

AI Acknowledgment

Grammarly was used to help with proofreading, grammar correction, and minor language improvements during the preparation of this essay. All ideas, research, and written work are my own and are based on academic sources cited in the reference list.

Moral development refers to the process which individuals learn to distinguish between right and wrong and make ethical decisions. It is an important aspect of human behaviour, as it influences how people interact with others and respond to moral dilemmas in everyday life. One of the most important and influential theories in this field is Kohlberg's theory of moral development. He proves that moral reasoning progresses through a sequence of universal stages based on cognitive development (Kohlberg, 1981). According to this theory, individuals move from self-interest to conformity with social norms and eventually begin to base their decisions on broader ideas like fairness, justice and human rights. While his model has contributed hugely to the psychological understanding of moral reasoning, particularly through its focus on the reasoning behind decisions rather than the decisions itself. This approach allows a deeper understanding and for us to explore how individuals justify their actions instead of simply observing behaviour. Despite its influence, it has been widely criticised. The assumptions have been challenged by researchers regarding the universal development, gender neutrality and its rigid stage-based structure. It's suggested using further research and perspectives that moral reasoning is shaped by cultural, social and contextual influences rather than following a fixed development sequence (Shweder et al., 1987; Turiel 1983). These criticisms highlight the difficulty of moral development and suggest that his theory may not fully account for the diversity of human moral reasoning. This essay will critically evaluate Kohlberg's theory by examining key issues; the rigidity of stages, cultural differences, gender bias, social and domain theory, biological influences, and variation across the lifespan.

Kohlberg's theory of moral development suggests that individuals progress through three levels of reasoning: preconventional, conventional and postconventional (Kohlberg, 1981). At the preconventional level, individuals base their moral decisions on avoiding punishment and seeking rewards. At the conventional level, the reasoning is guided by social expectations and the urge and desire to maintain relationships and social order. Lastly, at the postconventional level, individuals use abstract ethical principles, such as justice and human rights, to guide their decisions. He argued that these stages occur when in a fixed and universal sequence and are closely linked to cognitive development. This means that individuals cannot skip stages or regress once they have progressed. One of the key strengths of his theory is that it provides a structured framework for understanding moral reasoning and has provided a foundation for further research into moral development (Rest, 1979). Comparing this to the earlier theories, for example Piaget's, Kohlberg's model offers a much in detail and systematic explanation by identifying multiple stages and extending development into adulthood. This allows researchers to examine moral reasoning beyond childhood and consider how it evolves over time. Furthermore, the use of moral dilemmas allows the researchers to focus on the reasoning behind decisions rather than just simply observing behaviour. For example, Heinz dilemma. This is vital as two individuals may make the same decision for completely different reasons, and Kohlberg's theory helps explain these differences in reasoning. As a result, the theory has been highly influential in development psychology and has provided a foundation

for further research into moral development. However, the theory has been widely criticised for its rigid structure and assumption that moral development is universal. A major criticism of this theory is that it's assumption about individuals progressing through fixed and consistent stages of moral reasoning. He also proposed that individuals operate at a single stage at any given time and move sequentially through each stage as they develop. However, research suggests that moral reasoning is more flexible and context dependant than this model implies. For instance, Carpendale (2000) argues that individuals may use different forms of reasoning depending on the situation, rather than consistently operating at a single stage. This portrays that moral reasoning is not a stable trait, but a dynamic process influenced by context.

Furthermore, individuals often demonstrate reasoning from multiple stages simultaneously. For instance, a person may follow social rules in one situation but rely on personal moral principles in another. This therefore contradicts the idea of a clear progression through stages and suggests that moral reasoning cannot be easily categorised into fixed levels. In a real-life scenario, more dilemmas are often complex and involve competing values, which require individuals to adapt their reasoning accordingly. Therefore, Kohlberg's theory may oversimplify the complexity of moral decision- making by assuming that individuals progress through a rigid and predictable sequence. A further limitation of Kohlberg's theory is its assumption that moral development is universal across different cultures. Kohlberg argued that individuals progress through the same stages regardless of cultural background, suggesting that moral reasoning follows a fixed and universal pattern (Kohlberg, 1981). However, cross-cultural research strongly challenges this assumption. For example, Shweder et al. (1987) propose that moral reasoning is shaped by cultural values and identify three key moral frameworks: autonomy, community, and divinity. These frameworks demonstrate that different societies prioritise different moral concerns, such as individual rights, social roles, or religious beliefs. This directly contradicts Kohlberg's emphasis on justice and individual rights, which reflects a Western perspective rather than a universal one.

Similarly, Snarey (1985) conducted a cross-cultural review and found only partial support for Kohlberg's theory. While early stages of moral reasoning appeared across cultures, higher stages, particularly postconventional reasoning, were significantly less evident in non-Western societies. This suggests that Kohlberg's highest stage may not represent a universal endpoint of moral development but instead reflects culturally specific values. Furthermore, many non-Western cultures emphasise collective responsibility and social harmony rather than individual rights, which are not fully accounted for in Kohlberg's model. Therefore, these findings indicate that moral reasoning is shaped by cultural context rather than following a fixed developmental sequence. As a result, Kohlberg's theory can be considered ethnocentric, as it fails to account for cultural diversity in moral reasoning and limits its applicability on a global scale.

A further criticism of Kohlberg's theory is its gender bias, particularly in its emphasis on justice-based reasoning. Gilligan (1982) argued that Kohlberg's research was based mainly on male participants and therefore reflects a limited view of moral development. According to Gilligan, Kohlberg's model prioritises abstract reasoning based on rules and justice, which may not fully represent how all individuals approach moral dilemmas. Instead, she proposed an alternative ethic of care, this suggests that moral reasoning can also be based on relationships, empathy and responsibility towards others. This perspective highlights that individuals may approach moral situations in different ways. For example, some individuals may prioritise maintaining relationships and avoiding harm rather than focussing on rules and fairness. This suggests that moral reasoning is not solely based on justice, as Kohlberg proposed, but can also invoke emotional and relational considerations. However, Gilligan's theory has been criticised. Puka (1990) argues that care-based reasoning may be influenced by socialisation and gender roles rather than representing a distinct form of moral reasoning. This suggests that differences in moral reasoning between men and women may arise from societal expectations rather than inherent differences. Despite this, Gilligan's critique remains important, as it highlights the limitations of Kohlberg's theory. It demonstrates that the model may provide a narrow and incomplete account of moral development by focusing primarily on justice-based reasoning. Therefore, a moral reasoning should be understood as more diverse and influenced by both cognitive and social factors.

Biological perspectives challenge Kohlberg's focus on purely cognitive reasoning by highlighting the role of brain processes in moral judgement. Research in cognitive neuroscience suggests that moral decision-making involves both thinking and emotional responses (Greene et al., 2001). For example, studies have shown the involvement of the prefrontal cortex, which is linked to decision-making and reasoning, alongside other brain areas connected to emotional reactions. This suggests that moral reasoning is not entirely rational, as Kohlberg proposed, but is shaped by both cognitive and emotional processes. This is supported by research suggesting that moral judgment is strongly influenced by emotional and intuitive responses rather than purely deliberate reasoning (Greene, 2011). In many moral situations, individuals experience immediate emotional reactions that influence their decisions. For instance, feelings such as empathy or guilt can affect how a person responds to a moral dilemma. This shows that moral reasoning is not only based on logical thinking but also involves emotional responses that guide behaviour. Furthermore, research has shown that damage to certain areas of the brain can affect moral behaviour, providing further evidence that biological factors play a role in moral development. This is important because it suggests that moral reasoning cannot be understood as a purely logical and structured process, as proposed by Kohlberg. In real-life situations, individuals often rely on immediate emotional responses, such as empathy or guilt, rather than carefully applying abstract moral principles. This indicates that moral decision-making is not strictly stage-based but instead involves both intuitive and reflective processes. Therefore, Kohlberg's theory may be limited in

explaining moral reasoning, as it does not fully consider the interaction between cognitive and emotional processes.

Finally, Kohlberg's theory has been criticised for its assumptions regarding moral development across the lifespan. Research on moral reasoning in professional context suggests that individual may apply different types of reasoning depending on their roles and responsibility (Hafeez et al,2020). According to Kohlberg's theory, people go through more difficult phases until arriving to postconventional reasoning, which is regarded as the pinnacle of moral evolution (Kohlberg, 1981). But according to research, not everyone gets to this point, and moral reasoning might differ greatly based on personal experiences and external circumstances. For instance, research on moral reasoning in professional contexts, like teaching, shows that people may use various kinds of reasoning based on their roles and obligations. This implies that moral reasoning does not follow a predetermined developmental route but rather is impacted by context. Instead of advancing to abstract moral concepts, people may really rely on traditional reasoning, such as upholding social order or adhering to institutional regulations, even as adults. Kohlberg's theory that development inherently progresses to higher stages is called into question by this. Furthermore, moral reasoning is greatly influenced by elements including education, cultural background, and life experience which can lead to significant variation between individuals (Hafeez et al,2020). varied moral viewpoints may be developed by people exposed to varied situations, indicating that moral growth is not exclusively influenced by cognitive maturation. This emphasises that moving through Kohlberg's stages is not a given and can differ from person to person. Also, some people might stay at the conventional level for the rest of their lives, especially if their surroundings promote rule-following conduct over autonomous moral reasoning. This implies that moral development is not a uniform process and calls into question Kohlberg's theory's universality.

Although Kohlberg's theory offers a helpful framework for comprehending moral thinking, it might exaggerate the degree to which people rise to higher levels. Contrary to the hypothesis, moral reasoning seems to vary more during life and be impacted by outside influences. This is significant because it implies that moral development is not a constant, predictable process that is applicable to every person. Rather, it shows how a variety of outside factors, including as the social environment, education, and life experiences, alter moral reasoning, which can result in notable individual differences. This calls into question the notion that everyone will inevitably advance to postconventional reasoning because, depending on their situation, some people may never get there. It also suggests that moral development should not be viewed as a straight line but rather as a fluid and continuous process. As a result, Kohlberg's theory might overstate how universal moral development is and neglect to take individual differences throughout life into consideration.

All things considered, Kohlberg's theory offers a useful framework for comprehending moral growth, especially because of its organised stage-based model and focus on reasoning as

opposed to conduct. It provides a well-defined framework that has greatly impacted developmental psychology research. However, the theory's simplicity of moral thinking limits its applicability. Evidence indicates that moral reasoning is fluid and context-dependent rather than set into rigid stages, since people may use different types of reasoning based on the circumstances (Carpendale, 2000). Furthermore, cross-cultural studies demonstrate that moral thinking is influenced by social conventions and cultural values rather than being universal (Shweder et al., 1987; Snarey, 1985). This implies that rather than offering a universal explanation of moral formation, Kohlberg's theory represents Western viewpoints. Similar to this, gender-based criticisms show that the theory may offer a constrained perspective on moral reasoning by emphasising justice-based reasoning, whereas other viewpoints place more emphasis on relationships and caring (Gilligan, 1982). Additionally, different perspectives like domain theory demonstrate that moral thinking is more intricate and situation-specific than Kohlberg suggested (Turiel, 1983). The notion that moral reasoning is solely rational is further challenged by biological research, which indicates that moral assessment incorporates both cognitive and emotional processes. These critiques imply that although Kohlberg's theory is a good place to start, it falls short of capturing the complexity of moral development.

To conclude, Kohlberg's theory of moral growth has significantly advanced our knowledge of the evolution of moral reasoning. Its methodical structure and emphasis on logic have given developmental psychology research a solid basis. However, the theory has several important limitations. Evidence demonstrates that moral reasoning is flexible and context-dependent rather than set into rigid stages. The concept of universality is contested by cross-cultural study, and gender-based criticisms draw attention to its narrow viewpoint. Furthermore, biological studies and alternative ideas show that a variety of elements other than cognitive development have an impact on moral thinking. In general, Kohlberg's theory offers an insufficient explanation of moral growth, despite its continued influence. Recognising the influence of individual, social, and cultural diversity on moral reasoning.

Reference List

Carpendale, J. I. (2000). Kohlberg and Piaget on stages and moral reasoning. *Developmental Review*, 20(2), 181–205. <https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1999.0500> Gilligan Google Books. https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=XItMnL7ho2gC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Gilligan+1982+In+a+Different+Voice+summary&ots=6XkEMOFk__&sig=bEaVWbu3XIK6pZiMBJihNY6Z7O8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Gilligan%201982%20In%20a%20Different%20Voice%20summary&f=false

Gilligan (1982). Google Books.

https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=XItMnL7ho2gC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Gilligan+1982+In+a+Different+Voice+summary&ots=6XkEMOFk__&sig=bEaVWbu3XIK6pZiMBJihNY6Z7O8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Gilligan%201982%20In%20a%20Different%20Voice%20summary&f=false

Greene, J.D & Department of psychology, Havard University. (2022). The cognitive neuroscience of moral judgment. In *The Cognitive Neurosciences IV*. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/54763f79e4b0c4e55ffb000c/t/5484abe8e4b04d71ee5c6749/1417980904860/the-cognitive-neuroscience-of-moral-judgment.pdf>

Paxton, J. M., Ungar, L., & Greene, J. D. (2011). Reflection and reasoning in moral judgment. *Cognitive science*, 36(1), 163–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2011.01210.x>

Puka, B. (1990). The liberation of Caring; a different voice for Gilligan's "Different Voice." *Hypatia*, 5(1), 58–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.1990.tb00390.x>

Sabellano, L. H. *Stages of Moral Development According to Kohlberg Stages of Moral Development by Lawrence Kohlberg (1971) I. Pre-conventional Level.* [Stages of Moral Development According to Kohlberg-libre.pdf](#)

Snarey, J. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergian research": Correction to Snarey. *Psychological Bulletin*. [cross_cultural_universality_on_social_moral_development_Snarey_1985-libre.pdf](#)

Shweder(1987). *The emergence of morality in young children*. Gooogle docs.[The Emergence of Morality in Young Children - Google Books](#)

Tahira, F. (2020). *Analysis of Moral Reasoning of Teachers and the Students with Respect to Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development*. *International Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*. <https://doi.org/10.11648/J.IJNPT.20200601.12> IJBSSS-2020-31-11-29-libre.pdf

Turiel (1983). *The development of social knowledge*.[The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and Convention - Elliot Turiel - Google Books](#)