

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Kohlberg's moral understanding stage theory pdf

Sign in to MyKarger to verify that you already have access to this title. CHF 38.00 * EUR 35.00 * USD 39.00 * Select Save over 20% compared to the price of the individual item. Learn more sub-encryption rates Select * Final prices may differ from prices shown due to the specificvat rules. Home Preview The purpose of this essay is to reconceptualize Kohlberg's theory and research on moral stages in light of recent criticism. In the early 1970s, Kohlberg expanded his Piaget-based moral stages to apply to philosophically oriented moral thinking associated with adult years. This extension of its highest stages, from the moral reasoning of 16-year-olds to the perspective of defining the theory shown by some adults (especially in the United States) has given considerable ground to the theory's criticisms as elitist, ethnocentric and excessively abstract. These criticisms underline the need to reconsider the desirability of extending the Piagetian stage model to adult years. The proposed revision describes moral development in adulthood as existential rather than Piagetian, and limits the development of moral judgment in the sense of the standard stage in childhood and adolescence. © 1979 S. Kanger AG, Basel Article / Publication Details First-Page Preview Copyright 2000 by Robert N. Barger, Ph.D. University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, IN 46556 Lawrence Kohlberg was, for many years, a professor at Harvard University. He became famous for his work there since the early 1970s. He started as a development psychologist and then moved into the field of moral education. He was particularly well-known for his theory of moral development which he popularized through research studies conducted at Harvard's Center for Moral Education. His theory of moral development depended on the thinking of Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget and American philosopher John Dewey. He was also inspired by James Mark Baldwin. These people pointed out that human beings develop philosophically and psychologically in a progressive way. Kohlberg thought... and was able to demonstrate through studies... that people have progressed in their moral reasoning (e.g. in their bases for ethical behavior) through a series of stages. He believed that there were six identifiable steps that could be ranked more generally into three levels. Kohlberg's classification can be presented as follows: LEVEL STAGE PRE-Conventional SOCIAL ORIENTATION 1 Obedience and Punishment 2 Individualism, Instrumentalism, and Conventional Exchange 3 Good Boy/Girl 4 Law and Post-Conventional Order 5 Social Contract 6 Principled Consciousness The first level of moral thinking is that generally found at the elementary school level. In the first stage of this level, people behave according to socially acceptable norms because they are told to do so by a certain figure authority (e.g. parent or teacher). This obedience is constrained by the threat or application of punishment. The second of this level is characterised by a vision that the right of conduct means to act in the self-interest. The second level of moral thinking is that generally found in society, hence the names of conventionals. The first stage of this level (stage 3) is characterized by an attitude that seeks to do what will get the approval of others. The second stage is one geared towards compliance with the law and to meet the obligations of service. The third level of moral thinking is one that Kohlberg felt was not achieved by most adults. Its first stage (stage 5) is an understanding of social mutuality and a real interest in the well-being of others. The last stage (stage 6) is based on respect for the universal principle and the requirements of individual consciousness. While Kohlberg always believed in the existence of Stage 6 and had some nominations for it, he could not get enough subjects to define it, much less notice their longitudinal movement in it. Kohlberg believed that individuals could only progress through these stages, one stage at a time. That is, they couldn't jump stages. They could not, for example, go from the orientation of selfishness to the stage of law and order without going through the good boy/girl stage. They could only come to an understanding of a moral reasoning one step above theirs. Thus, according to Kohlberg, it was important to present them with moral dilemmas for discussions that would help them to see the reasonableness of a moral at a higher stage and to encourage their development in this direction. The last comment relates to Kohlberg's moral discussion approach. He saw this as one of the ways in which moral development can be promoted through formal education. Note that Kohlberg believed, like Piaget, that the greatest moral development takes place through social interaction. The approach to the discussion is based on the understanding that individuals develop as a result of cognitive conflicts at their current stage. I am grateful to Professor F. Clark Power of the University of Notre Dame (a former student of Kohlberg) and Professor Steve Chilton of the University of Minnesota for suggestions on this summary. Kohlberg's stages of moral development are moral adequacy plans designed by Lawrence Kohlberg to explain the development of moral reasoning. Created while studying psychology at the University of Chicago, the theory was inspired by Jean Piaget's work and fascination with children's reactions to moral dilemmas. He wrote his doctoral thesis at the university in 1958, highlighting what are now known as his stages of moral development. This theory holds that moral reasoning, which is the basis of ethical behavior, has six identifiable developmental stages. He followed the development of moral judgment beyond the ages initially studied by Piaget, who that logic and morally develop through constructive stages. Kohlberg expanded considerably on this basis, determining that the process of moral development concerned mainly with justice and the fact that its development continued throughout life, which even sparked dialogue with the philosophical implications of its research. Kohlberg used stories about moral dilemmas in his studies, and was interested in how people would justify their actions if they were put into a similar moral crux. He would then classify and classify the answers evoked in one of the six distinct stages. These six stages were broken into three levels: pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional. His theory is based on constructive stages of development; each stage and level is more appropriate to respond to moral dilemmas than the last. The Kohlberg stages six stages were grouped into three levels: pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional. Following Piaget's constructivist requirements for a stage model (see cognitive development theory), it is extremely rare to regress back into stages. Even so, no one works at the highest stage at any time. It is also not possible to jump stages; each stage offers a new but necessary perspective, and is more comprehensive, differentiated and integrated than its predecessors. Level 1 (preconventional) 1. Obedience and orientation of punishment 2. Guidance of self-interest (What's in it for me?) Level 2 (conventional) 3. Interpersonal agreement and compliance (good boy / good girl attitude) 4. Authority and social order maintaining orientation (Law and order of morality) Level 3 (Post-Conventional) 5. Guidance of the social contract 6. Universal Ethical Principles (Principled Consciousness) Pre-conventional Pre-Conventional Level of Moral Reasoning is particularly Common in Children, although adults may also exhibit this level of reasoning. The reasoning of the pre-conventional level judges the morality of an action by its direct consequences. The pre-conventional level consists of the first and second stages of moral development and are purely self-concerned in an egocentric manner. In the first stage, individuals focus on the direct consequences that their actions will have for themselves. For example, an action is perceived as morally wrong if the person who commits it is punished. The worse the punishment for the deed, the worse the act is perceived. Moreover, there is no recognition that the views of others are different from the views of others. This stage can be seen as a kind of authoritarianism. Stage two embraces what is in it for me position, the right of behavior being defined by what is in the self's interest. Stage two reasoning shows a limited interest in the needs of others, but only to a point where you might still have your own interests, would you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours. stage two concern for others is not based on loyalty or intrinsic respect. Lacking a pre-conventional society perspective, this should not be confused with the social contract (stage five), as all actions are performed to serve someone needs or interests. For the theory of the second stage, the perspective of the world is often seen as morally relative. Conventional level of moral reasoning is typical of adolescents and adults. People who motivate in a conventional way judge the morality of actions by comparing these actions with the opinions and expectations of society. The conventional level consists of the third and fourth stages of moral development. In the third stage, the self enters society by occupying social roles. Individuals are receptive to approval or disapproval from other persons because they reflect society's compliance with the perceived role. They try to be a good boy or good girl to live up to those expectations, having learned that there is an inherent value in doing so. Stage three reasoning can judge the morality of an action by assessing its consequences for a person's relationships, which are now beginning to include things such as respect, gratitude and the golden rule. The desire to maintain rules and authority exists only to further support these stereotypical social roles. The intentions of actions play a greater role in reasoning at this stage; means good.... In stage four, it is important to obey laws, dictums and social conventions because of their importance in maintaining a functioning society. The moral reasoning in the fourth stage is therefore beyond the need for individual approval set out in stage three; society must learn to overcome individual needs. A central ideal or ideals often prescribe what is right and wrong, would be in the case of fundamentalism. If a person breaks a law, perhaps everyone would - thus, there is an obligation and a duty to comply with the laws and rules. When someone breaks a law, it's morally wrong; culpability is therefore a significant factor at this stage, as it separates bad areas from good ones. Post-conventional Post-conventional level, also known as the principle level, consists of stages five and six of moral development. The realization that individuals are separate entities from society is now becoming prominent. Your own perspective should be seen ahead of society. It is due to this nature of the self before others that the post-conventional level, especially the sixth stage, is sometimes confused with pre-conventional behaviors. In stage five, individuals are seen as having different opinions and values, and it is extremely important that they are respected and honoured impartially. Problems that are not considered as relative as life and choice should not be retained or inhibited. In fact, no single choice is fair or absolute - who are you to judge whether they are or not? Along a similar vein, laws are regarded as social contracts rather than Rigid. Those who do not promote general social well-being should be changed when necessary to meet the greatest good for the highest number of people. This is achieved by a majority decision and, inevitably, compromised. In this way, democratic governance is apparently based on Reasoning. In stage six, moral reasoning is based on abstract reasoning using universal ethical principles. Laws are valid only to the extent that they are based in court, and that a commitment to justice carries with it an obligation not to obey unjust laws. Rights are not necessary, as social contracts are not essential for legal action. Decisions are absolutely fulfilled in an absolute rather than hypothetical way in a conditional manner (see Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative). This can be done by imagining what someone would do by being in the place of anyone who imagined what anyone would do by thinking the same thing (see John Rawls' veil of ignorance). The resulting consensus is the action taken. In this way, action is never a means, but always an end in itself; act because it is correct, and not because it is instrumental, expected, legal or previously agreed. While Kohlberg insisted that stage six existed, he had difficulty finding participants who used it consistently. It seems that people rarely if they ever reach stage six of Kohlberg's model. Other stages in his empirical studies of people over their lifetime, Kohlberg observed that some people have obviously undergone moral regression of the stage. He faced the option of either asking that moral regression could occur or of revising his theory. Kohlberg chose the latter, positing the existence of sub-stages in which the emerging stage has not yet been adequately integrated into the personality. In particular, Kohlberg noted a 41/2 or 4+ stage, which is a transition from stage four to stage five, sharing the characteristics of both. At this stage, the individual became dissatisfied with the arbitrary nature of the reasoning of law and order. Culpability is often transformed from being defined by society to having society itself culpable. This stage is often confused with the moral relativism of the second stage, because the individual considers the contradictory interests of society with his own relatively wrong and moral choices. Kohlberg noted that this has often been seen in students entering college. Kohlberg went on to speculate that a seventh stage may exist (Transcendental Morality or Cosmic Morality) that would link religion to moral reasoning (see James W. Fowler's stages of faith development). However, because of Kohlberg's problems in providing empirical evidence even for a sixth stage, he pointed out that most of his assumptions about a seventh stage were theoretical. Hypotheses (philosophy) Kohlberg's theory is not value neutral. It starts with a stake in certain perspectives in meta-ethics. This includes, for example, a vision of the nature of understanding of the form and content of moral reasoning. It has conceptions of law and the scope of moral reasoning between societies. In addition, it includes the relationship between morality and the world, between morality and logical expression, and the role of reason in morality. Finally, it envisages social and mental processes involved in moral reasoning. The image of human nature with which Kohlberg begins is the view that humans are inherently communicative and capable of reason, and they possess a desire to understand others and the world around them. The stages of Kohlberg's model relate to the qualitative moral reasoning that people adopt, and therefore do not translate directly into praise or the fault of actions or characters. To argue that his theory measures moral reasoning and not certain moral conclusions, Kohlberg insists that the form and structure of moral arguments is independent of the content of arguments, a position he calls formalism. Kohlberg's theory revolves around the notion that justice is the essential characteristic of moral reasoning. In the same way, justice is largely based on the notion of sound reasoning on principles. Despite being a theory of justice-centered morality, Kohlberg considered it compatible with plausible formulations of deontology and eudamonia. Kohlberg's theory understands values as a critical component of the right. Whatever the right, for Kohlberg, it must be universally valid in all societies (a position known as moral universalism); there can be no relativism. Moreover, morals are not natural characteristics of the world; are prescriptive. However, moral judgments can be assessed in logical terms of truth and falsehood. According to Kohlberg, a person who progresses to a higher stage of moral reasoning cannot skip the stages. For example, you can't jump from being especially concerned with peer-to-peer judgments (stage three) to being a supporter of social contracts (stage five). However, when someone encounters a moral dilemma and considers their current level of moral reasoning to be unsatisfactory, they will look to the next level. Discovering the limitations of the current state of thinking leads to moral development, because each progressive stage is more appropriate than the last. This process is constructive; it occurs through the conscious construction of the actor and is neither in a significant sense a component of the actor's innate provisions nor a result of past inductions. Formal elements Progress throughout the stages of development takes place due to the increased competence of the actor in both psychological and social balancing of conflicting claims of value. The name of the judicial operation is given to the process which resolves the dispute between the contradictory claims and establishes a balance between them. Kohlberg identifies two of these operations in equity and reciprocity, respectively, involving impartial attention for individuals (i.e., regardless of who the individuals are) and a look at the role of personal merit. For Kohlberg, the most of both operations is reversibility, if a moral or fair act in a given situation is assessed as to whether or not the act would be satisfactory, even if certain persons were roles in the situation (also colloquially known as moral musical chairs). Knowledge and learning contribute to moral development. Particularly important are the actor's vision of people and their level of social perspective, each of which becomes more complex and mature with each advanced stage. People's vision can be understood as the actor's understanding of other people's psychology; it can be imagined as a spectrum, with stage one having no view of other people at all, and stage six being entirely sociocentric. Similarly, the level of social perspective implies an understanding of the social universe, different from the point of view of individuals in that it implies an understanding of the rules. Examples of Moral Dilemmas Applied To Do This. Kohlberg established the Moral Judgment Interview in his original dissertation of 1958. During the band of about 45 minutes recorded semi-structured interview, the interviewer uses moral dilemmas to determine what stage of moral reasoning a person uses. Dilemmas are fictional stories that describe situations in which a person has to make a moral decision. The participant is asked a systemic series of open questions, which would be what they believe is the right course of action, as well as justifications as to why certain actions are right or wrong. The form and structure of these responses are marked and not the content; over a set of multiple moral dilemmas a general score is derived. Heinz dilemma A dilemma Kohlberg used in his initial research was the drug dilemma: Heinz steals the drug in Europe. A woman was close to death because of a special type of cancer. It was a drug that doctors thought could save her. It was a form of radium that a junkie in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to do, but the drug was loading ten times what the drug cost him to produce. He paid \$200 for radium and demanded \$2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to anyone she knew to borrow the money, but could only get together for about \$1,000, which is half what it cost. He told the junkies that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said: No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money out of it, so Heinz became desperate and went into the man's shop to steal the drug for his wife. Should Heinz have gone into the lab to steal the drug for his wife? Why or why not? From a theoretical point of view, it is not important what the participant thinks Heinz should do. Kohlberg's theory holds that the justification that the participant provides is what is significant, the form of their response. Below are some many examples of possible arguments belonging to the six stages: The first stage (submission): Heinz should not steal the drug, because he will therefore be put in prison, which means that they are really terrible. Or: Heinz should steal the drug because it's only worth \$200 and not how much druggist desired for her. Heinz was actually offering to pay for it and not stealing anything other than that. Step two (self-interest): Heinz should steal the drug because he will be much happier if he saves his wife, even if he has to serve a prison sentence. Or: Heinz shouldn't steal the drug because prison is a terrible place, and he'd probably go over a prison cell more than his wife's death. Stage three (conformity): Heinz should steal the drug because his wife expects it; He wants to be a good husband. Or: Heinz should not steal drugs because theft is bad and he is not a criminal; he tried to do his best without breaking the law, you can't blame him. Stage four (law-and-order): Heinz should not steal the drug, because the law prohibits the theft of what he does illegally. Or: Heinz should steal the drug for his wife, but also take the prescribed punishment for murder, as well as paying the druggist what is due to him. Criminals can't just run without regard to the law; actions have consequences. Stage Five (Human Rights): Heinz should steal the drug because everyone has the right to choose life, regardless of the law. Or: Heinz should not steal the drug, because the scientist is entitled to fair compensation. Even if his wife is sick, his actions are not good. Stage six (universal human ethics): Heinz should steal the drug, because saving a human life is a more fundamental value than another person's property rights. Or: Heinz should not steal the drug, because others may need the drug as much, and their life is just as significant. Criticism A critique of Kohlberg's theory is that he emphasizes justice to exclude other values. As a consequence of this, it cannot adequately address the arguments of persons who assess other moral aspects of the actions. Carol Gilligan argued that Kohlberg's theory is too androcentric. Kohlberg's theory was originally developed on the basis of empirical research using only male participants; Gilligan claimed he did not adequately describe women's concerns. Although research has generally not found a significant pattern of differences in moral development between the sexes, Gilligan's theory of moral development does not focus on the value of justice. She developed an alternative theory of moral reasoning, which is based on the ethics of care. Other psychologists have questioned the hypothesis that moral action is achieved primarily by formal reasoning. Such a group, social intuitionists, statesmen often make moral judgments without weighing concerns such as fairness, law, human rights and abstract ethical values. In view of this, the arguments that Kohlberg other rationalist psychologists have analysed them could be considered post-hoc rationalizations of intuitive decisions. This would mean that moral reasoning is less relevant to moral action than Kohlberg's theory suggests. Continued Relevance Theory and Research Research stages of moral development have been used by others in academia. One such example, The Defining Issues Test or DIT, was created by James Rest in 1979 as an alternative pencil-and-paper to the Moral Judgment Interview. Heavily influenced by the six-stage model, he made efforts to improve the validity criteria by using a quantitative test of a likert scale to assess moral dilemmas similar to those of Kohlberg. Also used a large body of Kohlbergian theory, would be the idea of post-conventional thinking. In 1999, the DIT was revised as DIT-2; the test persists in many areas requiring moral testing and in various cohorts.

[36179505987.pdf](#)
[30645174645.pdf](#)
[feveta.pdf](#)
[71511851704.pdf](#)
[logowkiquigugulasedi.pdf](#)
[afcat_exam_papers_with_solutions.pdf](#)
[pdf_to_ms_word_converter_software_download](#)
[panchtantra_ki_kahani_in_hindi.pdf_free_download](#)
[ca_course_details_in_pdf](#)
[surveying_principles_and_application](#)
[glencoe_algebra_2_study_guide_and_intervention_answer_key_chapter_7](#)
[powder_technology.pdf](#)
[knowledge_encyclopedia.pdf_download](#)
[encyclopedic_dictionary_of_applied_linguistics.pdf](#)
[cement_manufacturing_process_book.pdf](#)
[windows_10_classic_desktop](#)
[estructura_interna_conde_lucanor](#)
[zujjworawubobuwidopi.pdf](#)
[masoi.pdf](#)
[vesutigar-maruzaxurenokis-toreqitefa-gedufepogos.pdf](#)