Balancing the Self: The Four Dimensions of Ethics and Aristotle's Pursuit of the Good Life

by Ebun Areogun

The study of ethics, is the study of balance- between self and society, duty and desire, reason and emotion. Throughout history, philosophers from Aristotle to Confucius have grappled with what it means to live a good life. In contemporary discourse, the framework of the four dimensions of ethics: action, character, structure, and culture, offer us a more comprehensive way to understand moral life. These dimensions are not just a reflection of external systems of morality but it is a mirror into the dimensionality of oneself. Each parallel a facet of human existence: how we act, who we become, the systems that shape us, and the meanings we collectively create.

The four dimensions of ethics: action, character, structure, and culture, represent the full terrain of moral life. Action governs the rightness of individual decisions; character, the cultivation of virtue; structure, the justice of social systems; and culture, the shared meanings that sustain communities. Together, they form an ethical ecology that mirrors the complexity of the self. In this essay, I argue that the four dimensions of ethics mirror the layered structure of the self, and that Aristotle's theory of virtue (*arete*) provides the clearest model for achieving balance among them. Through a comparative analysis of classical moral theories, feminist and structural critiques, and contemporary design ethics, I demonstrate that the good life, what Aristotle calls *eudaimonia,* emerges when these dimensions are in harmony.

The Four Dimensions of Ethics

The four dimensions of ethics provide a multi-perspectival approach to moral life, each representing a distinct yet interrelated domain of ethical inquiry. The first, action, concerns the moral quality of what people do—the immediate decisions that determine right and wrong. This is the terrain of utilitarianism and deontology, traditions that evaluate morality according to the outcomes of an act or its adherence to duty. Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, for instance, contended that an action is ethical if it maximises happiness and minimises pain, whereas Immanuel Kant argued that moral worth depends not on consequences but on acting from duty according to universal law. Both frameworks emphasise decision-making and individual responsibility, yet they risk reducing ethics to rational calculation, abstracted from the emotional and social contexts in which choices occur.

The second dimension, character, was the principal focus of Aristotle's virtue ethics. For him, morality lies not in isolated acts but in the cultivation of a virtuous self through the steady practice of reason and habit. "We become just by doing just acts," he writes in *Nicomachean Ethics*, reminding us that virtue is learned through repetition and embodied behaviour. This perspective shifts attention from the morality of doing to the morality of being—from discrete choices to the enduring patterns of personality and disposition that shape a person's life. Virtue ethics thus asks not only *what should I do*, but *what kind of person should I become*.

The third dimension, structure, extends ethical reasoning beyond the individual to include the systems, institutions, and arrangements that shape moral possibilities. It highlights the way that political, economic, and historical conditions condition moral life. Charles Mills, in *The Racial Contract*, demonstrates how moral philosophy has often been built upon and maintained by racialised structures of exclusion, while John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* offers an attempt to design fair institutions that reconcile liberty and equality. From this perspective, ethics is not confined to personal integrity; it must also concern itself with the justice of the systems within which individuals act.

Finally, the dimension of culture situates ethics within the realm of shared meanings, rituals, and narratives. Thinkers such as Virginia Held and Confucius remind us that moral reasoning develops through relationships and the social practices that sustain them. Held's feminist ethics of care challenges the dominance of rational abstraction by foregrounding empathy and interdependence, while Confucius's concept of *li* emphasises ritual propriety and the moral force of tradition. In contemporary contexts, Sasha Costanza-Chock extends this cultural insight to the domain of design, showing how technologies themselves "hard-code" the values and biases of their creators. Culture, then, is both the medium and the mirror of moral life—it shapes our collective imagination, our sense of belonging, and the ethical vocabulary through which we understand ourselves.

Taken together, these dimensions form a holistic framework for understanding ethics as a living, interdependent system. They are not merely theoretical categories but reflections of the human self in its fullness—our choices, our character, our institutions, and our shared meanings. To live ethically, then, is to hold these dimensions in balance, allowing each to inform and correct the others in the continual pursuit of a flourishing life.

Aristotle and the Pursuit of Balance

Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* presents a vision of the good life rooted in balance and habituation. Virtue, he writes, is "a mean between two vices, one of excess and one of deficiency." Courage, for instance, lies between recklessness and cowardice. This "doctrine of the mean" suggests that ethical excellence isn't gotten through rigid obedience or emotional suppression, but through the continuous calibration of one's actions and desires toward reason.

What distinguishes Aristotle's ethics from the utilitarian or deontological traditions is his integration of action, character, structure, and culture into a unified vision. He begins from the self (character) but extends outward to the polis (structure), where laws and education sustain virtue. Culture, too, plays an implicit role: the arts, rhetoric, and shared practices of Greek life cultivate emotional attunement and communal identity.

Aristotle's ethics is not an inward, self-contained system, it is a social and embodied philosophy. Living well (*eu zen*) requires aligning one's internal dispositions with the external order of the community. When the self and the polis are in harmony, justice and happiness coincide. The good life is therefore not an achievement but a dynamic balance—a rhythmic negotiation between moral dimensions.

Confucius offers a parallel to this. His concept of *ren* (humaneness) and *li* (ritual propriety) similarly emphasise that moral character develops within relational and cultural frameworks. In both traditions, ethics is not simply a question of "doing right" but of becoming attuned—to oneself, others, and the surrounding world.

The Dimensions of Ethics as Dimensions of the Self

The four dimensions of ethics—action, character, structure, and culture—can be understood as reflections of the layered nature of the self. Each dimension reveals a distinct way in which human beings engage with the moral world, embodying not only external systems of ethics but also the internal architecture of moral identity.

Action corresponds to agency, the self as actor capable of intention, choice, and responsibility. It represents the will to act, guided by reason or desire, and constrained by the duties we owe to others. Our actions mark the most visible expression of moral life, the point at which thought becomes behaviour. Yet, as Aristotle suggests, right action alone cannot constitute virtue; it must arise from a stable disposition to choose well.

Character, in turn, speaks to identity—the self in a state of becoming. Through the repetition of action and the guidance of reflection, we form habits that solidify into moral character. Aristotle's claim that "habit becomes second nature" captures the intimate link between psychology and ethics. To cultivate character is to shape one's moral horizon, building coherence between what we do and who we are.

Structure reflects the self's embeddedness within context. No life unfolds in a vacuum; every moral choice is situated within legal, economic, and social systems that shape its possibilities. Charles Mills reminds us in *The Racial Contract*, the moral imagination is historically conditioned, often constrained by structures of inequality that determine whose flourishing counts. John Rawls similarly situates morality within institutions, arguing that justice depends upon the fairness of the systems that organise our collective life. To act ethically, therefore, is also to question and reform the structures that limit justice.

Finally, culture corresponds to belonging, revealing the self as relational and interdependent. Our moral vocabulary—what we call right, fair, or good—is shaped by the languages, stories, and rituals of our communities. Virginia Held's ethics of care situates morality within the web of human relationships, where empathy and reciprocity replace abstraction as the foundations of ethical understanding. Likewise, Confucian thought emphasises that virtue is cultivated not in isolation but through participation in shared practices that harmonise the individual with the collective.

Together, these four dimensions form an ethical ecology. To privilege one at the expense of the others is to fragment moral life. A focus on action without attention to structure risks moral individualism; an emphasis on structure without character can dissolve responsibility into determinism. True ethical flourishing requires integration—a balance among agency, identity, context, and belonging. This is the rhythm of virtue that Aristotle envisioned: a self harmonised not only within but also with the world it inhabits.

Feminist and Structural Expansions of Virtue Ethics

While Aristotle offers a powerful model for moral balance, feminist and structural theorists reveal its limits and expand its reach. Virginia Held critiques classical virtue ethics for privileging autonomy and rationality over care, emotion, and interdependence. For her, morality is sustained through relationships, not isolation—a view that enriches the cultural dimension of ethics by recognising how gendered and emotional labor uphold moral life.

Charles Mills and postcolonial thinkers likewise insist that virtue cannot be separated from the historical structures of power that determine who can flourish. A balanced self cannot exist in an unbalanced world; ethical life is both personal and political. To live virtuously, one must not only act well but also transform the unjust conditions that define what "acting well" means.

The Ethical Self as a Practice of Balance

When seen as reflections of selfhood, the four dimensions of ethics transform morality into a form of self-design. The self is not fixed but continually shaped by action, habit, and environment. Aristotle's focus on practice provides the temporal rhythm of this process: the good life unfolds through time, demanding constant recalibration. Modern thinkers such as Alasdair MacIntyre and Martha Nussbaum reinterpret this as a narrative endeavour, an ethical story woven from reason, emotion, and circumstance.

To live ethically, then, is to compose a coherent life across moral, social, and cultural registers—to maintain dialogue among competing demands rather than seek a single rule. Balance itself becomes a virtue, and the self its most enduring creation.

Conclusion

The four dimensions of ethics—action, character, structure, and culture—chart both the landscape of moral philosophy and the inner terrain of the self. Each reflects a facet of being: our choices, our habits, our systems, and our shared meanings. Aristotle's idea of *eudaimonia* unites them as a dynamic equilibrium of reason, virtue, and community.

In a world defined by complexity, inequality, and technological acceleration, the ethical task remains the same—to seek balance. To cultivate a self that acts justly, forms good habits, challenges unjust structures, and contributes to a culture of care. Ethics, in this light, is not a code but a choreography: the ongoing dance of aligning the many dimensions of self and world toward human flourishing.

Bibliography

Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton University Press.

Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)

Confucius. (1997). *The Analects* (R. Dawson, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). Design values: Hard-coding liberation? In *Design justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need* (pp. 35–64). MIT Press.

Held, V. (1993). Feminist transformations of moral theory. In *The feminist perspective on virtue ethics* (pp. 31–47). Oxford University Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.

Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Cornell University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1986). *The fragility of goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.