

I acknowledge the use of Grammarly (<https://www.grammarly.com/>) on 09 March, 2026, to check my work using the prompt(s): Please check the following text for readability, grammar and syntax. I confirm that I have not presented any AI-generated text as my own work. I confirm that I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used before and after using AI tools, which I may be asked to provide as evidence.

Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development is one of the most influential frameworks in psychology for understanding how humans reason about ethical dilemmas and how moral thinking evolves during development. Building on Jean Piaget's foundational research on moral reasoning, Kohlberg sought to identify cognitive processes underlying moral judgment, rather than merely cataloguing moral behaviours or beliefs (Gibbs, 2014; Piaget, 1932). Kohlberg proposed that moral development progresses through six stages organised into three hierarchical levels. Each level reflects increasingly complex perspective-taking and moral justification, progressing from self-interest to social conformity and ultimately to principled reasoning. Unlike earlier accounts that focused on moral content, Kohlberg emphasised structural transformations in reasoning, arguing that development involves increasingly abstract principles, the integration of multiple perspectives, and the capacity to reason logically about complex moral problems. Over several decades, this framework has profoundly shaped research on moral development across psychology, education, and cross-cultural studies. However, it has also faced extensive critiques regarding cultural bias, gender assumptions, methodological limitations, and its emphasis on rational deliberation at the expense of emotion and context. Evaluating Kohlberg's enduring contribution requires examining both the structure of his theory and the critiques that have informed contemporary understandings of moral development.

Kohlberg's model is hierarchically organised into three levels, each containing two stages, which describe the trajectory of moral reasoning from egocentric and concrete perspectives to principled and abstract reasoning. The first level, the preconventional level, is most common among children, though adults can also demonstrate reasoning at this level under certain circumstances. At stage one, often described as a focus on avoiding negative consequences, moral reasoning is dominated by the obedience-and-punishment orientation. Individuals judge actions as morally wrong if they result in punishment. For example, a child might argue that stealing is wrong because they will get punished, without considering fairness or social norms. Stage two, the instrumental-relativist orientation, is slightly more sophisticated because it incorporates self-interest and reciprocal benefits. Here, moral reasoning remains concrete, but individuals recognise that actions can serve personal goals or involve mutual exchange. For instance, stealing is okay if it helps someone, as long as no one gets hurt. At this level, moral reasoning is outcome-focused and egocentric, reflecting individuals' immediate interests rather than broader ethical principles.

The conventional level, which typically emerges during adolescence, represents internalisation of societal norms and expectations. Stage three, often labelled good interpersonal relationships, emphasises social approval, trust, and loyalty within personal relationships. Moral reasoning at this stage prioritises being a good person in others' eyes and maintaining harmonious relationships. Stage four, the law-and-order orientation, further expands the scope of reasoning to encompass social systems and institutions. Here, morality is defined by adherence to laws, rules, and authority.

Individuals evaluate actions based on their impact on social order. For example, an adolescent might argue that stealing is wrong because it violates the law and threatens societal stability. Importantly, stage four reasoning integrates personal conscience with broader social norms, but it remains largely context-dependent, guided by established rules rather than abstract ethical principles.

The post-conventional or principled level represents the apex of Kohlberg's developmental model. Stage five, the social contract orientation, recognises that laws and rules are social constructs that should be evaluated against broader ethical principles, such as justice and human rights. Individuals reason that laws are legitimate only if they serve the collective good and respect the dignity of others. Stage six, often described as the universal ethical principles stage, involves reasoning based on abstract moral principles that may conflict with specific laws or social conventions. Individuals at this stage can coordinate multiple perspectives, weigh competing ethical demands, and act in accordance with principles such as fairness, human dignity, and equality, even when doing so entails personal risk or social disapproval. For instance, one might argue that stealing to provide medicine for a dying person is morally justifiable, despite legal prohibitions. Kohlberg emphasised that these stages represent structural shifts in reasoning and qualitative changes in cognitive capacity rather than differences in moral content.

By emphasising structure rather than content, Kohlberg highlighted the roles of cognitive development and perspective-taking in moral growth. Drawing from Piaget's

constructivist framework, Kohlberg argued that individuals actively construct moral understanding through interaction with social experiences, conflict, and reflection. Moral development is therefore conceptualised as a dynamic, developmental achievement, influenced by cognitive maturation and social engagement.

Kohlberg's claims regarding stage progression were supported by research employing the Moral Judgement Interview (MJl). This semi-structured instrument presented participants with hypothetical dilemmas, most famously the Heinz dilemma, and assessed the reasoning behind their decisions rather than the decisions themselves (Gibbs, 2014). Longitudinal studies have shown that individuals rarely skip stages and typically progress in the predicted order, providing strong evidence for a consistent developmental sequence (Colby et al., 1983). Cross-sectional studies have corroborated these findings, demonstrating systematic age-related increases in stage attainment and supporting the view that moral reasoning evolves gradually and hierarchically (Rest et al., 1999).

To enable larger-scale research, Rest (1979) developed the Defining Issues Test (DIT), which operationalised Kohlbergian moral development into quantifiable moral schemas that could be scored across large samples. The DIT enabled quantitative analysis of moral reasoning across broad populations, revealing that moral reasoning scores are positively associated with age, education, and exposure to complex social environments. For example, research using the DIT indicates that university students and individuals with higher education tend to score higher on postconventional moral

reasoning, suggesting that engagement with critical thinking, ethical dilemmas, and exposure to diverse perspectives may support the development of more advanced moral reasoning (Rest & Narvaez, 1994). These instruments also helped establish reliable, replicable measures of moral cognition, thereby solidifying Kohlberg's status as a pioneer in empirical moral psychology.

Despite its robust methodology, Kohlberg's theory has faced scrutiny for its assumption of universality. Kohlberg argued that while cultural context may shape the content of moral reasoning, the structural stages themselves are invariant. However, cross-cultural research has provided a more nuanced picture. Snarey (1985) reviewed 45 cross-cultural studies of moral reasoning and found that lower stages of moral reasoning were observed universally, whereas postconventional reasoning (stages five and six) was less consistently attained, particularly in collectivist or small-scale societies. In such contexts, moral reasoning often emphasises interpersonal obligations, community cohesion, and relational responsibilities rather than abstract principles of justice (Shweder et al., 1997; Miller et al., 1990). These findings suggest that Kohlberg's highest stages may reflect Western ideals of justice and autonomy, and that moral development is shaped by both universal cognitive capacities and culturally specific norms.

Cultural psychology has expanded on this critique. Shweder et al. (1997) proposed that moral systems can be organised around three primary ethical codes: autonomy, community, and divinity. From this perspective, justice-based reasoning

represents one moral orientation among several. In societies prioritising hierarchy, tradition, or sacred values, moral maturity may be expressed through dutiful adherence to social roles or fulfillment of community obligations, rather than through abstract ethical principles. Miller et al. (1990) compared moral reasoning among American and Indian participants and identified systematic cultural differences. Indian participants were more likely to view interpersonal responsibilities as moral obligations. In contrast, American participants were more likely to treat such responsibilities as matters of personal choice, reflecting differing cultural emphasis on relational duty and individual autonomy. Gibbs (2014) argues that while the cognitive capacities underlying moral reasoning, such as perspective-taking and abstract thought, may be universal, their expression and the moral values they support are shaped by cultural norms and social institutions.

Gender represents another important axis of critique. Gilligan (1982) argued that Kohlberg's justice-centred framework reflects predominantly male-oriented conceptions of morality and may underestimate forms of moral reasoning that emphasise care, empathy, and relational responsibility, perspectives more frequently observed in women. Gilligan contended that the scoring system may undervalue care-based reasoning, leading to systematic underrepresentation of women at higher stages. Subsequent research has nuanced this claim. Walker (1984) conducted a meta-analysis examining gender differences in moral development and found only modest differences in stage attainment. These findings suggest that, although some gender patterns exist, they are less pronounced than Gilligan initially proposed. More importantly, these critiques

broaden the conceptual landscape of moral psychology, highlighting that moral reasoning encompasses multiple complementary orientations, justice, care, loyalty, and authority, which may be emphasised differently depending on identity, context, and socialisation.

One of the central assumptions in Kohlberg's model is that higher-stage moral reasoning should correspond with more principled moral behaviour. Individuals who reason according to abstract ethical principles (stages five and six) are expected to act consistently with those principles. However, empirical research in the neo-Kohlbergian literature indicates that DIT scores are only modestly associated with real-world moral behaviour, suggesting that reasoning alone does not fully determine moral action (Rest et al., 1999). This gap between moral judgment and action prompted researchers to explore mediating factors.

Blasi (1983) argued that moral identity is a key determinant of whether reasoning translates into behaviour. Moral identity refers to the extent to which moral values are central to an individual's self-concept. Individuals with strong moral identity are more likely to act consistently with their ethical reasoning. In contrast, those with weaker moral identity may be more influenced by self-interest, social conformity, or situational constraints. Aquino & Reed (2002) operationalised moral identity as a measurable construct and found that individuals who regard moral traits as central to their self-concept tend to exhibit more consistent moral conduct. This research highlights a critical nuance in moral development: cognitive reasoning alone is not sufficient to

explain moral behaviour, because moral judgement interacts with motivational and identity-based factors in the regulation of moral action.

Further research indicates that social context can either facilitate or inhibit moral action. Environments that provide moral learning outcomes, supportive relationships, and chances for reflection enhance the enactment of moral principles (Narvaez & Lapsley, 2005). Conversely, contexts characterised by social pressure, competition, or limited opportunities for prosocial engagement can inhibit morally consistent behaviour, even among individuals with advanced moral reasoning. These findings underscore the complex interplay between cognition, motivation, and social context in translating moral reasoning into behaviour.

Kohlberg's framework primarily emphasises rational deliberation, yet contemporary research highlights the critical role of emotion and intuition in moral judgment. Haidt's (2001) social intuitionist model proposes that moral decisions often arise from rapid, automatic intuitive processes, with deliberative reasoning serving primarily to justify or rationalise preexisting judgments. For example, an individual may immediately sense that stealing a lifesaving drug is morally permissible or impermissible, with conscious reasoning emerging afterward to support the initial intuitive response. This perspective challenges Kohlberg's rationalist assumptions and highlights the dual process nature of moral cognition.

Neuroscientific research has also highlighted the interaction between affective and cognitive processes in moral judgment. Using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), Greene et al. (2001) found that personal moral dilemmas, which involve direct harm to others, elicited greater activity in brain regions associated with emotional processing, whereas impersonal moral dilemmas more strongly engaged regions associated with cognitive control and working memory. These findings are consistent with a dual-process perspective, in which moral judgment arises from the integration of intuitive, affective responses and deliberate, rational evaluation.

Emotion does not merely bias moral judgment; it can also enhance perspective-taking and ethical reflection. Empathy and guilt contribute to moral motivation and facilitate consideration of others' needs and rights (Hoffman, 2000; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). Recent work in developmental psychology emphasises that the integration of cognitive and emotional processes may itself be a form of moral growth, suggesting that Kohlberg's focus on rationality captures only one dimension of moral development.

Although Kohlberg's research focused primarily on adolescence and early adulthood, evidence suggests that moral reasoning can continue to develop across the lifespan, as individuals encounter increasingly complex social roles and cognitive challenges. Commons et al. (1990) argue that some adults attain more integrative forms of reasoning capable of coordinating multiple systems of thought, while Kegan (1982) similarly proposes that adult development involves integrating diverse perspectives and

value frameworks, extending moral and cognitive growth beyond adolescence.

Together, this research highlights that moral development is nonlinear, context-sensitive, and continually shaped by ethical dilemmas, social experiences, and cognitive demands.

Adults in professions that regularly involve ethical decision-making, such as medicine, law, or education, often score higher on standardised measures of moral reasoning, reflecting the potential influence of factors including higher education, exposure to complex ethical dilemmas, and accumulated professional experience (Rest & Narvaez, 1994; Rest et al., 1999). For example, longitudinal research indicates that individuals who encounter complex ethical dilemmas, engage in reflective practice, and are exposed to diverse social perspectives tend to score higher on postconventional reasoning. In contrast, those with limited exposure to varied perspectives or more constrained social environments generally exhibit lower stage attainment, illustrating how cognitive capacity interacts with social and cultural context in shaping moral development (Rest et al., 1999).

Several theoretical models have emerged that both complement and extend Kohlberg's framework. Social domain theory, developed by Turiel (1983), distinguishes among moral rules, social conventions, and personal choices, emphasising that children and adults can differentiate among these domains early in development. The theory highlights that moral reasoning is context-sensitive and multifaceted; individuals evaluate rules differently depending on whether they concern welfare and justice, social

conventions, or personal choice, demonstrating that moral judgment varies across domains.

Graham et al. (2012) propose moral foundations theory, which further expands the scope of moral psychology by identifying five intuitive bases for moral judgment: care/harm, fairness/cheating, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation. Unlike Kohlberg's focus on justice and rights, moral foundations theory captures the plurality of moral orientations across cultures and individuals. Collectivist societies may prioritise loyalty and authority, whereas individualist societies emphasise fairness and autonomy, reflecting cultural diversity in moral priorities. Integrating this perspective with Kohlberg's developmental framework suggests that moral reasoning involves both cognitive growth and the weighing of culturally and emotionally salient values.

Kohlberg's insights have had an enduring influence on education and character development. Programs that engage students in discussions of moral dilemmas, debates, and cooperative learning have been shown to promote higher-order moral reasoning (Power et al., 1989). These approaches leverage the principle that social dialogue and exposure to differing viewpoints stimulate perspective-taking and cognitive conflict, thereby advancing moral development. Importantly, these programs are effective across age groups, reinforcing the idea that moral reasoning remains malleable and responsive to social experience throughout life. Even contemporary

educational initiatives integrating emotional intelligence and civic engagement draw upon Kohlbergian principles, demonstrating the enduring relevance of his framework.

Kohlberg's theory is simultaneously foundational and contested. Its strengths include a coherent structural model, empirical rigour, and a focus on developmental progression, which legitimised moral psychology as a scientific field. Kohlberg's emphasis on perspective-taking presaged later research linking moral development to the theory of mind, empathy, and executive functioning. Its methodological innovations, including the MJT and DIT, remain influential for measuring moral reasoning in educational and research contexts.

However, Kohlberg's theory has notable limitations. Cross-cultural critiques demonstrate that the highest stages may reflect Western ideals, while gender critiques reveal that care-oriented reasoning may not fit neatly within a justice-centred hierarchy. Behavioural research indicates that advanced reasoning does not guarantee moral action, highlighting the importance of moral identity, motivation, and context. Neuroscientific and social intuitionist research further reveals that moral reasoning is entwined with emotion and intuition, challenging the primacy of purely rational deliberation. Together, these critiques suggest that moral development is pluralistic, context-sensitive, and multidimensional, rather than a strict, invariant stage sequence.

Nevertheless, Kohlberg's framework remains a critical foundation, serving as a reference point for contemporary models. Kohlberg's theory prompted extensive

empirical research, opened new avenues for educational practice, and inspired theoretical integration, including lifespan perspectives, emotional-cognitive models, identity-based approaches, and cultural pluralism. By articulating moral reasoning as a structured, empirically investigatable process, Kohlberg transformed moral psychology from a philosophical speculation into a rigorous scientific discipline.

In conclusion, Kohlberg's contribution to moral psychology lies not in the unqualified acceptance of his stage model but in his conceptualisation of moral development as a structured, developmental, and empirically testable process. Contemporary scholarship, informed by cross-cultural, gender-sensitive, neuroscientific, and lifespan perspectives, recognises that cognitive growth, social interaction, cultural norms, emotional processes, and identity formation influence moral reasoning. While Kohlberg's theories' justice-centred and rationalist assumptions have been challenged, the developmental sensibility he articulated continues to shape research, educational practice, and theoretical innovation. Ultimately, Kohlberg's work demonstrates that moral reasoning is dynamic, pluralistic, and contextually situated, yet understanding its evolution across the lifespan remains indebted to the conceptual architecture Kohlberg constructed.

References

- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. II. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1423–1440.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1423>
- Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. *Developmental Review*, 3(2), 178–210.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297\(83\)90029-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297(83)90029-1)
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., Lieberman, M., Fischer, K., & Saltzstein, H. D. (1983). A Longitudinal Study of Moral Judgment. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 48(1/2), 1–124. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1165935>
- Commons, M. L., Armon, C., Kohlberg, L., Richards, F. A., Grotzer, T., & Sinnott, J. D. (Eds.). (1990). Adult development: Volume 2: Models and methods in the study of adolescent and adult thought. *Praeger*.
- Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviours. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1), 91–119.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91>
- Gibbs, J. C. (2014). Moral development and reality : beyond the theories of Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt (Third edition.). *Oxford University Press*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199976171.001.0001>

- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development (38th print.). *Harvard University Press*. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674037618>
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2012). Moral Foundations Theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 55–130.
- Greene, J. D., Sommerville, R. B., Nystrom, L. E., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2001). An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment. *Science*, 293(5537), 2105–2108. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1062872>
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814–834. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814>
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues. *Daedalus (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 133(4), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526042365555>
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000). Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self: Problem and process in human development. *Harvard University Press*.
- Miller, J. G., Bersoff, D. M., & Harwood, R. L. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and in the United States: Moral imperatives or personal

decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(1), 33–47.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.33>

Narvaez, D., & Lapsley, D. K. (2005). The Psychological Foundations of Everyday Morality and Moral Expertise. In D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Character psychology and character education* (pp. 140–165), *University of Notre Dame Press*.

Piaget, J. (1932). The moral judgment of the child. *Routledge and Kegan Paul*.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education. *Columbia University Press*.

Rest, J. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. *University of Minnesota Press*.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (1999). Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach. *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*.

Rest, J.R. and Narváez, D. (1994) Moral Development in the Professions: Psychology and Applied Ethics. *Psychology Press, Abingdon*.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601162>

Shweder, R. A., Mahapatra, M., & Miller, J. G. (1997). Culture and moral development. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 1–83). *University of Chicago Press*.

Snarey, J. R. (1985). Cross-Cultural Universality of Social-Moral Development: A Critical Review of Kohlbergian Research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(2), 202–232.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.202>

Turiel, E. (1983). The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention. *Cambridge University Press*.

Walker, L. J. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. *Child Development*, 55(3), 677–691. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130121>