

The DADA concept - Implementing integrity programmes

Conditions to make it work on individual level through interdisciplinary cooperation

Introduction

Worldwide scientists and professionals are working on integrity programmes to stimulate and anchor morally just behaviour in organisations. Organisational structures are changed, processes are reorganised, functions are redefined and tasks divided anew. A lot of paperwork is produced during this process describing the future state of integrity of the organisation. But what does another policy paper mean to a public department that has suffered for years under the dictatorship of their manager? What are the chances that a manager with good intentions, but without communicative skills will be capable of convincing his employees of the necessity of talking about difficult moral questions, of new arguments and of starting the necessary moral investigation into choices of behaviour of employees? How will a team be in the position to make a real change in policy towards justice, when the board still judges along old, strictly hierarchical standards developed to enhance only the *effectiveness* of the organisation?

In other words: how do changes in human behaviour, in respect of justice, come about in reality? What are the basic conditions for changing human behaviour, whether it be 'unwitting fraud' to deliberate honesty, or indifferent cheating to care and fairness? Conditions for changes in the realm of justice *have* to be found in people's choices and behaviour, in their willingness to choose the morally right (alternative) action and deed. In this paper it will be argued that it is necessary to take into account the internal (im)possibilities of those involved, as well as external (im)possibilities, the knowledge and sensitiveness to perceive moral choices as such and to see the moral dimensions of situations. To achieve this, it is necessary to have a tool for proper argumentation. The DADA concept offers a structure to deal with all these different conditions to enable people to make moral choices in their position within an organisation. Already Aristotle introduced in his famous work *Ethica Nicomachea* the importance of and difference between deliberation, choice and action when trying to understand responsibility. (Ethica Nicomachea, in: Introduction to Aristotle, edited by Mc Keon 1973, p.385-395)

The DADA concept offers a conceptual structure to be implemented when working on integrity in organisations. DADA stands for: Dialogical skills and practice, Attitude, Decision and Action. When trying to implement integrity programmes on the shop floor each one of these elements has to be paid attention to to make it work. *Dialogical skills and practice* are necessary because integrity presupposes a certain realm of freedom to investigate, enquire and discuss what is at stake, why certain deeds would or would not be moral, etc. Furthermore, *dialogical communication* is a necessary skill for managers who want to treat employees with respect as human beings, rather than just as a means to organisational ends. People's attitude needs attention because it may be that someone *knows* what is the morally just thing to do but is nevertheless not going to carry it out. One reason may be their basic attitude towards others. This *attitude* may be one of indifference towards the rights and interests of others. If this is the case, someone can participate in the whole integrity programme and understand it, but nevertheless stick to immoral practices. Thirdly, to improve

integrity in organisations, dilemma training helps familiarise employees with a rational way of finding out what is the morally right thing to do in a certain situation, and make the *decision* to do it. Dilemma training in its last developed variant (Geraedts, in: Delnoij et al (red) 2006; De Jong c.s. in Delnoij et al (red) 2006) is a very adequate and philosophically rooted way to achieve this. And finally: practice shows that, although the first four elements are addressed, employees in a certain organisation or in a specific team may still not be willing to practice what is morally right. Occasionally we meet internal or external obstacles to really put into practice what we think of as morally right. One way of dealing with these obstacles is (individual or group) “moral therapy”. For example, where a whole team struggles with a problem created by a former manager. In other words: in most situations it may take more than a basic structure of rational deliberation, right rules and supporting preventive policy to get people act morally right in their own working practice. The theory presented here explains why it is necessary to pay attention and time to each one of these four elements: Dialogue, attitude, decision and action. It is based on years of work with employees, mainly working in administration in The Netherlands.

1. Integrity: a basic structure

Until recently, the most developed structure in The Netherlands, to work on the integrity of organizations, was that developed by Bureau Integrity of the council of Amsterdam together with De Jong, Geraedts and Meij. They developed a structure with seven or eight elements of ‘the moral organisation’. (Handboek Integriteit, 2006; University of humanistic sciences, 2006) According to their view, organisations have to pay attention to the following aspects: first of all the organisation has to train all employees, to enable each and every one of them to make individual, morally correct judgments in dilemma situations, in which they have to choose between two alternatives. This, according to the authors, would form the strongest foundation for integrity in any organisation. But there is one underlying assumption here, that I will call the *Platonist fallacy*, which is the assumption that people who know what is right to do, will act accordingly. I will get back to this point in chapter The second structural element consists in *group discussion*. Two know more than one, and (philosophical) questioning into norms, values and basic principles normally is more complete and less self-betraying than individualistic questioning of one’s own actions. It is also important in organisations that everyone has a chance to participate in thinking and making explicit values, norms and basic principles relevant for their specific job. The third structural element consists in some sort of document, in which basic principles, values, rules and core dilemmas are described. Just as other forms of knowledge, this moral kind of knowledge is worth memorizing and writing down so it can be passed to future colleagues / employees. Important here is also the power of the written letter; already Socrates warned us to be on our guard to take the written word as the truth! So what we actually do by writing rules down, is not only a way to not forget, but also a way of giving extra power to what we think is worth striving for. A key role according to Geraedts and Hofstee (F. Geraedts and B. Hofstee in: De Koningh 2006) is played by the rules and norms; ideally, on the one hand, rules have to be agreed to by employees, which would be ensured by the first two elements (individual judgment in relation to group discussion). On the other hand, superiors have to supervise and control what has been agreed upon in rules and agreements. The fifth element of the structure reduces integrity risks e.g. by reducing temptations to act immorally and by (re)organising functions and processes to avoid unwitting mistakes. (M. Bouland, in: De Koningh 2006) Careful control and investigation and just, consistent, and proportional punishment are the last elements. (K. Groot, in:

De Koning 2006; E. Sinnema, in: De Koningh 2006) De Jong c.s. suggest that this is the best structure for a framework for the moral organisation. (UvH 2006)

We agree with the authors that these elements are crucial for an organisation working on integrity. But, as practice shows, trying to implement these changes often is not enough to bring about changes in people's behaviour and thus in the integrity of the organisation. Besides, the elements mentioned above refer to different levels or points of application: the individual thinking and behaviour (I would rather use the word 'autonomous' instead of 'individual'), the content of a function and the (lack of) clarity about this, the way processes are organised and, again, the (lack of) clarity about processes. Also not mentioned as a level of application is the influence on goals and mission of the organisation, let alone the influence on the surrounding external world.

Each of the following four paragraphs will introduce other aspects that need attention in order to create optimal circumstances and 'inner'¹ conditions for acting morally. This paper intends to be an amplification and fine tuning of the basic structure in view of individual moral behaviour.

2.1 Dialogical skills and communication

According to our view and experience, dialogical skills and deliberation are necessary conditions for making *independent moral judgment work* in practice. The points of application for dialogical skills and communication in the first place are on the individual level. Each employee has to get acquainted with dialogical skills. But to make it work "the dialogue" will have to be embedded at the level of the organisation: in most organisations it will be necessary (at least temporarily) to organise a structural moment to sit and analyse integrity issues.

2.1.1 Communication

The first example is one of a manager who was trained as usual in individual moral judgment, and, because he was director, he followed the workshop "managing integrity". One of the elements managers learn in this workshop is to handle (suspicions of) integrity violations. In this case there was little or no doubt that the employee had really done it. He was about to take home material that could not be used anymore by his department without asking his superior. As soon as the director heard this, he called this employee and fired him immediately for stealing. The director did not consult his managers nor did he take time to think about alternatives. Had he been more dialogical he might have known the importance of not acting on gut feeling or on first impressions or intuition or on hierarchical motives. One could say that he had not developed dialogical skills and insights, and did not even consider deliberation with relevant others.

A dialogical approach would call this initial inclination to punish the employee just a '*first opinion*', as Socrates would have done. It would have been worthwhile to investigate the situation: the director should have consulted his managers and the employee himself, he might even have made another decision and even might have come to the conclusion that the employee was not stealing but only removing office waste. Consequently, the efforts of the managers, to carefully examine each situation and to try and judge only after close consultation with colleagues, which had been the cause of a growth in confidence among the employees that management was strict but fair, were undermined at a stroke.

¹"Inner" refers to both the organisation and the person

Apart from not consulting others before making his decision, the director did not communicate the reasons or arguments for his decision even after he had fired the employee. This raised all kinds of questions about fairness, and again undermined confidence in management willingness to be fair and caused old fear and feelings of unsafety.

As Van Lwijk and others (Van Lwijk 2001; Van Es et al. 2004) show, where people, and especially managers, are held individually responsible, they also have to be able and willing to make explicit the motives for their decisions. To make any sense this making explicit has to be done in a way that is understandable. In other words: for a manager, dialogical skills are necessary conditions to enhance integrity of employees in an organisation.

2.1.2 Dialogical skills

What are dialogical skills and why are these skills necessary? To deliberate with others about what it is morally right to do, a participant has to be able to behave like a *dialogician*. A dialogician is able to participate in a *dialogical investigation*, aiming at truth. Other than by, for example, scientific experimentation, the true answer to a question is investigated by critical dialogue. One of the greatest dialogicians who searched for the truth in this way was, of course, the philosopher Socrates, (if Plato's reports about his master were accurate). And already the European philosopher Immanuel Kant pointed out that sensible philosophical discussion means that you think for yourself, that you think in accordance with yourself, and that you try to put yourself into the position of the other (so you can understand other people and their motives). Modern critical investigation, building on these two hugely influential thinkers, means: participants can listen and be listened to. They are capable of letting other people finish their sentences and thoughts; furthermore the ideal *dialogician* tries to understand what someone else really means, and is capable of perceiving, postponing and investigating his own (pre)judices. He is capable of critical enquiry without losing track of the moral investigation. He is able to express himself as briefly as possible, while at the same time taking all the time he needs. He can summarize what someone else said without changing it into what he wanted to say himself, and he expresses his doubts and asks what he does not know, not held back by the fear looking ignorant or stupid. (Kessels 1994; Delnoij et al (red)1997)

Why is all this necessary? Simply because it is relevant that we aim at a true statement each time we say that some action we planned is morally right (or wrong). If this would be irrelevant, possibly all questions of moral behaviour would become a matter of taste, and justice in the world literally would be non-sense. The aim of answering the question "Is it morally right for me to do this?", however provisional, is that we find a true answer. There is another reason why it is fruitful to work on dialogical skills. Many a moral dilemma develops from a misunderstanding or lack of understanding. So working on dialogue and communication is one way of preventing integrity problems within an organisation. This does not always mean that every employee should be trained in dialogical skills; it does mean however that the trainer is aware of the importance of dialogue and that he can work on dialogical skills in every dilemma training he gives.

2.2 Attitude

Why improve morally correct behaviour of employees? Managers can profit from their colleagues morally wrong decisions: they cover things up for him, they back him up in case of dubious decisions he made himself, they do not consult him which keeps him away from

responsibility for their questionable decisions, they don't bother him and they save his time. So, as a manager, why stimulate morally right behaviour of your employees?

It is obvious, without an attitude of care for others and of willingness to take full responsibility for your own action, there is no reason to enhance integrity of yourself, your employees or your organisation. Some philosophers claim this to be the age of indifference, (Heidegger). When someone has an attitude of indifference towards the rights, interests and eventually wishes of other parties involved, he may understand the method of moral judgment but he will not act accordingly.

In a case discussed with civil servants, it was obvious to everyone in the group that it was morally wrong to accept presents from commercial organisations, working for the local government. The arguments were the following: because of the right of citizens that a civil servant tries to prevent even the *impression* of treating somebody with marked preference, and because of the citizens' right to prevent someone from being tempted by a gift to favour contractors, it was not right to accept an invitation to get dined and wined and visit a theatre. After the weighing-up process was finished, the civil servant concerning (let us call him William) assured the group that, in spite of the outcome, he didn't even consider cancelling the invitation. This left many colleagues puzzled.

2.2.1 Stages of moral development

I first go into Kohlberg's description of human moral development in three levels, each divided into two stages (2.2.1). Then I raise the question why someone in one of Kohlberg's stages, like William, would not act in the light of the knowledge he has, whereby I will introduce three *levels of care attitude*. (2.2.2) I will end this paragraph with a statement and a question for further research.

When trying to understand someone's moral behaviour we might analyze the level of moral development he is in. Kohlberg introduces three levels: the pre-conventional level, the conventional level and the post-conventional level. A person on the pre-conventional level will be oriented on obeying, on fear of punishment and later on egotistical reasons for action. Someone on the conventional level attunes his actions to the conventional order and to the "good guy" stereotypes. Kohlberg also mentions authority and social order as relevant reasons for behaviour. In the third and last level behaviour is very much directed by orientation on shared standards, and in the sublime form of this level a person behaves according to his or her own conscience or principles. According to Kohlberg development on these levels is irreversible.

We will not go into this theory further; the reason for introducing these levels of moral development is only to prepare for introduction of levels of care or concern. We therefore go back to the above mentioned case of the invitation to the theatre. Let us assume that William is beyond the conventional level, by which I mean that he accepts his manager's authority but also is capable of knowing and understanding the rules and the moral judgment he just made with the group. Then why does he not act according to the moral values he accepts as being relevant in his situation? Why would he let his personal interests of having a nice evening with his wife and enhance his social prestige by showing off in the theatre prevail? This touches the core of what I earlier called the *Platonist fallacy*. William *knows* what is morally right to do, but *he is* not prepared to change his behaviour accordingly.

2.2.2 Attitude of care

It is obvious that we have to address this question again: why does William act against what he knows is the right thing to do? Obviously, there is something deeper or at least something else than the conscious, morally right judgment that determines our decisions about how to act. I will call this an *attitude of care*. Obviously our William does not care whether he acts according to his own moral judgment or not, but he is conscious of all the arguments to act otherwise. One could say that his attitude is one of indifference: he does not really care whether he violates the rights of citizens with respect to his behaviour. On the other hand, it is not a purposeful action with the explicit aim of violating these rights.

The levels of care which indicate decisive elements of responsibility can be classified as follows: someone can be unaware of the rights, interests and wishes of others involved. *Level 1: (un)awareness*. Someone can be unaware of the rights and interests. In our case however William can be said to be aware of the arguments for not going to the theatre on the invitation of a businessman. *Level 2: (in)difference*. The next level is that of moral indifference towards the rights and interests of others; although William is aware of the rights and interests involved, he acts otherwise. Apparently he is indifferent towards the mentioned rights and interests of citizens. He is responsible for his decision to go to the theatre, but he does not have bad intentions towards the citizens. *Level 3: purposefulness*. The next level of care would be that William would voluntary and purposeful act in accordance with the arguments he has weighed up himself, which would be a sign of conscious care for others. The next level in the opposite direction would be to on purpose thwart the rights of others involved, which would be a sign of total lack of care for the rights and interests of others involved, which would probably be morally most objectionable because the aim of the action would be 'hurting (the rights of) another person', in this case the citizen.

All those working in the field of fraud and corruption, but also those working in the field of (health) care will easily recognize these levels of a lack of care and of objectionableness. In the basic structure of integrity in organisations this problematic issue was not addressed. It is my hypothesis that cooperation with Social scientists like psychologists on this point might improve the effectiveness of working on integrity.

2.3 Decision

The philosophically strongest method to support professionals forming a morally correct decision in everyday working practice, is undoubtedly the method developed by De Jong c.s. (Delnoij et al (red) 2006), enriched by knowledge about, and skills in, argumentation. Roughly speaking the heart of this method consists of four elements. a. creating an understanding of the ethical position of the participants and of the organisation they work in, b. developing insight in what "morally right" means, c. in teaching the seven step method (like in dilemma training, Van Luijk 1999) and d. in explaining the value of and the difference between arguments when weighing the pro's and con's in deciding whether or not to take certain action. (Van Luijk 2000; Karssing 2001; Van Iersel and Baarda (red); De Jong c.s. in: Delnoij, Laurier and Geraedts (red) 2006; Geschwindt 2006) This is not the place to go deeper into this dilemma training and / or this method to find a proper moral judgment. It is important to know, however, that employees have to learn to make morally sound judgments. A basic assumption however is a 'definition' of when an action is morally right: an action is morally right when I have taken into account all the rights, interests and wishes of all parties involved. (Van Luijk 1997,p31; and also see Geraedts in: Delnoij et al (red) 2006). It takes the seven steps to find

agreement about what it means in a concrete situation when one has taken into account all relevant rights and interests, and to attach the right value to the different arguments, which also involves weighing up the arguments in a logical and ethically sound and correct way. Again, not all employees have to follow a course in logic. But a dilemma trainer has to know what he is doing on the logical level of argumentation, and he has to be able to show employees how logical argumentation works.

Without *thinking about* the right or wrong to course of action in a certain situation, whether employee's behaviour does justice to someone or whether it takes into account the rights and interests of others involved, will be a mere matter of coincidence. When working purposefully on integrity in organisations, the aim is to deliberately improve morally just behaviour. The strongest foundation for integrity in organisations is the individual capacity and willingness to form for oneself a moral judgment about what one has to do in relevant situations. (F. Geraedts in: Delnoij et al (red) 2006)

For many employees, managers, and also for many politicians, it is a powerful eye-opener to discover this method for individual thinking and moral decision making. One politician sighed and said: Now I see that I made several decisions that were morally wrong. In retrospect I probably would not have punished one of my administrators a few years ago that severely, I would not have gone on that free trip to Norway, and in the future I will do my utmost to collect all the relevant arguments before taking an important, morally relevant decision in my political career, and not only those that support my initial inclination.

2.4 Action

The last element that needs explicit attention, is the question of what enables people to act according to their decision, assuming that the first three items have been addressed. For obvious reasons, not all organisations are willing actively to support their employees in doing what they think is right. But once you teach individuals how to find an independent morally right judgment, you have to allow them to act in accordance with it, or you present them with an extra problem instead of a means to handle moral questions.

Working in a city with all civil servants, we were about to train a team that had severe problems with their head of department. Almost every case they mentioned showed how frustrated everybody was about the lack of management skills of their foreman. Two participants in one of the trainings burst into tears, which is not exceptional in this kind of situation. I decided to give them time after the training to think about what to do, which actually was a choice between going to the director or accepting the situation and doing nothing. They had already tried to talk to their head of department but without success. After the training they felt empowered, because it gave them the necessary words to explain in ethical terms what was wrong in allowing this man to continue. They were able to explain which rights were violated. Now here comes the illustrative meaning of this example. What made them take the morally right action? Obviously, there were no inner or outer obstacles to prevent them from taking the big step of going to their director. The organisation they worked in, was a safe environment. They knew that they would not get fired by going to the director to complain and explain. They felt forced to do this; some of them just could not cope anymore. And at last: they now could see that the right of citizens to an effective administration had been violated because the department had the usual costs, but was no longer able anymore to deliver the services required of it.

Another negative example is that of a culture where it is normal to take up offers that are a real threat to e.g. politician's and administrator's integrity; formed by lobbyists organising networks where members can profit from material or immaterial benefits, like free memberships with access to special offers and reduced prices. This may be used as a subtle transitional sphere from influencing into corruption.

Another example of an obstacle is that of a woman, let's call her Amy, who accused her boss of making her act immorally because she had to do something that was someone else's task, and who had felt pushed aside. After the group had discussed the possibility of refusing his request, because the man was known as a reasonable person who would not immediately fire her or letting her down in another way, they decided that the morally right thing to do in this case would be to refuse this task and explain why. But Amy could not get herself to change her answer to her boss. Later she mentioned an example of the danger of refusing things in a situation when she was a child. So would it go too far to assume that personal trauma's can prevent someone from doing the morally right thing, even though he or she can argue correctly? This would mean that, in respect of morally right behaviour, it sometimes may be more effective to offer someone therapy rather than use incentives or sanctions.

Conclusion

Working on integrity in organisations requires a lot of knowledge, of not only about how to fight corruption and how to prevent fraud. Nor is it enough to build structures, train all employees or to produce new piles of paper and transform rules.

1. Dialogical skills are required, as well as a practice of respectful and adequate communication. Point of application: individual level and process level.
2. Support of psychologist might be helpful in developing and/or applying theory and practice concerning human attitude. Point of application: individual level.
3. Decision making should be sharply distinguished from action; decision-making in the ethical realm should always be coupled with sound reasoning and knowledge about ethics. Point of application: on the individual level.
4. A condition to make it work is that an organisation that starts an integrity programme should be prepared to also critically look at and maybe change internal circumstances and external circumstances that prevent employees structurally from taking the morally right actions. Points of applications are the individual level, team level and the highest level of the organisation: goals and mission.

Intensifying cooperation with social scientist in de advisory and training practice on integrity might deepen our knowledge and contribute to integrity in organizations.

Jos Delnoij

Key concepts

Integrity (Moral) integrity is a state of being whereby an acting agent takes into account sufficiently the rights, interests (and wishes) of all involved.

Morality concerns questions of being allowed or obliged to do or not to do something. You are allowed to do something, when you do not violate someone else's rights or interests. You are obliged to do something, when someone else has the right to this action of yours and your own right does not have a heavier weight in the situation.

Dilemma training and moral judgement The latest variant of the so called dilemma training inspired by Van Lwijk (Van Lwijk 1997, Van Lwijk 2000) can be regarded as a further development of dilemma training to make it an effective method for weighing all relevant rights and interests in a situations where there is more than one option to act. (Delnoij et al (red) 2006) This dilemma training, called *training moral judgment*, makes explicit and implements earlier ideas from Van Lwijk in the vocabulary of the training. Arguments are not only examined to distinguish between arguments of principle and arguments of consequence; arguments are also examined to see whether the arguments contains only a wish, an interest or even a right of one of the 'moral stakeholders'. If the argument contains a right of one of those involved, then it will be an argument of principle. If not, it is an argument of consequence. This makes it a lot easier to look into the types of arguments and to see the weight an argument should have.

Here we would like to make two additions: Having recognized arguments of principle, is often still is hard to decide upon the weight , compared to one another.

Basic principles have the heaviest weight. Why is that and what is a basic principle? See below.

A second criterion is the extent to which the party involved is dependent on your action; the more exclusive the dependency, the heavier the weight of the argument. NB: this criterion can never wipe an argument out nor can it be a reason for weightlessness of an argument!

Values express an abstract, desirable state of being, worth striving for. For example: beauty, harmony, justice, truth.

A *moral value* expresses an abstract, desirable state of being concerning rights and interests of others (worth striving for). For example: fairness, honesty, care.

Principles express the prescription to act purposeful to realize a (moral) value in real life. E.g. "Thou shall not kill".

Basic moral principles constitute the kind of relationship people (and organizations) have in terms of rights and duties towards the other, *and* refer to doing right to the other, i.e. the right of the other to be left unaffected by your action.

Hypothesis: There is a hierarchy between the weight a value has in dilemma situations, which depends on the kind of relationship the agent has with those involved. E.g. a mayor has to take care

of the safety of the inhabitants of the city as citizens. As such they have the right that he tries to guard the safety of the town. This is what I would call a basic moral principle. The inhabitants of the neighbouring city do not have the same rights towards him than they have toward their own mayor. Where the mayor can, he will be obliged to use his power to also guard the neighbouring city's safety. In other words: the mayor's duty to take care of the safety of his or her own inhabitants have a heavier weight in dilemma situations where both groups appeal to the mayor's action and efforts.

Another example is the following. In situations where there is a big fire in his city, at the same time that he is expected to represent his town in an official meeting, in a normal situations without further complications the right of the citizens to his careful attention and efforts to guard the safety of the town has a heavier weight than the interest they have that the mayor will be representing their city at that meeting.

The most fundamental way to be related to someone, to a stakeholder, is that of human being towards human being. So that would explain why we so often during training sessions were confronted with the argument of what was usually called "humanity". For example, if a civil servant, in a dilemma situation, has to choose between following a formal functional rule and medical care for someone who is about to lose a limb when not having medical treatment, the safety and health has a heavier weight than following the formal rule which prohibits giving resources for medical treatment.

Order of weight of moral arguments

It is worth discussing the order of values or basic principles. Why call these values(see below) basic principles? Every person is a human being towards other human beings, whether you are civil servant, customer, client, mother, priest, prisoner, president of the US or director of a multi-national. So apart from the other values that establish the relationship you have with him or her (customer-seller, child-mother etc), which will differ from relationship to relationship and from case to case, the next three basic principles (of humanity, if you like) may *always* be at stake, in *any* situation where a human being acts and is about to hurt or please someone else.

My hypothesis is that the order is as follows: 1. Safety and health, 2. Wellbeing and property 3. (Individual) happiness. Human beings strive for this in life. An indication that this is true, is to be found in the order these themes were picked up in philosophy, at least by three philosophers: Hobbes (1588) discussed freedom of violence in his well known book "Leviathan"; Locke (1632) defended the right to 'life, liberty and property' (Taylor 1991; 25) and from the time from Rousseau (1712) on, the individual has or should have a voice in which society is best for us and the highest form of freedom is to live in accordance with the law that we prescribe ourselves. I would call this the awakening of the individual which resulted in the post modern drift for individual happiness.

Human striving can be said to be organised by three principles: freedom, effectiveness and integrity. We very much want to "choose" our action or attitude "ourselves" (however questionable this is as a philosophical statement!); we want our actions to be on purpose, and we don't want to hurt others with our actions.