THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORAL INTEGRITY, PHSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING, AND ANXIETY

By Dr. Leanne M. Olson
Associate Professor of Psychology
Wisconsin Lutheran College

This article is based on the research Dr. Olson published as part of her doctoral dissertation at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bifurcation means split apart or divided. I have to admit that the study which provides the foundation for this article is the product of a certain bifurcation between Christian faith and psychological science. Despite the division, as a Christian and a psychologist, I am grateful to have the opportunity to explore this great divide in light of God's truth. I do, however, ask your patience when you recognize the competing assumptions between a study designed to empirically measure moral integrity through behavioral observations and the truth that our moral selves, fragmented by sin, yearn for the perfect integrity that characterized God's creation before the fall (Gen. 1:26-28) and which can only be fully restored by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

When, as a doctoral student, I first considered how to empirically measure, without regard to religious beliefs, the construct of moral integrity, I couldn't help but wonder how my psychological study would relate to the Christian teachings of justification and sanctification. Mindful that the knowledge generated by the methods of science aren't necessarily reconcilable with the revealed knowledge of the Scriptures, it is natural to wonder if the Bible's teaching about our new life in Christ can better inform a psychological understanding of moral integrity. As I reflected on the possible insights that might be provided by Christian faith to science, a number of dual and conflicting constructs came to mind: man - God, earth - heaven, old Adam - new Adam, law - gospel, sin - redemption, and individual -body of Christ. St. Paul's words in Romans 7 illustrate the struggle God's people experience when attempting to integrate thoughts, feelings, and actions. How can anyone empirically measure such a complex concept like moral integrity? Certainly, by most definitions of moral integrity, one does not have to be a Christian to have moral integrity. However, does the Christian faith provide an inherent psychological framework upon which the Holy Spirit brings forward the new man – a person of moral integrity who can live before God in righteousness.

Admittedly, it is impossible to measure many essential elements of Christian moral integrity such as faith and the affective fruits of the Spirit. Yet, moral integrity is central to the Christian moral life because it not only guides individuals when faced with ethical questions, it defines the Christian's questions. So I looked to the science of psychology to develop a question about moral integrity that could be answered using the scientific method. From an empirical standpoint, a beginning investigation of integrity could describe how individuals come to actually experience and demonstrate integrity in their lives. From a psychological perspective, the investigation might address whether or not moral integrity would lead to a subjective sense of felt wholeness. Though not verifiable empirically, I also wondered how this would relate to the moral integrity the Christian derives from knowing that "it is by grace you have been saved, through faith – and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God – not by works, so that no one can boast. For we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do." (Eph. 2:8-10) Do Christians experience the same kind of subjective felt wholeness? The Bible certainly says they should!

Despite the limitations in defining moral integrity in behavioral terms, empirical perspectives on the construct of moral integrity are greatly needed in our time since we live in an increasingly relativistic world. Individuals are challenged to integrate multiple truths and their integrities are increasingly divided or silenced in the name of diversity, open-mindedness, or subjective relativism. Assuming integrity rises above stubborn, mule-headed conviction, and that individuals with different convictions can stand along side each other on differing moral foundations without war, I began the first of what I hope to be many studies to investigate how individuals with moral conviction might develop and nurture moral integrity in a world that does not value conviction.

Within the discipline of philosophy, virtues take center stage in the moral and ethical philosophies of Aristotle, Plato, and Aquinas. But the scientific observation of virtue itself, however, was hindered by research findings in the 1930's that failed empirically to support

a connection between people's social attitudes and their behaviors (LaPiere, 1934). Unfortunately, this research along with that of the character studies by Hartshorne and May (1928-1932) led to a consensus in the field of psychology that moral virtues were not consistent across or within people and could not be studied with any scientific validity. With few exceptions (Erikson, 1968) the field of psychology avoided the empirical study of the complex nature of virtues. Those psychological scientists interested in virtue and morality (for example, Piaget, 1932/1965; Kohlberg, 1964) reduced the complex area of moral virtue to justice reasoning rather than studying what appeared as an empirically unreliable area of moral virtues or moral action.

In response to the growth of contextualism, however, the philosophical study of virtue emerged from a long silence (Bennett, 1993; Carter, 1996; MacIntyre, 1981). During the 1980's and 1990's, even the field of moral psychology began to re-address the questions of moral character (see Lapsley, 1996). Blasi's (1984) theory of moral self spoke to the integrative properties of an undefined moral integrity. Colby and Damon (1992) as well as Damon (1996) defined the moral exemplar as an individual with a sense of moral integrity. Though these psychologists theorized of the virtue of integrity, they did not directly define or measure it. This opened a small door that allowed me to empirically investigate moral virtue through defining and describing the construct of moral integrity among adults.

From a Christian perspective, Luther defined the self as a bifurcation between the new man and the old Adam. From this perspective we are born into this world without moral integrity even though God's laws are written on our hearts. Faith in the redeemer, Jesus, provides the basis for any felt sense of integrity and its expression in thankful living. Integrity then is realized by God's gift of justification and faith in Jesus. Moral integrity is felt as a fruit of the Spirit and sanctified through God's grace. If I am to truly understand moral integrity, I need to find a psychological model to address what is really at stake when we live moral lives: our relationship with God and how we live our lives in response to his love and according to his will.

Operationally Defining Moral Integrity

Carter (1996) developed an excellent working definition of integrity that seems to provide a theoretical foundation for a defined construct of moral integrity. He identified three philosophical components of integrity which, when placed in the context of the moral domain, provided a starting point for an operational definition of moral integrity. Theoretically then, moral integrity represents the integration of three components summarized as follows:

1. Moral Discernment: The ability to discern what is morally right from morally wrong. This requires moral reflectiveness on the meaning of good and bad as well as how that meaning applies to self and others. It also includes the ability to draw conclusions from the discernment to develop convictions. Although nonbelievers may know right from wrong and even act on this knowledge, only the Christian with moral integrity knows God's truth - his law and his gospel.

2. Consistent Behavior: The ability to consistently act on those convictions. This means that the person of moral integrity acts reliably across time and situation. It also means resulting feelings are consistent with convictions even in the face of adversity. The Christian with moral integrity lives thankfully in accordance with God's will and his or her life is a testament to his or her faith for others to see (Matthew 5:16).

3. Public Justification: This is found in the ability to openly articulate that one is acting according to his or her convictions and that these convictions are the result of moral reflection and evaluation. The person of moral integrity is unashamed of doing what he or she believes is right and is open and honest enough to share his or her intentions, desires, and motivations. Public in this sense is not limited to the political arena. Public simply refers to "outside of oneself." That is, the person of integrity must be capable of promoting his or her convictions with others. Acts 1:8 speaks to the importance of the public confession of Christian truth, and a Christian with moral integrity demonstrates God's love through service to others.

Carter's (1996) definition of integrity provided a working paradigm consistent with Christian principles and offered a place to start to operationally define moral integrity. Empirically, however, the field of psychology depends on a rational and behaviorally defined explanation of the concept of moral integrity.

Even with Carter's definition of integrity, *moral* integrity is a very complex construct to define and may represent a coherence between the philosophical components of moral discernment, consistent behavior, and public justification and the psychological aspects of affect, behavior, and cognition. Moral integrity is *affectively* experienced as a sense of wholeness and balance in the individual who is aware of his moral convictions, is consistent in his behavior, and is unashamed to share his convictions Yet, this individual remains at peace with the limits of his or her own moral responsibility and acts out of thankfulness (1 John 3:16-24). Integrity is *behaviorally* experienced in the individual who

consciously considers the moral conviction, is able to do what is believed, and can share the conviction in the face of adversity. These individuals consistently portray behavior that reflects moral commitment and are capable of articulating and justifying their commitments publicly (2 Corinthians 3:2-3). Moral integrity is *cognitively* experienced in the person who thinks about and weighs the consequences of moral conviction, is able to consider the appropriate behavior in various compromising circumstances, and believes the conviction should be shared with others (Rom. 12:1-2).

Moral conviction lies at the heart of moral integrity. The individual of integrity must be able to discern a moral right from wrong, and must have the criteria or standard with which to measure or compare alternative positions of good and evil (Lourenco, 1996). Moral discernment, however, defines and shapes the moral convictions that determine one's behavior and ultimately one's life. Moral integrity includes an unambiguous moral conviction (or consistent set of moral convictions) that appears to motivate and animate the individual to act in the fulfillment of the moral conviction. While Carter (1996) equates integrity with words like fidelity, commitment, and forthrightness, these terms define the authenticity and veracity with which a person of moral integrity holds to a pure moral principle or conviction. Such tenacity includes the courage of developing, sustaining, and justifying one's moral convictions. A Christian's conviction is centered around a knowledge of and response to God's truth. Such good a Christian knows and does, not by his own efforts, but through Christ who both frees him or her from the bondage of the law, and also empowers him or her to serve God by obeying his commands.

The empirical and psychological aspects of the study of moral integrity reflect an analysis of the moral commitment alluded to in Kohlberg's (1981) last stage of his theory of moral development of justice. A glimpse of integrity is found in Kohlberg's (1981) rarely documented sixth stage of moral development. At the sixth stage, the individual is guided by universal ethical principles that apply to humanity. "The reason for doing right is that, as a rational person, one has seen the validity of the principles and has become committed to them" (p. 412). Moral integrity includes a similarly internalized commitment, though Kohlberg's method does not directly address moral integrity. This seems to sound like the wholeness of character noted in Colossians 3:17.

Ephesians 3:16-19 also describes the Christian's sense of being or self – that "being filled to the measure of all the fullness of God." The intersection of the self and moral domains within the moral individual is empirically measured in many different ways. The individual with moral integrity is one in which morality and the self are unified in one. According to Rorty (1993), a moral person's sense of morality is connected to the self. Blasi (1984) notes that character is the self-consistency of moral action. That is, Christian moral character consists of a moral self rooted in the Word that influences moral behavior and organizes and motivates those behaviors through Christ Jesus.

Psychologically then, Blasi's (1985) moral self-model speaks directly to the intersection of the self and moral domains. Identity represents the answer to the Christian's question, who am I in Christ? Moral integrity represents the answer to the question, what do I stand for since I am a redeemed child of God? Blasi envisions the moral individual as a whole and suggests that the self mediates feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. Based on Erikson's (1968) premise that identity is the core of being, Blasi suggests that people have an internal demand for self-consistency and are motivated to maintain consistent motives and behaviors. The Christian empowered through Jesus, seeks reconciliation with God or wholeness, but also recognizes that such wholeness is solely the work of the Holy Spirit who empowers the Christian to live and act with moral integrity.

Similar to Damon (1984), Blasi suggests that not all people develop a moral self, or integrate morality within their self-identity. In fact, people differ on whether they develop any particular identity, the issues that they center their identities around, the manner in which they sense or experience their individual identities, and the way they relate their identities to the rest of the world (Blasi, 1993). For the Christian, however, morality is central to self and identity, and is established in Law and Gospel. (1 Chronicles 28:9).

Moral responsibility develops from the conscious awareness of the Christian's moral goals, motives, and emotions. Keller and Edelstein (1993) noted participants in their study recalled a felt sense of moral certainty which, as they suggest, results from clear conscious knowledge of moral rules. They reported that in a sample of elementary school children whose choice of moral action is consistent with their moral obligation, these children had greater certainty in their moral choice. The children in the study, who were morally ambiguous about the rules or whether they, themselves were responsible to act, failed to report a felt sense of certainty about their choice. It is reasonable to suggest that psychological well-being is related to this kind of certainty and suggest positive

moral affect.

Moral affect appears to be a significant element in all three components of moral integrity and in moral responsibility. Moral individuals must feel the discerned difference between right and wrong. People must also feel that the convictions that result from that discernment are a part of the fabric of their moral identities (Montada, 1993). The person of moral integrity must also feel the moral emotions of guilt, shame, or regret when he or she fails to act consistently according to his or her convictions (Keller & Edelstein, 1993; Rorty, 1993). This individual also feels a sense of peace, certainty, or courage to act when he or she is confident of the moral rules and his or her moral responsibility (Keller & Edelstein, 1993). Rest and Narvaez's (1991) four component model of morality includes the affective component of moral sensitivity. This sensitivity is found in the person's ability to feel empathy and moral disgust. Yet, moral emotions can be separated from and even override the self's fear of loss (Erikson, 1982) especially in cases of self-sacrifice when doing the right thing fails to insure survival (Nunner-Winkler, 1993). Moral integrity allows one to be at home with oneself. The Christian with moral integrity feels his conscience struggle and his heart become heavy in the face of sin. Yet, the Christian who is leading the sanctified life offered in service to God finds hope and joy through Christ.

The purpose of the study was to empirically assess moral integrity. The adult who is confident in his or her beliefs and assured in his or her moral vision has a moral will and then also experiences lowered psychological anxiety (Keller & Edelstein, 1993; Nunner-Winkler, 1993). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that among the adults, moral integrity as measured by the Moral Integrity Survey (MIS) is positively associated with psychological well-being on the Scales of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff, 1989) and negatively associated with anxiety on the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Scale (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983).

Method

Participants

The adult sample included 42 participants (16 males and 26 females) ranging in age from 23 to 63 with a mean age of 39.5 and a standard deviation of 12.26. The sample included 6 adult volunteers from a social service setting, 10 from a hospital setting, and the remaining 26 adults were affiliated with a small Christian Liberal Arts college in Midwestern United States as either teachers registered for continuing education classes, returning adult students registered in the college program, faculty, or staff at the college. The sample consisted of well-educated, articulate individuals who indicated that morality was a significant aspect of their identities.

Instruments

The Moral Integrity Survey (MIS) includes a total of 49 objectively scored statements designed to assess degree of moral integrity. Participants rate their feelings, behaviors, and thoughts regarding the one issue or conviction they identified as being important to who they are as a person on a Likert scale. The identified conviction is then inserted into each of the MIS statements. Items represent nine components that operationally define moral integrity. These components include (1) discernment of the moral conviction: affect component, I feel good about myself knowing _____is essential to who I am as a person; (2) discernment of the moral conviction: behavioral component, I have had tried to understand why _____ is right for me to do; (3) discernment of the moral conviction: cognitive component, being/doing _____ is something I know I should do; (4) consistent behavior in relation to the moral conviction: affect component, I feel it is my responsibility to (be/do)_____in most aspects of my life; (5) consistent behavior of the moral conviction: behavioral component; I consistently try to (be/do)_____; (6) consistent behavior of the moral conviction: cognitive component, I have the conscious objective of (being/doing)_____ in my life; (7) public justification of moral conviction: affective component, I feel comfortable explaining to others why I believe that_____ is important to me; (8) public justification of the moral conviction: behavioral component, I continue to live according to _____ even when others don't like it; (9) public justification the moral conviction: cognitive component, I have thought about how other people should (be/do)____ in their lives as well. Total moral integrity score represents the sum of all ratings.

The Scales of Psychological Well-Being: Short Form (Ryff, 1989) include six subscales of 14 items each designed to measure the dimensions of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose of life, and self acceptance. Participants respond on a Likert scale to statements such as, "In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live," or "I feel good when I think of what I've done in the past and what I hope to do in the future." Items from each subscale are mixed (by taking one item from each scale) into a continuous objective, self-report measure of psychological well-being. Items are worded negatively or positively and negatively scored items are reversed in the final scoring procedure so that high scores indicate high self-ratings on the items.

The six dimensions of this scale are designed to represent different aspects of psychological health and well being. Validity and reliability are reported for a longer version of this test. Test-retest reliability coefficients for 20-item subscales are as follows: autonomy, .88; environmental mastery, .81; personal growth, .81; positive relations with others, .83; purpose of life, .82; and self-acceptance, .85.

In general, the subscales are not related to general demographic factors, and the total score from the Scales of Psychological Well-Being provide an assessment of the psychological health theorized to be the result of moral integrity in adults. Psychologically, it is logical that self-consistency (Blasi, 1984) inherent in moral integrity results in the inner peace that this instrument measures particularly in the purpose in life subscale and self-acceptance subscale.

The Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Scale (form Y) is a 40 item self-report scale designed to measure the participant's immediate state of anxiety as well as the degree of the participant's long-term anxiety trait. Each statement is rated on a four point Likert scale. The test included separate anxiety state and anxiety trait subscales. Each subscale includes 20 items and total scores from both scales range from 20 (low anxiety) to 160 (high anxiety). Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, and Jacobs (1983) suggest that the state of anxiety is not permanent and is characterized by "subjective feelings of tension, apprehension, nervousness, worry, and by activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (p. 2). The trait of anxiety is a stable characteristic of individual differences and refers to how people cope with situations when they are under stress. The State-Trait Anxiety scale is widely used in clinical and research and is considered a valid instrument of anxiety (Subkoviak, M., Enright, R., Wu, C., Gassin, E., Freedman, S., Olson, L., & Sarinopoulos, I., 1995).

Anxiety relates to stress, and Blasi (1984; 1987; 1993) suggests that individuals are motivated to maintain self-consistency thus reducing the anxiety associated with self-inconsistency. This state-trait anxiety scale provides an estimate of internal stress that has, at least in theory, been related to the lack of self-consistency or the fragmented moral self that is the result of a lack of moral integrity, especially among adults. State anxiety was particularly important for this study since individuals completed this measure after consciously having had to think about their degree of personal moral consistency or lack thereof while completing the MIS.

Procedures

Potential participants for this study were screened for presence of moral self, or whether or not their identities centered around moral issues. The screening device was adapted from Nisan's (1991) study of moral identity. Nisan required participants to identify issues that were important to how they defined themselves. He allowed the respondents to select these qualities from a comprehensive list.

Participants in this study were asked to generate four aspects that they thought best defined themselves. Respondents were then asked to rate the degree to which they thought they would be the same person if they did not have the aspects they had identified. Participants were also asked to indicate the strength of the degree to which they identified with the self-chosen issues on a Likert scale.

Those individuals who identified a moral issue or conviction as an important part of their identity as well as indicated that they identified with that issue to a high degree were assumed to have integrated the moral issue into their moral identities. A high rating on a moral aspect provided evidence that the individual strongly identified with their conviction. At the completion of the survey, individuals were asked to identify whether the issues they identified were moral. Therefore, the participant defined whether the specific content of what defined his or her identity fell within his or her own definition of morality. Over two-thirds of the individuals in the sample who completed the screening device identified religion, faith, and Christian morals as a very important part of how they define themselves. Valuing family or friends was noted second most frequently. Some individuals identified themselves with moral values including being caring, respectful, empathetic, helpful, honest, trustworthy, and loving.

Participants volunteered from existing classes at a Christian liberal arts college, a hospital, and a social service facility located in Midwestern United States. The potential participants completed the screening devise obtained from a research assistant at each facility. Those individuals who completed the screening procedures were notified and asked to complete the second half of the study. If the adult agreed, the researcher mailed the research packet containing the surveys along with return mail postage and instructions to the individual participant's home. Participants were asked to complete the informed consent separately and return it to the researcher in a self addressed stamped envelope. They were then asked to complete the questionnaire packet at one sitting within a two week period and return it with a self-addressed stamped envelope to the researcher. Average return rate of the

questionnaire packet was 4 weeks. Participants received a debriefing statement upon returning the informed consent and questionnaire packet.

Results

It was hypothesized that among adults, moral integrity positively correlated with well being on the Scales of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff, 1989) as indicated by the total well-being score and by the purpose in life and self-acceptance subcategories. It was also hypothesized that integrity would be negatively related to anxiety on the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Scale (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983). Pearson Product Moment correlations support these hypotheses. See Table 1 for a summary of the correlation coefficients with one tailed probability.

Table 1

Correlation Coefficients for MIS Total Scores for Psychological Well-Being, two subscales of well-being, and Anxiety

	Total MIS score	
Total Well-Being	$r = .30$	$p = .03$
Purpose in Life	$r = .40$	$p = .00$
Self Acceptance	$r = .40$	$p = .01$
State Anxiety	$r = -.30$	$p = .02$
Trait Anxiety	$r = -.16$	$p = .33$

The correlation coefficients supported the hypothesis that among adults, well-being is positively associated with moral integrity and state anxiety is negatively associated with moral integrity.

Discussion

The study supported the hypothesis that moral integrity is positively associated with well-being and negatively associated with anxiety. This provides preliminary support for the theoretical proposal that moral integrity is experienced as a subjective sense of wholeness and balance. Specifically, the positive correlation exists between total MIS score and total well-being score ($r = .3$, $p = .03$) as well as the subcategories of purpose of life ($r = .4$, $p = .00$) and self-acceptance ($r = .4$, $p = .01$). These well-being sub-categories are particularly important in moral integrity and reflect feelings of self-assured confidence that one is doing the right thing.

Keller and Edelstein's (1993) study of moral responsibility addressed the association of moral integrity to psychological well-being. For Keller and Edelstein, moral responsibility included issues of moral reliability, dependability, and trustworthiness, all of which define aspects of moral integrity. According to this perspective, a person of moral integrity gathers moral motivation to act morally through moral emotions that result from the cognitive component of believing in moral rules. Moral responsibility represents the bridge from the knowledge of moral rules through the moral self, which identifies these rules as important to who the self is as a moral person, to moral action. Psychological well-being (particularly purpose of life) is related to the consistency one experiences with moral responsibility.

Moral affect includes negative feelings such as shame, blame, and regret. The moral emotions that yield a sense of cohesiveness from believing the right thing and doing the right thing, are the same emotions that trigger anxiety with a loss of that cohesiveness. This study also supported the hypothesis that integrity is negatively correlated with anxiety. Specifically, the total MIS score was negatively associated with state anxiety ($r = -.3$, $p = .02$). The MIS correlation with trait anxiety may suggest that moral integrity is related to a general form of moral anxiety. However, more research must be done to identify the factors and specific relationships among moral integrity and moral emotions. The moral emotions of anxiety can correct or provide affective evaluation in times of moral fallibility by providing the moral individual with feelings of guilt and shame. Ultimately moral emotion allows the individual the ability to act in accordance with what is morally (not just personally) best according to the priorities and convictions the moral individual holds.

In the words of Carter (1996), "...integrity, applied to the person, carries more than a sense of wholeness, because a person must have something to be whole about. It carries more than a sense of perfection, because the person must have a standard against which that perfection is measured. And the thing that the person of integrity is whole about, the standard against which perfection is measured, is 'uncorrupted virtue' and a sense of 'uprightness, honesty, [and] sincerity' (p. 18). To achieve such a sense of integrity, philosophically, one must morally discern, consistently act on that discernment, and believe that discernment is true for others to the point of justification even in the face of personal devaluation.

Character, virtue, and moral integrity are difficult to measure. Historically, research on character and virtue has led to ambiguous results. Piaget's (1932/1965) classic research on rules and moral development led Kohlberg (1981 & 1984) to new insights about the construct of moral reasoning. Kohlberg introduced the empirical question of morality by focusing on the moral reasoning and people's moral philosophies concerning

hypothetical dilemmas. His work developed the empirical tool that not only defined the field of moral psychology but also allowed psychology to ask the important questions once again of how people not only understand good and evil but what they do in response to that knowledge.

The image of the person of moral integrity acting with conviction reflects a different portrait than that of Kohlberg's moral philosopher. As the domain widens to incorporate the amorphous qualities of character, virtue, and moral integrity, the attention shifts from the discrete study of moral thought to defining moral behaviors and feelings as well.

The Christian's moral integrity is only achieved through God's grace. Luther defined the moral self as a bifurcation between new man and the Old Adam. From this perspective we are born into this world without moral integrity even though God's law is written on our hearts. Jesus provides the means for obtaining any felt sense of moral integrity. Moral integrity for the Christian, then, is derived from God's justification by grace through faith in Jesus, felt as a fruit of the Spirit, and expressed through thankful sanctified moral behavior in service to God.

This research study only begins to introduce the construct of moral integrity within the field of moral psychology. The results of this study are promising. Moral integrity is associated with psychological well-being and represents an important construct in understanding the moral individual. Moral integrity bridges the gap between moral motive and behavior through a morally defined and consciously realized purpose or commitment of will. For Christians interested in moral psychology, the results also point out the need to discuss and reflect on what God's Word says about moral identity and integrity, to provide those experiences necessary to allow individuals to develop conviction, and to offer those opportunities to speak that conviction among others who do not hold the same beliefs. Moral integrity derives from more than cognitively knowing God's will. It is subjectively realized as moral conviction and unifies the individual's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in the face of alternative moral bedrock. As Job so eloquently expressed in Job 27:5-6: *"I will never admit you are in the right; till I die, I will not deny my integrity. I will maintain my righteousness and never let go of it; my conscience will not reproach me as long as I live."*

References

Bennett, W. J. (1993). *The book of virtues: A treasury of great moral stories.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Blasi, A. (1984). Moral identity and its role in moral functioning. In J. L. Gewertz & W. M. Kurtines (Eds.)*, Morality, moral development, and moral behavior.* (pp. 128-139). New York: Wiley.

Blasi, A. (1985). The moral personality: Reflections for social science and education. In M. W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), *Moral education: Theory and application.* (pp. 433-444). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Blasi, A. (1988). Identity and the development of the self. In D. K. Lapsley & C. Power (Eds.), *Self, ego, and identity: Integrative approaches* (pp. 226-242). New York: Spinger-Verlag.

Blasi, A. (1990). How should psychologists define morality? or, The negative side effects of philosophy's influence on psychology. In Thomas Wren (Ed.). *The moral domain* (pp. 38-70). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Blasi, A. (1993). The development of identity: Some implications for moral functioning. In G. G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 99-122). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Carter, S. (1996). *Integrity.* New York: Basic Books, a division of Harper Collins Publishers.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment.* New York: The Free Press.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1993). The uniting of self and morality in the development of extraordinary moral commitment. In G. G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 149-174). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Damon, W. (1984). Self-understanding and moral development from childhood to adolescence. In J. L. Gewertz & W. M. Kurtines (Eds.), *Morality, moral development, and moral behavior* (pp. 109-127). New York: Wiley.

Damon, W. (1996). The lifelong transformation of moral goals through social influence. In Baltes & Staudinger (Eds.), *Interactive minds,* (pp. 198-220). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Damon, W., & Colby, A. (1996). Education and moral commitment. *Journal of Moral Education, 25,* 31-37.

Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society*: 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Erikson, E. (1964). *Insight and responsibility*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Erikson, E. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle: A reissue*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Hartshorne, H., & May, M. (1928-1932). *Studies in the nature of character*. New York: Macmillian Publishing Co.

Keller, M., & Edelstein, W. (1993). The development of moral self from childhood to adolescence. In G. G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 310-336). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1964). Development of moral character and ideology. In M. Hoffman (Ed.). *Review of child development research: Vol. 1*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development: Vol. I. The philosophy of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.

LaPiere, R. (1934). Attitudes and action. *Social Forces, 13*, 230-237.

Lapsley, D. K. (1996). *Moral psychology*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Lourenco, O. (1996). Reflections on narrative approaches to moral development. *Human Development, 39*, 83-99.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press. 551-558.

McFall, L. (1987). Integrity. *Ethics, 98,* 5-20.

Montada, L. (1993). Understanding thoughts by assessing moral reasoning or moral emotions. In G.G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 292-309). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nisan, M. (1991). The moral balance model: Theory and research extending our understanding of moral choice and decision. In William Kurtines & Jacob Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral Development: Volume 3. Application* (pp. 213- 249). Hillsdale, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Nunner-Winkler, G. (1993). The growth of moral motivation. In G. G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 269-291). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Piaget, J. (1932/1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: The First Free Press Paperback Edition.

Rest, J. (1983). Morality, In P. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Volume 3 Cognitive development* (4th ed.). J. Flavell and E. Markman, Vol. Eds. (pp. 556-628). New York: Wiley.

Rest, J., & Narvaez, D. (1991). The college experience and moral development. In William Kurtines and Jacob Gewirtz (Eds.) *Handbook of Moral Development: Volume 2: Research* (pp. 229- 248). Hillsdale, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rorty, A. O. (1993). What it takes to be good. In G. G. Noam & T. G. Wren (Eds.), *The moral self* (pp. 28-55). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ryff, C. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,* 1069-1081.

Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory (form y): Self evaluation questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Subkoviak, M., Enright, R., Wu, C., and Gassin, E., Freedman, S., Olson, L., & Sarinopoulos, I. (1995). Measuring interpersonal forgiveness in late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence, 18,* 641-655.

Dr. Olson acknowledges her dissertation committee for their assistance with the original study: Dr. R. Enright, Dr. R. Serlin, Dr. M. Subkoviak, Dr. I. Bretherton and Dr. C. Moore.