant cognitions such as competence, reliability, and dependability; and affective trust, which refers to the emotional bonds between individuals that are grounded upon the expressions of genuine care and concern for the welfare of the other party. To test the hypotheses, we collected data from 215 employees in the service industry. Using parallel multiple regression by PROCESS, we find that the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness is fully mediated by cognitive trust ($b = 0.73$, $p < 0.01$) and affective trust ($b = 0.60$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that behavioral integrity only takes place when subordinates have cognitive and affective trust towards their leaders. This research is particularly important because it delineates the mechanism under which behavioral integrity affects leader effectiveness.

1 INTRODUCTION

Leadership theories have shifted over the last few decades from focusing on objective measures of performance towards subordinates' evaluation of their leaders' behaviors relevant to team performance (Hannah *et al.*, 2014). Leaders will have great influence if their subordinates see them as competent. An example of a leader considered effective is Ignatius Jonan, when he served as the CEO of Indonesia's train company. Before he served as the CEO of Indonesia's train company, people did not use trains. Under his leadership, trains went back to being one of the most popular forms of public transportation (Nugroho, 2012). On top of that, the company made immense profit in 2015, close to one trillion Rupiah (Khalifah, 2015). Jonan does what he says, so the Indonesian people believe and trust him (Sutianto, 2014).

Leader effectiveness refers to (1) leaders' behavior relevant to the organization's performance and (2) the outcomes of this behavior, reflected by the company's financial performance (DeGroot *et al.*, 2011). In this study, the concept of leader effectiveness is leader effectiveness behavior, which is measured subjectively through the subordinates' evaluation.

Leader effectiveness can be influenced by two factors, namely internal and external factors. The internal factors consist of personality traits (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011; Zaccaro, 2007), emotional intelligence (Riggio & Reichard, 2008; Rockstuhl *et al.*, 2011), and integrity (Kannan-Narasimhan & Lawrence, 2012; Simons *et al.*, 2015). The external factors consist of the types of company (Judge *et al.*, 2002; Hoffman *et al.*, 2011), the levels of positions in the company (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011), and the corporate culture (Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2007).

From the multitude of factors that influence the effectiveness of leaders, the relationship between integrity and leader effectiveness is very important because previous studies show

that integrity is the core of leader effectiveness (Soltani & Maupetit, 2015). An effective leader is one who consistently behaves in accordance with his/her values, expectations, and priorities (Salicru & Chelliah, 2014). The alignment or consistency between someone's words and actions is the definition of behavioral integrity (Simons *et al.*, 2015).

Simons (2002) found that a pattern between the leaders' words and actions assessed by subordinates is the basis of the formation of trust between leaders and subordinates, suggesting that behavioral integrity is an antecedent of trust between leaders and subordinates. Hoffman *et al.* (2011) strengthen the argument by explaining that from 25 individual differences, integrity is one of the main factors influencing leader effectiveness. Subordinates will pay more attention to the values reflected from their leaders' actions compared to from only their words.

Although some scholars argue that behavioral integrity directly influences leader effectiveness (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011; Kannan-Narasimhan & Lawrence, 2012; Salicru & Chelliah, 2014; Simons *et al.*, 2015), others are convinced that the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness is fully mediated by trust (e.g., Simons, 2002). When there is trust between leaders and subordinates, subordinates are likely to believe that their leaders will behave in accordance with their spoken values and are able to fulfill their promises. This would improve their performance, which is one way to measure leader effectiveness (DeGroot *et al.*, 2011). This kind of trust refers to cognitive trust (McAllister, 1995).

Besides cognitive trust, which refers to trust that is based on performance-relevant cognitions such as competence, responsibility, reliability, and dependability, there are emotional bonds between individuals that are grounded upon the expression of genuine care and the concern for the welfare of other parties, which is called affective trust (McAllister, 1995).

Teams that have better affective relationships show better team performance than other pairs that focus more on cognitive relationship (Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2009). Palanski, Kahai, and Yammarrino (2011) argue that affective trust partially mediates the relationship between behavioral integrity and team performance. When the interaction between leaders and subordinates happens more frequently and intensively, the relationship between them will be deep and mutual until there is an emotional bond between them. Leaders who have good interpersonal relationships with their subordinates will make their subordinates more willing to follow the leaders' direction, which will improve the team's performance. Team performance is one way to measure leader effectiveness by DeGroot *et al.* (2011).

Therefore, the study asks, "How is the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness? Is it directly related or is it mediated by cognitive trust and affective trust?"

1.1 Hypotheses

In an organizational context, behavioral integrity is the extent to which employees believe a leader will walk his/her talk. Previous studies show that behavioral integrity is directly related to leader effectiveness (Simons, 1999). In his study of hospitality managers, Simons (1999) found that the hotel manager with high behavioral integrity was reported to have more profit (i.e., have higher effectiveness) than the hotel manager with low behavioral integrity. Further, subordinates will pay more attention to the values that are reflected from the leaders' actions compared to from only words. The alignment between someone's words and actions is a form of behavioral integrity by Simons (2002). This hypothesis is supported by studies from Hoffman *et al.* (2011) and Parry & Protor-Thomson (2002), which argue that integrity is one of the main factors influencing leader effectiveness. Leaders with high behavioral integrity will also provide stability to subordinates by behaving in accordance to his/her values, which can influence subordinates to not only work to achieve their targets, but also to take initiative to improve overall effectiveness (Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2012). Thus, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: Behavioral integrity is positively associated with leader effectiveness behavior.

Although some scholars argue that behavioral integrity directly influences leader effectiveness (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011; Kannan-Narasimhan & Lawrence, 2012; Salicru & Chelliah, 2014; Simons *et al.*, 2015), others are convinced that the relationship between behavioral

integrity and leader effectiveness is fully mediated by trust. Simons (2002) states that behavioral integrity is an antecedent of trust. The patterns between the leaders' words and actions that subordinates perceive become the basis of formation of trust between leaders and subordinates (McAllister, 1995). Subordinates must perceive that their leader has high integrity, so that cognitive trust can be established between them (Kannan-Narasimhan & Lawrence, 2012).

Teams that have deep cognitive trust between leaders and subordinates show better performance than other teams that have only superficial trust (Erdem & 2003). Leaders' performance will increase if there is trust between them because subordinates acknowledge their leaders' competence. This is supported by a study from Lee, Gillespie, Mann, & Wearing (2010) that says that trust between leaders and subordinates will influence the leaders' performance. Johnson & Grayson (2005) also argue that cognitive trust between leaders and subordinates will increase subordinates' perception of leader effectiveness.

Subordinates' perceptions towards their leaders' behavioral integrity influences the establishment of trust between leaders and subordinates, which affects the positive consequences of job performance. Performance is one way of measuring leader effectiveness by DeGroot *et al.* (2011). Leaders who demonstrate alignment between their values and their actions can make subordinates understand what the leaders expect from their subordinates. Therefore, subordinates can optimize the efforts to achieve the leaders' expectations, which would increase team performance. This is supported by a study from Simons *et al.* (2015) that shows that cognitive trust fully mediates the relationship between behavioral integrity with the team's performance. Thus, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 2: Cognitive trust fully mediates the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness.

Some studies only use trust that focuses on the leaders' competence as a means to measure the relationship related to leaders' performance (Dirks, 2000; Lee *et al.*, 2010; Simons *et al.*, 2015), which refers to cognitive trust (McAllister, 1995). Subordinates can also believe in leaders because of an emotional bond between them, which refers to affective trust (McAllister, 1995). Cognitive and affective trust can be related to one another, but in the beginning of a relationship, it is important to establish cognitive trust first, then over time the interaction between the two will increase and become deep, so cognitive trust can become affective trust (McAllister, 1995). Asia, particularly Indonesia, has a strong culture of collectivism rather than individualism, so workers prioritize socio-emotional relationships in establishing business relationships, such as giving personal gifts, having lunch together, getting to know each other's families, etc. (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010).

Pairs of leaders and subordinates which have affective trust towards each other will make subordinates willing to follow their leaders' direction and this will eventually improve team performance (McAllister, 1995). Chua, Morris, & Ingram (2009) show that pairs of leaders and subordinates that have a better affective relationship show better team performance than other pairs that focus more on cognitive relationships. Chua, Morris, and Ingram's findings make us speculate that affective trust plays a larger role than cognitive trust in Indonesia.

The more frequent the interaction between leaders and subordinates, the bigger the chance of an emotional bond building between them, thus creating affective trust (Simons, 2002). As trust develops, subordinates will spend less time covering their backs and more time focusing on their jobs. Individuals who trust one another will develop higher quality social relationships, so they will help one another and go above and beyond the call of duty and work towards higher levels of performance (Palanski & Yammarino, 2011). Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino (2010) show affective trust mediates the relationship between behavioral integrity and the team leader's performance. Team performance is one way to measure the leader's effectiveness by DeGroot *et al.* (2011). Thus, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3: Affective trust fully mediates the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness.

2 METHODS

2.1 *Participants and procedure*

We tested the study hypothesis using the service industry in Jakarta and Bali. The participants (215 employees) were staff members from the service industry (finance and hotel industry) who were two levels directly below the leaders in the company structure and had been working for at least one year in their current organization. The companies in the service industry were selected because those companies have a dynamic and unpredictable environment. The greater the change in the environment, the companies will increasingly need leaders who are flexible, able to change, and ability to handle work activities and diverse problems (Chen, 2007). The original number of participants under study was 292 employees, yielding an overall response rate of 78.43 percent.

2.2 *Measures*

All scales were adapted from previous research, and back-to-back translations were applied. The data were provided by the subordinates' evaluation of their leaders. To limit common method bias, we used psychological separation (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003), which means to separate the measurement of the predictor and the criterion variables to make it appear that the measurement of the leadership effectiveness is not connected to the measurement of the behavioral integrity, cognitive trust, and affective trust. All scales used a six point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree).

2.2.1 *Leader effectiveness*

Leader effectiveness was measured using 14 items of the leader effectiveness behavior scale adapted from DeGroot *et al.* (2011). The reliability coefficient of this scale was 0.95, and a sample item of this scale was "My leader helped coordinate the team's activities".

2.2.2 *Behavioral integrity*

Behavioral integrity was measured using six items of the behavioral integrity scale adapted from Simons (2007). A sample item of this scale was "My leader delivers on promises". The reliability coefficient of this scale was 0.85.

2.2.3 *Cognitive trust and affective trust*

Trust was measured using an affect and cognition based trust scale from McAllister (1995). This scale consists of eleven items, six items assessing the level of cognitive trust ($\alpha = 0.82$), and five items assessing the level of affective trust ($\alpha = 0.82$). A sample item from this cognitive trust scale was "I can rely on the leader of my leader not to make my job more difficult by careless work", and a sample item of the affective trust scale was "We, my leader and I, can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes".

2.2.4 *Control variables*

We controlled the type of industry (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011), and the leaders' age, education and tenure (Andrews, Kacmar, & Kacmar, 2015).

3 RESULTS

The mean, standard deviation, and correlation are presented in Table 1. It shows that behavioral integrity, cognitive trust, and affective trust between leaders and subordinates have significant positive correlations with leader effectiveness behavior. Behavioral integrity is positively correlated to leader effectiveness behavior ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.01$). Cognitive trust and affective trust have significant correlations to leader effectiveness behavior ($r = 0.66$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.67$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 1 also shows that there is potential multicollinearity between behavioral integrity and cognitive trust ($r = 0.85, p < 0.01$). After undergoing a collinearity test, there is no multicollinearity between behavioral integrity and cognitive trust because the value of tolerance was above 0.1 and the value of VIF was under 10 (Field, 2009).

To analyze the relationship between behavioral integrity, cognitive trust, affective trust and leader effectiveness behavior, we conducted a parallel multiple regression analysis using PROCESS by Hayes (2013).

Table 2 shows that behavioral integrity is significantly correlated with cognitive trust ($R^2 = 0.73, p < 0.01$), which means that 73% of cognitive trust could be explained by behavioral integrity. Behavioral integrity was also significantly correlated with affective trust ($R^2 = 0.60, p < 0.01$), which means that 60% of affective trust could be explained by behavioral integrity.

Table 3 reveals that leader effectiveness behavior is not predicted by behavioral integrity ($\beta = -0.03, p > 0.05$). The relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness is fully mediated by cognitive trust ($\beta = 0.74, p < 0.01$) and affective trust ($\beta = 0.65, p < 0.01$). This indicates that the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness

Table 1. Mean, standard deviation, and correlation.

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Age	4.66	1.56	1						
Education	4.18	1.56	-0.21**	1					
Tenure	4.86	1.80	0.54	-0.08	1				
Behavioral integrity	4.72	0.70	0.00	-0.01	0.01	1			
Cognitive trust	4.79	0.68	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.85**	1		
Affective trust	4.85	0.73	0.09	-0.03	0.04	0.78**	0.77**	1	
Leader effectiveness	5.05	0.68	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.61**	0.66**	0.67**	1

Table 2. Regression coefficients, standard errors, and model summary information of parallel multiple mediation.

Antecedent	Consequent								
	M ₁ (CT)			M ₂ (AT)			Y (LE)		
	Coeff	SE	P	Coeff	SE	p	Coeff	SE	p
X (Behavioral integrity)	0.79	0.03	<0.01	0.66	0.04	<0.01	1.36	0.13	<0.01
M ₁ (Cognitive trust)	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.94	0.24	<0.01
M ₂ (Affective trust)	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.99	0.21	<0.01
Constant	6.11	1	<0.01	5.21	1.12	<0.01	32.16	3.65	<0.01
	R ² = 0.73			R ² = 0.60			R ² = 0.49		
	F (3, 206) = 184.94, p < 0.01			F (3, 206) = 102.20, p < 0.01			F (5, 204) = 39.06, p < 0.01		

Table 3. Mediation effect.

Effect	Coeff	Explanation
Total effect	1.36**	–
Direct effect	-0.03	–
Indirect effect 1 (<i>Behavioral integrity</i> and Leader effectiveness mediated by <i>Cognitive trust</i>)	0.74**	Fully mediated
Indirect effect 2 (<i>Behavioral integrity</i> and Leader effectiveness mediated by <i>Affective trust</i>)	0.65**	Fully mediated

cannot be explained simply by behavioral integrity alone, but through mediators, which in this study are cognitive and affective trust. This corresponds to what was said by Hayes (2013) that a predictor variable can be said to influence or be directly related to the criterion variable if it has a coefficient with a value greater than zero (0.00).

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 *Theoretical and practical implications*

The results of this study indicate that cognitive and affective trust fully mediate the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness. This means that leaders who are considered to have high behavioral integrity will have cognitive and affective trust with their subordinates. The better the quality of cognitive and affective trust between leaders and subordinates, the stronger the subordinates' perception that their leaders are effective.

This study contributes to the current discussion of the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness by showing that behavioral integrity must be mediated by trust, which is cognitive trust and affective trust. These results are in line with McAllister (1995) who states that the subordinates' evaluation of the perceived pattern of alignment between the leaders' words and actions will make subordinates willing to be in vulnerable situations because subordinates see that their leaders consistently behave in accordance with their spoken values, and are able to fulfill their promises. When subordinates feel that their leaders are not reliable or trustworthy, they become unable to work in accordance with the strategies developed by their leaders. This leads to difficulties in team performance. This is because leaders who show consistency between their values and their actions are able to make their subordinates understand what the leaders expect from them. Therefore, subordinates can optimize their efforts to achieve the leaders' expectations for them without having to guess what their leaders expect. Achieving the leaders' expectations increases team performance, which is one way to measure leader effectiveness (Simons *et al.*, 2015).

These findings are consistent with Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino (2011), who argue that longer time working with each other results in more intense interaction between superiors and subordinates. The trust between the two will then become deeper until it reaches the stage at which the subordinates can communicate their problems with their leaders and believe that their leaders will listen. Subordinates who have emotional ties with their leaders will have higher quality of social relationships, where the leaders will help their subordinates beyond their duties as leaders. When the subordinates have reached this stage, the team will have more integrated values, so the subordinates will follow the direction of their superiors in achieving the company's goals. This will lead to an increased team performance.

The relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness fully mediated by cognitive trust suggests that to be effective in leading, leaders must consistently behave according to their values. If a leader does not consistently behave in accordance with his/her spoken values, that leader will not be perceived as an effective leader by his/her subordinates.

4.2 *Limitations*

Like all studies, this study has a limitation. The data for the predictor and criterion variables in this study were obtained from the same source. This can potentially lead to the emergence of a common method bias (Podsakoff, 2003). However, to control the possibility of a common method bias, we used psychological separation (Podsakoff, 2003) by separating the measurement into three booklet forms.

Fortunately, the strengths of this study outweigh its limitation. First, this study has a considerably large number of respondents (215 samples) with also a very high response rate (78.46%). The large number of respondents can improve generalization, and is increasingly able to describe the population. Second, the respondents of this study were leaders who work in the companies, while many leadership research use students with no work experience as

respondents. Third, the research design has considered the potential of a common method bias, and has adopted strategies (e.g., psychological separation) to deal with it.

5 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to examine whether cognitive trust and affective trust fully mediate the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness. Our findings suggest that there is no significant relationship found between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness behavior, and cognitive trust and affective trust fully mediates the relationship between behavioral integrity and leader effectiveness. This research is particularly important because it delineates the mechanism under which behavioral integrity impacts leader effectiveness, so information on the practices to improve leader effectiveness can be provided.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, M.C., Kacmar, K.M. & Kacmar, C. (2015) The Interactive Effects of Behavioral Integrity and Procedural Justice on Employee Job Tension. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 126 (3), 371–79. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1951-4.
- Chua, R.Y.J., Morris, M.W. & Ingram, P. (2009) Guanxi versus Networking: Distinctive Configurations of Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust. *Networks of Chinese and American Managers*. 40 (3), 490–508.
- DeGroot, T., Aime, F., Johnson, S.G. & Kluemper, D. (2011) Does Talking the Talk Help Walking the Walk? An Examination of the Effect of Vocal Attractiveness in Leader Effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 22 (4), 680–689. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.008.
- Detiknews. (2017) *Kisah Jonan Perbaiki KAI: Dari Rapor Merah Hingga Untung Hampir Rp 1 T.* [Online] Available from: <http://news.detik.com/berita/d-2938862/kisah-jonan-perbaiki-kai-dari-rapor-merah-hingga-untung-hampir-rp-1-t>. [Accessed 25th January 2017].
- Dirks, K.T. (2000) Trust in Leadership and Team Performance: Evidence from NCAA Basketball. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 85 (6), 1004–1012.
- Erdem, F. & Ozen, J. (2003) Cognitive and Affective Dimensions of Trust in Developing Team Performance. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*. 9 (5/6), 131–135. doi:10.1108/13527590310493846.
- Hannah, S.T., Sumanth, J.J., Lester, P. & Cavarretta, F. (2014) Debunking the False Dichotomy of Leadership Idealism and Pragmatism: Critical Evaluation and Support of Newer Genre Leadership Theories. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 35 (5), 598–621. doi:10.1002/job.1931.
- Hannes, L., Michael, P. & Tony, S. (). Authentic Leadership and Behavioral Integrity as Drivers of Follower Commitment and Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 107 (3), 255–264. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-10-36-1.
- Hayes, A.F. (2013) *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. 1st edition. New York, The Guilford Press.
- Hoffman, B.J., Woehr, D.J. Maldagen-Youngjohn, R. & Lyons, B.D. (2011) Great Man or Great Myth? A Quantitative Review of the Relationship between Individual Differences and Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 84 (2), 347–381. doi:10.1348/096317909X485207.
- Johnson, D. & Grayson, K. (2005) Cognitive and Affective Trust in Service Relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, Special Section: Attitude and Affect, 58 (4), 500–507. doi:10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00140-1.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R. & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002) Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87 (4), 765–780.
- Kannan-Narasimhan, R. & Lawrence, B.S. (2012) Behavioral Integrity: How Leader Referents and Trust Matter to Workplace Outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 111 (2), 165–178. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1199-9.
- Kwantes, C.T. & Boglarsky, C.A. (2007) Perceptions of Organizational Culture, Leadership Effectiveness and Personal Effectiveness across Six Countries. *Journal of International Management*. 13 (2), 204–230. doi:10.1016/j.intman.2007.03.002.
- Lee, P., Gillespie, N., Mann, L. & Wearing, A. (2010) Leadership and Trust: Their Effect on Knowledge Sharing and Team Performance. *Management Learning*. 41 (4), 473–491. doi:10.1177/1350507610362036.

- McAllister, D.J. (1995) Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 38 (1), 24–59. doi:10.2307/256727.
- Nugroho, S.A. (2012) Transformasi PT KAI: Mengurai Benang Kusut. *SWA.co.id*. November 29. [Online] Available from: <http://swa.co.id/swa/trends/management/transformasi-pt-kai-mengurai-benang-kusut>.
- Palanski, M.E., Kahai, S.S. & Yammarino, F.J. (2011) Team Virtues and Performance: An Examination of Transparency, Behavioral Integrity, and Trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 99 (2), 201–216. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0650-7.
- Parry, K.W. & Proctor-Thomson, S.B. (2002) Perceived Integrity of Transformational Leaders in Organisational Settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 35 (2), 75–96. doi:10.1023/A:1013077109223.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y. & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003) Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 88 (5), 879–903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.
- Riggio, R.E. & Reichard, R.J. (2008) The Emotional and Social Intelligences of Effective Leadership: An Emotional and Social Skill Approach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 23 (2), 169–185. doi:10.1108/02683940810850808.
- Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. & Annen, H. (2011) Beyond General Intelligence (IQ) and Emotional Intelligence (EQ): The Role of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) on Cross-Border Leadership Effectiveness in a Globalized World. *Journal of Social Issues*. 67 (4), 825–840. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01730.x.
- Salicru, S. & Chelliah, J. (2014) Messing with Corporate Heads? Psychological Contracts and Leadership Integrity. *Journal of Business Strategy*. 35 (3), 38–46. doi:10.1108/JBS-10-2013-0096.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S.S.K. & Peng, A.C. (2011) Cognition-Based and Affect-Based Trust as Mediators of Leader Behavior Influences on Team Performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 96 (4), 863–871. doi:10.1037/a0022625.
- Simons, T. (2002) Behavioral Integrity: The Perceived Alignment Between Managers' Words and Deeds as a Research Focus. *Organization Science*. 13 (1), 18–35. doi:10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543.
- Simons, T., Friedman, R., Liu, L.A. & Parks, J.M. (2007) Racial Differences in Sensitivity to Behavioral Integrity: Attitudinal Consequences, In-Group Effects, and 'Trickle Down' Among Black and Non-Black Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 92 (3), 650–665. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.650.
- Simons, T., Leroy, H., Collewaert, V. & Masschelein, S. (2015) How Leader Alignment of Words and Deeds Affects Followers: A Meta-Analysis of Behavioral Integrity Research." *Journal of Business Ethics*. 132 (4), 831–844. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2332-3.
- Simons, T.L. (1999) Behavioral Integrity as a Critical Ingredient for Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. 12, 89–104. doi:10.1108/09534819910263640.
- Soltani, B. & Maupetit, C. (2015) Importance of Core Values of Ethics, Integrity and Accountability in the European Corporate Governance Codes. *Journal of Management & Governance*. 19 (2), 259–284. doi:10.1007/s10997-013-9259-4.
- Sutianto, F.D. (2014) Selama Di KAI, Jonan Pernah Jadi Kondektur Hingga Tidur Di Kereta. *Detik-finance*, October 28. [Online] Available from: <https://finance.detik.com/berita-ekonomi-bisnis/d-2731867/selama-di-kai-jonan-pernah-jadi-kondektur-hingga-tidur-di-kereta>.
- Taras, V., Kirkman, B.L. & Steel, P. (2010) Examining the Impact of Culture's Consequences: A Three-Decade, Multilevel, Meta-Analytic Review of Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 95 (3), 405–439. doi:10.1037/a0018938.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007) Trait-Based Perspectives of Leadership. *The American Psychologist*. 62 (1), 16–47. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6.