The book explores the five dimensions of corporate life: cultural, interpersonal, organizational, civic, and environmental. There is a focus on relationships and the implications of understanding integrity as a whole, which is challenging for corporations. The method for improving the integrity of relationships is to analyze, evaluate, and redesign communication patterns, which also include nonverbal behaviors. The ultimate goal of this book is to display what corporations would look like if they had integrity and how to steer them in that direction. The book explores corporate relations by examining communication patterns so that we will understand the challenges of integrity and learn what is necessary to meet them.

In each of the five dimensions of corporate life, the integrity challenge is to develop appropriate relationships for individuals, corporations, and civic organizations. Improving the quality of these relationships will improve integrity.

The Enron scandal is a well-known example of a lack of corporate integrity and this particular case resulted in distrust towards this corporation. Corporate conduct, good or bad, makes a much greater footprint than ever before. A perception of the overall direction of global corporations today is relative to what it must have been like traveling on the Titanic, slowly moving in the wrong direction, but too big and powerful to change course. This statement describes the corruption scandal of Enron Corporation, which eventually led to its corporate downfall. The comical picture refers to Kenneth Lay, who served as the CEO and Chairman of Enron at the time of the scandal. Enron was too large and powerful to suddenly change the direction of its existence, so it sank as a corporation, and Ken essentially fled with shareholders’ wealth, as their once significant investments into Enron dissolved to nothing.

Kaptein and Wempe apply these meanings to corporate integrity; the consistency aspect of integrity refers to the union of words and deeds, the relational aspect refers to the multiple relationships with various stakeholders, and the inclusion meaning refers to the integration of the ethical theories of virtue ethics, deontology, and utilitarianism in guiding corporate decisions. Pursuing a worthwhile purpose is the notion of a good corporate purpose.
This book explores the five dimensions of corporate integrity:

**Cultural** Most fundamental dimension; culture holds things together—how we relate to persons, experiences, things

**Interpersonal** Focuses on relationships that define the self

**Organizational** Actions in alignment with their purposes

**Social** Corporate relationships to society

**Natural** Corporate relationships to nature

All five dimensions of integrity must be integrated to achieve a high degree of corporate integrity. Cultural and natural provide the context, or contain the other three dimensions. Social contains organizational, organizational contains interpersonal.

**CHALLENGES OF CORPORATE INTEGRITY**

Culture challenge is to be open to differences and disagreements.

Interpersonal challenge is to acknowledge the relationships that constitute one’s relational self.

Organizational challenge is to ensure consistency between organizational purpose and conduct.

Social challenge is for corporations to develop cooperative relationships with other private and government agencies.

Natural challenge is the inclusion of corporations in the natural environment so that they acknowledge the links between their fate and the fate of the earth.

### Theories of Corporate Responsibility

**The classic theory:** Owners and investors are interested in increasing shareholder value.

**The contractual theory:** Business organizations are comprised of various contracts among individuals and groups, arranged for the purpose of satisfying their interests. This theory gives priority to the contract with shareholders and their interest in profit maximization.

**The stakeholder view:** Corporations are constituted by the various groups that have a stake in their conduct. It is a membership perspective; the corporation can only exist with all stakeholders’ involvement.

**The corporate agent theory:** The corporation is a decision maker and qualifies as an agent if it meets three conditions: the capacity to make decisions, the presence of real options or choices, and the ability to give reasons for a choice. Corporations are designed to make decisions to provide structure for persons to decide together what the corporation should do.

**The corporate citizen theory:** Builds on the stakeholder and agent theories and adds to them an awareness of the civic context in which corporations exist. This view imagines corporations as belonging to civil society with similar rights and duties as other citizens.

### Models of Corporate Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories of Corporations</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Notions of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>Self-interested individuals</td>
<td>Property of owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>Self-interested individuals</td>
<td>Nexus of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Members of stakeholder groups</td>
<td>Constituted by stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Agent</td>
<td>Persons and personnel</td>
<td>Decision maker with internal decision making structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Persons, personnel and citizens</td>
<td>Corporate decision maker as citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Dimensions of corporate integrity:*

- Cultural
- Interpersonal
- Organizational
- Social
- Natural

*Integrity challenges:*

- Openness to differences and disagreements
- Relational wholesomeness
- Worthwhile purpose
- Civic cooperation
- Natural prosperity
COMMUNICATION MODELS

Looking at corporations as a series of communication patterns makes it clear that they are fundamentally social constructions. Humans have become resources. Communication patterns are not all that easy to change, because we are usually unaware of them.

**Post office model** – one isolated individual has an idea in his head, puts it in some form, and sends it to another, whom receives it, decodes it, and sends back a response. The connection between individual does not have much texture.

**Contextual model** – speakers and listeners are continually relying on, as well as continually maintaining and changing, their context. Individuals participate in communication, and the context is seen as an integral part of the communicative process. This creates an awareness of texture by providing access to the ways in which individuals belong to the relationship. Belonging to the same context not only adds value in family and civic relationships, but also in relationships at work.

CHAPTER TWO: CULTURAL INTEGRITY AS OPENNESS

This chapter presents a method for examining and changing communication patterns and examines the meaning of cultural integrity as openness to differences and disagreements. As well, it outlines a method of examining and changing communication patterns, and displays that the capacity for dialogue is an essential element in the creation of corporate integrity. When we can engage in dialogue, we can begin to explore and change the communication patterns on each of the five dimensions of corporate integrity.

**Pearce’s four communicative culture types:**

1) Monocultural communicators use community’s stories to provide coherence and coordination. The logical force of this communication is prefigurative – people rely on the past to interpret correct actions. Monocultural patterns are typical of traditional cultures where people treat others as members, and no one seriously questions the community’s beliefs.

2) Ethnocentric communicators imitate the monocultural communicators in not placing their resources at risk. They never question their own norms or assumptions. They treat others as non-natives, so see others as inferior and their stories as wrong.

3) Modernistic communicators are willing to put their resources at risk. They can evaluate and discard their stories and traditions because these traditions have lost their sacred status. Modernistic communicators achieve coherence by stressing the new and their belief in progress. Since what is new is better, they can discard their old stories and beliefs without regret.

4) Cosmopolitan communicators give primacy to coordination rather than coherence. The other three culture types sought coordination through coherence. Cosmopolitan communicators rely on sophisticated practices of coordination that allow participants to value other resources and at the same time, maintain a connection to the truth of their resources.

**STRATEGIES FOR MOVING TOWARD COSMOPOLITAN COMMUNICATION:**

- Promote curiosity in monocultural contexts
- Imagine more resources in ethnocentric contexts
- Set boundaries for modernistic contexts
The following is a matrix of Pearce’s four types of communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monocultural</th>
<th>Ethnocentric</th>
<th>Modernistic</th>
<th>Cosmopolitan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Belief in stories</td>
<td>Belief in us/them stories</td>
<td>Faith in progress, and the new</td>
<td>Primacy given to coordination rather than coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Coordination achieved through coherence</td>
<td>Enacting repetitive patterns</td>
<td>Stress on change, progress, and the new</td>
<td>Capacity to change communication patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mystery</strong></td>
<td>Embedded in stories</td>
<td>Supports us/them stories</td>
<td>Disenchantment of the world</td>
<td>Awareness of “more than can be said”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment of Others</strong></td>
<td>Others as native</td>
<td>Not as native</td>
<td>Not as native</td>
<td>Both as native and not as native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment of Resources</strong></td>
<td>Resources not put at risk</td>
<td>Not at risk</td>
<td>Not at risk</td>
<td>Both at risk and not at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Logic</strong></td>
<td>Prefigurative and contextual</td>
<td>Prefigurative and contextual</td>
<td>Implicative practical reflexive</td>
<td>Practical and reflexive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER THREE: INTERPERSONAL INTEGRITY AS RELATIONAL WHOLENESS**

This chapter demonstrates the significance of the book’s focus on relationships and explores the interpersonal challenge of relational wholeness. The matrix is an illustrative representation of the realistic, office, and ideal images of family, civic, and work relationships.

- **Realistic image** refers to experiences; separation and inequality.
  - Family relationships display each member of the family spinning in his or her own circle. Civic relationships are portrayed by citizens giving things to the government without receiving anything in return. Work relationships show significant difference in size between person, representing the differences between management and workers.

- **Official image** refers to the image projected by their culture.
  - Family relationships are portrayed by a family with a house and a dog. Civic relationships include people receiving things from the government. Work relationships are represented by a traditional organizational chart.

- **Ideal image** refers to the image of relationship they would desire; connection and equality.
  - Family relationships are represented by a set of family members connected to each other. Civic relationships are portrayed by citizens giving and receiving. Work relationships are pictured by people working together in work teams.
Official Images of Work Relationships

1) Master-and-servant image – the notion of obedience; the servant is obedient to the master. This image belonged to common law and served as the legal precedent for the adjudication of labor management relationships.

2) Market image – workers and managers see the workplace as a market place where they trade their respective goods, depending on the dynamics of supply and demand. The “Law of Reciprocity” states that everyone who does anything for someone else expects to be paid back eventually in one form or another. As a moral or deontic virtue, reciprocity – based on cooperation - is more than deciding what one must pay to get someone’s services. Reciprocity is recognizing that someone has contributed something worthwhile, and responding in an appropriate manner.

3) Teamwork image – acknowledges a relationship of cooperation by referring to employee during instances of clarifying a common vision, developing new strategies, and solving problems. Teams can facilitate personal development, but that should not be their primary focus. The primary focus should be mutual participation in the building of an organization that achieves its goals.

4) Entrepreneurial image – exemplifies faith in the new over the old, and appears willing to disregard the past for the sake of the future. An entrepreneur is an initiator of new ideas, products, and processes that keep the economy growing; success of private enterprise depends on entrepreneurs.

Ideal Images of Family Relationships

1) The mother-and-child image: humans are not programmed to be greedy or selfish; they are wired to develop in and through cooperative relationships. This cooperation is based on mutual dependency. Seeking and maintaining contact with others is a primary motivating principle in human beings, and such contact is an innate survival mechanism. The building blocks of secure bonds are emotional accessibility and responsiveness.

2) The family dinner image: The ideal purpose of family dinners is to enjoy and enhance family relationships. Participants are in tune with the security and pleasure of simply being together. Dependency on each other can go easily unnoticed, because it is natural. The image of relationship that emerges here is of people who carefully engage in mutual storytelling, and who nurture the possibilities of continuing the unfinished stories that project each one’s own best possibilities.

Ideal Images of Civic Relationships

A citizen is a member of a political community among and with others. To participate in, or at least to have your views represented in, the process of making decisions about the communities to which you belong is the first condition of citizenship. The republican view of citizenship states that “citizens are neighbors bound together either by block nor by contract but by their common concerns and common participation in the search for common solutions to common conflicts.”

Hannah Arendt states: “Power is actualized only where word and deed have not parted company, where words are not empty and deeds not brutal, where words are not used to veil intentions but to disclose realities, and deeds are not used to violate and destroy but to establish relations and create new realities.”

The need for security and the right to participate according to Robert Kegan declares that if the organization chooses the current state of its employees’ development, then the employees’ desire to grow will probably drive them out of the company to another place where they can pursue their lifeplan. If the organization, on the other hand, chooses to see its employees as people involved in a process of growth and learning, then they will need to provide the security that facilitates such growth, similar to how a family relationship provides a secure base for exploration and innovation.
The purpose of creating a standard for interpersonal relationships at work was not to say exactly what managers and workers should do in particular situations, but rather to provide a guideline to use in deciding what to do. The challenge of developing secure civic reciprocal relationships may seem unrealistic for some corporations.

**CHAPTER FOUR: ORGANIZATION INTEGRITY AS PURSUING A WORTHWHILE**

This chapter states that a corporation’s purpose depends on its place in larger social systems, which also contain nonprofit corporations and government agencies. This chapter also shows that relationships that are secure, civic, and reciprocal fit with pursuing a corporation’s worthwhile purposes.

**The Economic Perspective of Corporate Purpose**

This perspective dominates most conversations in the United States and the rest of the developed world. For many economists, the worth of something is not connected to purpose but to price. Consumers determine something’s worth by how much they will pay for it.

**The Management Perspective of Corporate Purpose**

David Packard describes this perspective: “I think many people assume, wrongly, that a company exists simply to make money. While this is an important result of a company’s existence, we have to go deeper and find the real reason for our being. As we investigate this, we inevitably come to the conclusion that a group of people get together and exist as an institution that we call a company so they are able to accomplish something collectively that they could not accomplish separately – they make a contribution to society, a phrase which sounds trite but is fundamental.”

**The Civic Perspective of Corporate Purpose**

This perspective has roots in Aristotle’s civic ethics, which assumed that leading a good life was only possible in the political realm. Today, there is agreement that nonprofits belong to the civic realm, but some question where for-profits belong.

There are two basic types of nonprofits: those that serve their members (professional associations) and those that serve the public (education, health care, social services).

For-profits have characteristics 1 and 2; they can distribute profits to owners, so differ from nonprofits with characteristic 3. Characteristics 4 and 6 relate more to the notion of purpose. As for characteristic 5, for-profits are not voluntary, and acknowledging workers as citizens requires that workers should not be forced to work.

If organizations’ communication patterns are designed so that the people who participate in those patterns work together in a decision making process, and if the process is guided by the organization’s purposes rather than the purpose of the individuals involved, then it makes sense to see the decision as a corporate decision.

“The glue that holds all relationships together -- including the relationship between the leader and the led is trust, and trust is based on integrity.”

--Brian Tracy
This chapter shows how civil society serves as the context for corporations cooperating with other agencies in civil society in order to fulfill a city’s mission. The idea that corporations should cooperate with communities and governments has become a standard requirement of corporate citizenship. Social systems contain nonprofit corporations and government agencies in addition to corporations. Corporations should give something back to society for providing them with resources such as an industrious population, an educated workforce, and the social infrastructure necessary for corporations to exist.

Corporate integrity does not focus so much on the identity of corporations as on the relationships among corporations and the other members of the whole to which they belong. Corporations almost always exist in cities and towns. Emphasizing the corporation’s urban context allows us to think of the global economy as happening in some place, rather than as merely an abstract category. By seeing corporations in the context of cities, we can imagine the social and political conversations that provide the communicative context in which corporations exist. Cities and corporations are both communities and agents.

Kenneth Boulding’s triad of threat, exchange, and integration presents three different ways to manage a system. The threat strategy says either you do this or you will be punished. The exchange strategy says if you do this, then you will get this in return. The integration strategy says that we can do it together. These three strategies parallel the three sectors of society: the government (threat), economic (exchange), and civic (integration).

SIX RELATIONAL MODELS BETWEEN CORPORATIONS AND CITY GOVERNMENTS

1) The ownership model has been determined by who owns what; the owner controls the happenings.
2) The unconscious model is where the corporation does not even recognize the city’s existence.
3) The business leader model assumes that those who know how to run a business also know how to run a city.
4) The competitive market model interprets the corporate/city relationship as similar to the competitive relationships among suppliers.
5) The philanthropic model views corporations as civic benefactors. Corporations have set up foundations, contributed to various civic events, and promoted corporate philanthropy within this business community.
6) The partnership model involves corporations with community groups and government agencies to address common economic, social, and environmental problems.

Although cities may have quite different missions, like corporations, they must have some good purpose, and strive to be good cities. John Friedmann defines a city as an environment where people can flourish: “Every human being has the right, by nature, to the full development of their innate intellectual, physical, and spiritual capabilities in the context of wider communities. This is the right to human flourishing, and I regard it as the most fundamental of human rights.”

CHAPTER SIX: ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY AS NATURAL PROSPERITY

Corporate integrity, as this chapter demonstrates, requires not only that corporations engage in cooperative endeavors with cities, but that they also switch from developing human prosperity at the expense of the environment to developing natural prosperity that includes the flourishing of human and nonhuman nature. In addition, the final dimension of corporate integrity is addressed by exploring the container of both cities and corporations: the natural environment.

Understanding the relationship between corporations and nature may seem to rely completely on human imagination and knowledge. We can hear nature by listening to our bodies, as we are creatures of nature. One way to understand an organization’s view of nature is to review how it is designed to care for the health of its members. Some work communities have been designed so they are largely divorced from the rhythms of water.
Nature can be brutal to human communities, from earthquakes to mudslides to hurricanes – and destroy livelihoods. Instead of participating in modernistic conversations about how to adjust our communities to fit into a technological age, we need to begin talking about how to fit technology into human age.

The following are three global environmental issue-related conversations that represent the complexity of current debates about the natural environment as the context for corporate integrity and corporate conduct:

1) United Nations’ conversations about sustainability – study climate patterns and weather forecasting; global weather information standardized and tracked for changes; key concept of national agendas was to agree on social and environmental concerns; central meaning to meet current needs should not deny future generations the capacity to meet their needs.

1972 The Limits of Growth conclusion: “If the present growth trends in work population, industrialization, pollution, food production, and resource depletion continue unchanged, the limits of growth on this planet will be reached sometime within the next one hundred years. The most probable results will be a sudden and uncontrollable decline in both population and industrial capacity.”

Since the United Nations has not been elevated to a position where it can enforce laws, and some nations have been unwilling to sign international treaties on environmental issues, the conversations about sustainability have lacked a global agent that would parallel the role of city governments.

2) Bretton Woods conversations about the world trade and finance – the US dollar became the currency to which national currencies were linked; the dominance of US in the financial and trade arrangements was to have significant consequences on trade and development conversations in the coming decades.

3) Ecology conversations about the integrity of nature – Aldo Leopold’s land ethic principle “A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.” Schumacher’s notion that small is beautiful states that humans are part of a natural environment that has limits. Arnold Naess’ deep ecology movement proposes a transformation from a ‘nature as a resource for humans’ view of life to ‘humans as one aspect of nature’ view.

**FOUR THEMES OF NATURAL INTEGRITY**

i) **Asking the right question**: solutions will come from imagining how to change the system. Questions point to their answers; question how to redesign the relationships between the market system and nature, the answer might be to join with others in a cooperative effort not only to develop appropriate regulations, but to develop education programs to change the expectations of the social systems. Must ask more than one question; the right set of questions will include all five dimensions of corporate integrity. Imagine what types of actions are appropriate for different dimensions of an issue.

ii) **The principle of subsidiarity**: “the authority of more distant levels of administration is subsidiary to the authority of more local levels, which allow a greater opportunity for direct citizen engagement.” This principle suggests addressing issues at the lowest level possible to make an adequate response. Direct involvement at the neighborhood and city level can prepare citizens for representative participation at higher levels.

iii) **Setting boundaries**: corporations function in a civic context that sets formal and informal boundaries, from laws to financial reporting. “No business, global business included, can properly function as business unless it draws upon and nurtures the non-market environment of civil society in which it is more or less embedded.” Four principles that unify human and nonhuman life:

- Respect and care for the community of life,
- Ecological integrity,
- Social and economic justice,
- Democracy, nonviolence, and peace.

To experience boundaries, corporations need to rely on their membership in the global civil society rather than on their possession of global resources. Just as corporations have an obligation to promote the mission of cities, they also have an obligation to promote the development of international laws and regulations that will create a context in which they can exist cooperatively with others.

iv) **Natural prosperity**: when government agencies refuse to proceed with caution, it is more difficult for corporations, since they require appropriate regulations not only to improve the systems in which they operate, but also to keep a level playing field among competitors in the same market. Corporations can take advantage of this denial or they can address it and join in exploring how to design conversations that focus on flourishing human and nonhuman nature.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CORPORATE INTEGRITY AND ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP

This chapter explores how civic leaders, both inside and outside corporations, can engage in the process of designing conversations that will promote integrity in all five dimensions of corporate life. Also, it explores the leader’s role in designing corporate integrity, and clarifies three key ideas: the meanings of integrity, the rationale for a civic perspective, and the idea that corporations are ongoing communication patterns. When communication patterns do not promote corporate integrity, organizational leaders need to change them. This process of leading by changing communication patterns is the theme of this final chapter.

By connecting the five dimensions of corporate integrity, they should reinforce each other. Progress in creating integrity in one dimension should aid the process of creating integrity in the others. Work on one dimension can influence the other dimensions, especially if people include all five dimensions in their ongoing communications. Adequate responses to many current issues in corporate ethics would benefit from exploring the challenges they present and the questions they raise on all five dimensions of corporate integrity.

McMahon’s three different types of authority:

**E-authority**, the authority of experts; if a person knows how to do something one cannot, the authority is granted for that person to do the work.

**P-authority**, the authority based on promises; such as the promise that if you do the work, you will receive wages in return. Encounters the same problem as relying only on contracts to establish relationships, rather than also emphasizing the idea of membership.

**C-authority**, the cooperation-facilitating kind of authority; work relationships are reciprocal but they should also include the need for security and the right of participation. C-authority requires obedience because employees can see it as facilitating the attainment of goods they desire.

If organizations have a worthwhile purpose, the manager-and-worker or leader-and-follower relationship receives legitimacy from belonging to a common endeavor to do something well. Leaders can facilitate the development of integrity in these communicative relationships in two ways: by designing the context for integrity and by showing signs of integrity.

**HACKMAN’S FOUR LEVELS OF TEAM SELF-MANAGEMENT**

- **Manager-led teams**: only have authority to execute the task assigned by management.

- **Self-managing teams**: have responsibilities in monitoring their process of meeting management directives.

- **Self-designing teams**: managers still give directives, but the team has authority to decide how to meet objectives.

- **Self-governing teams**: members have responsibility for deciding what is to be done and how to do it.

If the management directives of the teams are sufficient for the team’s task and the task is connected to a worthwhile purpose, then designing the appropriate context for each type of team can promote the integrity of the whole corporation.

Hackman states: “A leader cannot make a team great, but a leader can create the conditions that increase the chances that moments of greatness will occur — and moreover, can provide a little boost or nudge now and then to help members take the fullest possible advantage of these favorable conditions.”
Corporate integrity becomes apparent when people practice openness, provide safety, voice their concerns, refer to worthwhile purposes, cooperate with others, and include nature in their strategic plans. Just as the integrity or political leaders is connected to how they represent the public concerns of their constituency, the integrity of business leaders depends on how they represent or signify the integrity of the corporations to which they belong. The organization leader displays by words and deeds the direction to take in order to increase the integrity of the corporation to which it belongs.

"In looking for people to hire, you look for three qualities: integrity, intelligence, and energy. And if they don't have the first, the other two will kill you."
— Warren Buffet

The leaders with the greatest capacity for promoting or preventing appropriate conversations in all five dimensions of corporate life are the members of a senior leadership team and especially the CEO. Most CEOs have more duties than leading followers, such as their duties to the corporate board, but in terms of corporate integrity, their relationship with followers is essential. They can actively lead employees through promoting the design of appropriate communication patterns throughout the corporation and acting as a visible sign of how employees should participate in these conversations.

CRITIQUE

Brown demonstrates that if corporations are to meet the needs of civil society, they must facilitate inclusive communication patterns based on mutual recognition and civic cooperation.

I personally agree with this statement as a professional working within one of the world’s largest resource corporations. Communication is key to the success of the internal operations of a corporation, as it aligns numerous employees along the correct path towards execution. Recognizing each other’s strengths and weaknesses, in addition to the proper alignment and communication techniques, is the optimum environment corporations want to operate within.

Patricia Werhane states that the book develops corporate integrity as a complex concept with overlapping meanings.

I personally do not entirely agree with this statement, as I found the book quite “choppy” and pieced together, and at times I was left wondering how some of the concepts would eventually tie together. Brown’s publication did not give me a reassuring sense of collaboration, as the book covered quite diverse topics, and several of them. The content of the book was certainly complex, which made it even more difficult for me to “piece-together” what was to be a uniform publication.

Another reader review stated identified that the book has arrived just in time.

I personally agree with this statement, as global corporations are growing, and younger generations of corporate professionals are replacing baby boomers in corporate management positions. Because of this, it is even more important that corporate integrity be identified as a necessity practiced within the workplace, and an important factor in running a successful organization. And therefore, practices should be adopted in order to accomplish a smooth and acceptable organization transition.

Heidi von Weltzein Hoivik testifies that the book is a timely contribution to our world today, where cynicism about business integrity is at an all-time high.

This input from Hoivik directly ties into what I previously stated. Distrust is present, as greed is at an all-time high. The world can be materialistic, and in order to attain the materials desired, money is a mandatory requirement. The need for money creates greed, and scandal. This causes distrust.