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Chapter I

Overview of the Internship Experience

Introduction

The primary goal for this project is to develop classroom disciplinary and instructional methods, school-wide disciplinary procedures, district-wide programs, and community based service projects that incorporate Kohlberg’s principles of moral development. The need for school-based methods of discipline that go beyond maintaining control and encourage actual moral development is easily illustrated.

Teacher: “Oh shoot.”
Student: “What’s the matter Mrs. Schemrich?” student asks.
Teacher: “I just ripped my new pair of pants on my file cabinet drawer.”
Student: “No problem, just take the pants back.”
Teacher: “I can’t, I was the one that ripped them. This isn’t the fault of the stores.”
Student: “Just take the pants back folded up and say that they didn’t fit. The store clerk won’t notice that the pants are ripped, and you’ll get money for another pair of pants.”

In the above example, lying to repair a personal mistake is a question of opportunity rather than morality in the above example. In another more disturbing conversation a male student seems to lack the moral reasoning and ability to look at a situation from a different point of view. As a class discussion, plans for Spring Break was the topic. The teacher questioned why many of the students were going to Cancun, Mexico. One student mentioned that many students go to Mexico because the drinking age is lower than in the States and that willing sexual partners are readily available. The teacher asked, “What if one of you got unexpectedly pregnant or got a female pregnant?
How might that news change your future plans for college?” A male student answered
and said:

“Well, it’s not like I would have to take any responsibility for the child. I could
always deny that I slept with her. Besides, I wouldn’t be stupid enough to give
that chick my real name anyway.”

The above conversations are examples of what might be taking place in the minds
of young people, who seem to lack the ability to see their actions in the context, of how
others are affected. In both of the above scenarios, the students seemed to lack an ability
to consider how their actions may be affecting others. A partial remedy may have always
been available to our society at the school level. At the 30th Annual Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development (1975), Glenus G. Unrue, then the president of
the ASCD introduced Kohlberg by saying:

Kohlberg’s remarks to us are going to be most timely. As we know, we
are living in an amoral society. Theft of all kinds, kidnappings, corruption
in high places, our gluttonous consumption of natural resources, violations
of our environment, are all around us. In the schools, according to a study
conducted by NEA (National Educators Association), juvenile crimes
have increased since the 1970’s at a most alarming rate…

Unrue’s comments were made almost twenty-five years ago, well before the events of
September 11, 2001 and the highly publicized tragedies of school shootings. Kohlberg’s
remarks at that same AASCD meeting stated:

Ultimately the standard of development both for the individual and society
is the moral standard. And ultimately the development of the individual or
the society is the development of a higher level of moral awareness and
action. And the fundamental way in which education can aid social
progress is through aiding the moral development of the individual and of
the society through him.

Kohlberg’s message of moral development is still relevant today. Our educational
system can address these issues. Moral education can be implemented in the mainstream
curriculum. Using Kohlberg’s model of moral development, it is possible to address moral development by applying principles of Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development to classroom disciplinary and instructional procedures, school-wide disciplinary procedures, district-wide programs, and community based service projects.

**Primary Project Objectives**

The primary goal for this project is to develop classroom disciplinary and instructional methods, school-wide disciplinary procedures, district-wide programs, and community based service projects that incorporate Kohlberg’s principles of moral development. Initially these methods and programs will be developed for implementation within secondary Family and Consumer Science Departments. It is hoped that these procedures and programs, once developed, will be adopted for implementation within Family and Consumer Science Departments in high schools nationwide.

**Objectives for Specific Methods and Programs**

In all of the following objectives, Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development provides the principles for addressing moral development directly or indirectly in the diverse settings outlined below.

Classroom Instructional Methods:
1. Incorporate role-playing and use of scenarios to teach objectives of Family and Consumer Science curriculum.
2. Develop tests that use scenarios and questions specific to the scenarios.
3. Develop projects where students must use skills of application and evaluation.

Classroom Disciplinary Procedures:
1. Develop method of incorporating student input into classroom disciplinary procedures.
2. Develop writing assignments for classroom disciplinary infractions.
3. Develop procedures for evaluating writing assignment and involving parental contact.

School-wide Disciplinary Procedures:
1. Develop methods of improving student’s knowledge and input of school-wide disciplinary procedures.
2. Working within established school disciplinary procedures, develop writing assignments that expect students to review disciplinary procedures and policies of school and evaluate their behavior regarding these policies.
3. Develop strategies for incorporating parental knowledge of their adolescent’s minor infractions to school-wide discipline policies.

District-wide program:
1. Working with the districts elementary schools, develop program where by teens and elementary students build mutually beneficial relationships.
2. Establish an on going program of connection between high school and elementary schools.
3. Develop structures and procedures for program implementation in schools nationwide.
Community-based programs:

1. Establish on-going relationships with community members who will support
   programs that connect adolescents with opportunities for community service projects.
2. Develop at least two appropriate community based service learning projects for teens
   to involve themselves.
3. Develop structures and procedures for program implementation in schools
   nationwide.
Chapter II

Review of Literature

The main idea behind Kohlberg’s theory of moral development is that children and adolescents do not merely soak up or internalize the morals and values of the adults around them, but through situations of moral conflict, children construct their own values and morals (Stantrock, 1996; Kohlberg, 1958; 1975). Rosenzwig poignantly states Kohlberg’s ideas. She wrote:

The Kohlberg theory suggests that rather than attempt to indoctrinate or socialize students, moral education should seek to stimulate the natural process of development toward more mature reasoning. Hence the role of the educator ought to be that of a supportive but questioning guide—a Socratic teacher—who encourages the articulation and examination of students’ own reasoning about ethical issues and facilitates exposure to higher stages of reasoning, (Munsey, 1980 p.360).

The goal of moral education is to stimulate the child to reason at a higher level of moral maturity whereby the individual internalizes his or her beliefs and acts upon these beliefs (Duska and Whelan, 1975). An understanding of Kohlberg’s research and findings of moral development would be helpful in understanding why a higher level of moral reasoning is desirable.

Kohlberg performed a longitudinal study with seventy boys over an eighteen-year period. Kohlberg’s methods of research included presenting the boys with a moral dilemma and then asking the boys a series of questions (Kohlberg, 1958). He was
interested in the moral reasoning behind each boy’s answer. He interviewed the boys every three years over the eighteen-year period. He found that although there were variations of levels of moral reasoning, all boys passed through similar levels and stages and they did not skip over or revert back to a particular level of reasoning (Kohlberg, 1958, 1975).

Using parts of Piaget’s research in moral development and John Dewey’s Stages of Moral Development, Kohlberg suggested three levels of moral reasoning, each level being characterized by two stages (Santrock, 1999; Carpendale, 2000; Kohlberg, 1975). In the first level, the Pre-Conventional Level, the child has not internalized any of the values or morals he will compel himself to follow. The first stage in this level is called the Punishment and Obedience Orientation. At this level of reasoning the child is simply trying to avoid punishment. Following the rules is not a matter of personal reflection upon an internalized set of values. Rather, the child follows the rules because the grown-ups tell him to and if he doesn’t punishment is inevitable. The second stage under this level is called the Instrumental Relativist Orientation. At this stage the child is egocentric in his or her thinking and is seeking to get something from following the rules. Choosing to do what is right is a matter of satisfying one’s own needs. The child follows the rules in order to get something in return. Beginning ideas of reciprocity and ideas of fairness are present, but these qualities do not reflect a true sense of loyalty or justice. The young lady in the first scenario of chapter one was reasoning at this stage of moral development. She, placing herself in the teacher’s place, reasoned that her end goal was to replace the pair of jeans. She wasn’t concerned with whether it was right or wrong to do so. She
was interested and focused upon only her desires and needs not those of the store clerk or the storeowner.

The Conventional Level of reasoning entails hints of internalization, yet the child has not fully grasped the immensity of what he or she believes and can be easily persuaded to think and act against his or her newly rooted morals. The Interpersonal Concordance of “Good Boy-Nice Girl” Orientation is the third stage in this level of reasoning and it is characterized by the individual’s need to gain parental praise. He or she knows that “being nice” will gain parental approval. Also at this stage, the child is able to consider the intentions of the other people involved in moral dilemmas. Moral reasoning is based upon such notions as “he means well.”

In the fourth stage, Law and Order Orientation, choosing right behavior becomes important in upholding social order. It is characterized by a sense of duty to follow the rules for the sake of maintaining social order and avoiding chaos. The individual sees the merit in doing one’s duty and understands that rules and laws are in place for everyone to benefit.

The Post-Conventional level marks the individual's ability to follow his or her own set of internalized morals and values. These values may or may not reflect the societal group in which this individual is a part. The fifth stage is the Social-Contract Legalistic Orientation. The individual functioning at this level is able to clearly understand that laws exist for the good of all, yet if needed these laws can be changed to better represent the needs of all. Personal and individual rights are viewed as an important element of social order. The democratic avenue of arriving at laws and rules is viewed as most beneficial.
The Universal Ethical Principle Orientation marks the sixth and highest level of moral reasoning. Individuals who reach this stage have their internalized morals and strong conscience to govern their behavior. Rules are replaced by deep moral convictions. Following rules involves more than doing one’s duty; rather internalized values direct one’s behavior. The equality and respect for dignity of all individuals is considered a higher priority than that of the individual.

After reading through the brief summary of the six stages, it becomes apparent that each level of moral development turns the focus of justice and fairness away from the individual’s whims to that of the larger society. The individual functioning at a higher level of moral reasoning isn’t solely concerned with self-satisfaction, but thinks of the rights and needs of others. In order for societies to function well, individuals need to be aware and responsible for their actions. A child functioning at the first stage of moral development may interpret right and wrong by whether he or she is caught doing something that brings about consequences. As an adult this individual continues to function at this level, his lack of internalized morals could mean that rape, murder, stealing and the like are only wrong if the individual gets caught and punishment is administered.

As stated earlier, Kohlberg believed the development of a moral society is dependent upon the moral standards of the individuals that live within that society. The way to aid society’s progress then is to aid the individual’s progress in moral development. Moral education can coexist in and throughout the curriculum and it need not be a separate curriculum or a portion of curricula that is set aside for only religious
institutions to address (Kohlberg, 1975). Findings from a study done by Moshe Blatt support Kohlberg’s beliefs.

Moshe Blatt preformed the first documented “proof” that moral education could be implemented into the curriculum of a regular classroom. By using moral dilemmas and leading his junior high students in discussion, Blatt successfully incorporated moral development into his social studies class. In one semester one-third to one-half of the experimental group demonstrated a change in moral reasoning to the next stage (Kohlberg, 1975; Rosenzwig, 1980). By stimulating his students to explore their own beliefs and by exposing them to different levels of moral reasoning his students were able to construct a higher level of moral reasoning.

Kohlberg and Fenton replicated Blatt’s findings by performing a similar experiment in the Boston and Pittsburgh area. They trained junior high social studies teachers in the art of conducting discussions about moral dilemmas. To be more specific, the teachers were trained in the Socratic teaching style of conducting discussions (Rosenzwig, 1980). They were asked to follow a five-step procedure, which included:

1. introducing and clarifying the nature of the dilemma and the facts and circumstances involved
2. asking students to take a tentative position on the appropriate action for the main protagonist in the dilemma
3. dividing the class into small groups to discuss the reasoning behind their position
4. testing and questioning students reasoning in a full class discussion
(5) encouraging students to reevaluate their own positions and their reasons individually (Rosenzwig, 1980)

Kohlberg and Fenton found that by using the procedures above, one-third to one-half of the experimental group were stimulated in their moral reasoning enough to move up one stage in their reasoning. Many years after this study was conducted, the Kohlberg and Fenton model is still used in integrating moral cognitive development into educational curriculums (Rosenzwig, 1980). Rosenzwig said, “Since Blatt’s pilot project, programs in cognitive developmental moral education have involved virtually every subject area and every age level from elementary school through college” (1980, p. 362).

**Application of Kohlberg’s Theory to Classroom Instructional Methods**

Kohlberg’s primary suggestion for stimulating moral development is by using scenarios and class discussions. Family and Consumer Science Classes lends themselves to using scenarios and class discussions to solve relational-real-life practical problems. The State Mandated Family and Consumer Sciences Curriculum Guides have several scenarios in which students can place themselves in order to solve practical problems. For example, in the FCS Curriculum Guide for Personal Development students are given one of five scenarios to read within a pre-established group. The group is then asked to make a chart listing the characteristics of caring and uncaring behaviors using the scenario. This process can be enhanced by using Kohlberg’s methods of Socratic questioning and by developing tests that utilize the scenario methods. By doing so, students are given a great opportunity to explore their own moral reasoning and to apply their personal values to solving the problems presented through the scenario. Further
deepening the students experience of problem solving can take place when students are expected to take the position or role of one of the characters in the scenarios and argue from that point of view in role-playing skits. Lastly, it is noteworthy to point out that using Kohlberg’s methods of Socratic questioning will also force students to use skills that are higher on Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives (Bloom, 1956).

Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives starts with the simplest cognitive tasks such as reciting and remembering facts and progresses through six levels. In ascending order the levels are, Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation. At each ascending level, the student is required to use more cognitive and affective reasoning abilities. By incorporating role-playing, Socratic questioning students, and teacher guided discussions into lesson plans, students are provided opportunity to apply, analysis, and evaluate. These skills are at the heart of moral reasoning.

Practical Applications: Kohlberg’s Theory Applied

To Classroom Disciplinary Procedures

One way to apply Kohlberg’s ideas to classroom discipline would be by allowing the students an opportunity to be part of the creation of classroom procedure and policy. In Kohlberg’s “Just Community” School, students were given opportunity to participate in the creative process of school policies and procedures. The students had a voice in what policies and procedures were adopted (Kohlberg, 1975). Kohlberg admitted that the process was long and tedious and worked best in a small group setting. Yet, these techniques worked in that the students cooperated with teachers in following the policies and procedures they helped create (Kohlberg, 1975). Student within in the first couple of
days of class can be engaged in deciding what type of classroom atmosphere they desire. This system of establishing policies and procedures will be discussed in detail in chapter III.

Another way that classroom disciplinary procedures could be used to afford students an opportunity to develop and strengthen the abilities to reason morally would be through writing assignments. In many high schools, students are given a detention when they misbehave. A detention in many high schools usually consists of the student having to remain after school for approximately thirty minutes. They are assigned to sit in a room with other students who also have to serve detentions and they may do homework or sleep. By adapting Kohlberg’s Socratic question method, combining them with school policies, and developing writing assignments for students to complete during detention, students are then afforded opportunity to analyze and evaluate their own behavior.

Kohlberg’s Socratic questioning method could also be applied to in the classroom by using writing assignments and interview sessions when rules are broken. Students who break the rules could be afforded the opportunity to explore their actions in the context of the classroom setting with the teacher acting as guide. For example, an adolescent is angry at the grade she received on a test. She then begins to make snide remarks to the teacher in earshot of the whole class. Following the disciplinary procedures set in place at most high schools the adolescent is given a warning. If this does not prompt her to stop her behavior, she is then issued a detention with the teacher. When the adolescent arrives to serve the detention, the teacher hands her a writing assignment. The writing assignment could include a paragraph on respect and responsibility and some questions
that would be more specific to the offense. Some examples of questions could be as the following. What prevented you from keeping your negative remarks to yourself? What was appropriate or inappropriate about the time and place in which you chose to express your feelings about your grade? What rights of your peers did you violate when you took class time to discuss your grades? If your behavior continues, what might your peers and teachers expect from you? What might be gained by handling this situation differently in the future? After the teen completes the questions, the teacher and student then spend time together reviewing the answers. Expecting students to evaluate their own behavior while serving a detention, helps the teacher to follow the policies that are in place and affords the student an opportunity to reflect upon his or her behavior. More details about this application will be addressed in chapter III.

An Overview of School Wide Disciplinary Procedures and Application of Kohlberg’s Theory

In many high schools, students are given a student planner with all the disciplinary policies written in the first pages of the planner. The students must sign a paper stating they received, read, and understand the school’s policies. A similar parental form is sent home and must be returned signed by a parent or guardian. This is the extent of transmitting the school’s disciplinary codes of conduct. Kohlberg believed that if you want to have students “buy into” a system of discipline the students must be a part of the process of deriving the codes and the consequences of not following these codes of behavior. In his Just Community Schools, the teachers and students actively participated in forming the acceptable codes of conduct for their schools. Kohlberg conceded that in the beginning when this approach was introduced there were students whom did not take
the responsibility seriously, yet in a short time a working democratic system of
disciplinary policies were in place (Kohlberg 1975). In a high school of over 2,300 kids,
having the students participate in a round table discussion of school policies would be
impossible. Yet, adapting from what Kohlberg did in Just Community, one way of
accomplishing this could be that by having the students review each of the policies of the
school’s code of conduct in their homerooms. After which each student would be given
the opportunity to vote or submit comments about each of the school’s policies. The
school’s codes of conduct could be rewritten to better reflect the needs of the teachers
and students by having student’s input. This process would help stimulate a better
understanding of how and why the codes are in place. As it stands now, some students
hardly read the policy and only become aware of it when they have violated some portion
of it, which leads me to my next point.

In many high schools, after a student has committed an offense against the
school’s policy, the student is handled in a hierarchical approach to consequences
beginning with a verbal or written warning. The hierarchy starts with verbal or written
warning and progressively leads to more time consuming elements of discipline. They
are as follows:

- verbal or written warning
- detention – which consists of having the student remain after school
- Corrective learning – spending a full or half day in one room with students of
  similar offenses and having to complete work independent of classroom
  instruction*
Saturday assignment – Students have to report to school for a full or half day of Saturday School. They must bring class work and complete the work on Saturday.*

* The specific names for these consequences may vary from school to school.

Suspension – Student is given days off school without being able to make up the work he or she missed.

Expulsion – Student is kicked out of school for 30-80 days without being able to make up the work he or she missed. This usually causes a student to fail a semester, or the whole year.

In each of the above punishments except the verbal or written warning, the student is expected to show up for a prearranged amount of time. While serving this time, students can bring a book to read or homework to complete. Usually the student is given ample time to “schedule-in” when he or she will be expected to serve the detention. The whole process of the discipline doesn’t have any connection to the offense. Students are “punished” by having to spend their time at school longer than desired yet nothing else is expected of them. They are not required to make connections between the offense and possible future consequences. They are not asked to speculate upon how their present behavior can effect their future choices and that of their classmates. They simple show up for their scheduled amount of time. Using Kohlberg’s theory of moral development, educators and school administrators could use this time to stimulate students to reflect upon their actions and the possible impact of their actions have on others now and in the future. More specific applications will be discussed in detail in chapter III.
Application of Kohlberg’s theory in district-wide programs

and community based service learning projects

Kohlberg’s sixth stage of moral development emphasizes the respect for dignity of all human beings and equality of all human rights as the highest order (Duska 1975). In order for an adolescent to reach the depth of moral reasoning needed to respect the dignity of all humans, a deeper challenge must be provided than that of scenarios and class discussions. According to Kohlberg students need opportunities to develop empathy and mutual respect (Duska, 1975). By developing programs that place adolescents in the role of caregiver for elementary aged children and elderly adults, adolescents may be afforded the opportunities needed to produce the sensitivity, understanding, and respect for human beings in a way that can not be taught in any other way. More specific details of such programs will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Kohlberg’s research provided evidence that schools can effectively address moral education within the curriculum. Applying Kohlberg’s theory of moral development to classroom management and school-wide disciplinary procedures is another way moral development can be addressed in schools. Using Kohlberg’s model of Socratic questioning along with presently practiced disciplinary procedures, students will be afforded an opportunity to reflect upon their behavior and how it impacts themselves and others. These opportunities provide the avenue for the individual to develop a higher level of moral reasoning. Kohlberg’s message of moral development rings true today, “Ultimately the way to aid social progress is to aid the individual in developing a higher level of moral awareness and action” (Kohlberg, 1975). Educational institutions must lead the way in promoting social progress.
Chapter III

Implementation and Design

Classroom Instructional Methods:

1. Using the state mandated curriculum guides, lesson plans will be developed using scenarios, role-plays, and class discussions in order to provide students with opportunities to struggle with and define their own moral reasoning.

2. After implementing lesson plans, students will be evaluated using scenario-based tests.

3. Evaluation methods will consist of students’ affective behavior toward lesson plans and tests, test scores, and personal evaluations of units given to students.

Classroom Disciplinary Procedures:

1. Students will be afforded the opportunity to have to create classroom policies and procedures using a four-quadrant chart method described later in the chapter.

2. The four –quadrant chart will be revisited when necessary to restate class rules.

3. Writing assignments will be developed that will give the student an opportunity to reflect on misbehavior.

4. Evaluation and discussion of writing assignments will be noted in chapter IV.

School wide Disciplinary Procedures

1. Initial meeting with administrator to discuss gaining support of project.
2. Follow up meetings with other administrators.

3. Develop questions to coincide with school disciplinary policies.

4. Administrator’s support of questions.

5. Implementation using Corrective Learning.

6. Success or Failure of writing assignments will be made on an on going basis.

   Success of program will be dependent upon the administrator’s evaluation of workload needed to make writing assignments feasible for all offenders.

District wide program:

1. Establish contact with elementary schools in district.

2. Visit each school that shown interest in implementing “Teen Buddies” program. A program that matches high school students with an elementary aged student in order to form a “big brother or big sister” like relationship.

3. Write permission slips for elementary students.

4. Match adolescents with elementary children.

5. Keep all memos and messages with school.

6. Evaluation of program will include reactions from elementary principle, teachers, and students as well as those participating at the high school level.

Community Based Projects:

1. Establish contact with neighborhood nursing home.

2. Personally visit program director.

3. Work program details out with program director. The program will entail having high school students “adopt” a grandparent from the nursing home and establish an ongoing relationship with the senior adult.
4. Establish an initial meeting with of students and nursing home staff.

5. Match elderly residents with students.

6. Implement program.

7. Evaluation of program will include adolescents completion of evaluation form, program directors reactions, and residents overall reaction to program.
Chapter IV

Implementation and Evaluation

Classroom Instruction

Applying Kohlberg’s theory to classroom instruction can change the atmosphere of the traditional classroom in amazing and creative ways. Gone are the days when there is only one teacher in the classroom. By incorporating scenarios, role-playing, and providing students to work in cooperative groups, there rises up natural teachers within the classroom. These natural teachers are the students themselves. To begin to create a classroom by which the students teach each other and one, in which the students learn from placing themselves in roles in skits and scenarios, the teacher must do much preplanning.

Preplanning takes the form of reviewing the objectives for the next few units of learning in advance. In reviewing the objectives a realistic plan of action must be outlined. Questions that may help in this process are as follows. In what ways can these objectives be taught to help the students identify with the lessons? How can the objectives of this unit be taught in a way that helps the students apply the lesson to their personal lives? In what ways can the objectives of this unit be written as to ask in depth questions that the students will be challenged and interested in finding the answers? In what ways can the students be involved in role taking and with scenarios?

The second part is equally as challenging. The second part would involve actual preparing the worksheets, questions, and handouts that would direct the students to focus on the units objectives and not on irrelative information of the scenarios and skits. In Family and Consumer Sciences, the objectives are practical and applicable to the lives of
the students. Yet using scenarios could easily be adapted to math, science, history, or industrial technology. The main challenge for the traditional teacher is overcoming the need to be the lecturer and disseminator of information. The new challenge is to become the Socratic questioner.

The last challenge in applying Kohlberg’s principles comes in form of developing tests. Test should incorporate the type of Socratic questioning that took place in the class. If students were given scenarios or given roles to play in skits, the same format should be made available in testing the students. For an example, consider a unit of communication skills. The objective may be to list the verbal and non-verbal methods of communication. After working with scenarios and in role-plays, some possible test formats could be giving the students a few scenarios in which they must communicate for the characters using appropriate verbal and non-verbal techniques. Another method of testing may be to have the students communicate appropriately in a role-play. The test scorers could be the students who catch the actors using inappropriate body language and words that produce anger in others. (See Appendix A for example lessons and tests).

**Evaluation of applying Kohlberg to the classroom**

Applying Kohlberg’s principles to the classroom was indeed a challenge. Certain abilities to translate objectives into questions were called upon. Developing activities and scenarios in which the students were challenged and interested enough to search for and apply the answers was taxing to one’s creative powers. Much preplanning was done. Translating objectives into questions, scenarios, and role-plays took on average a least one-week preplanning. Teachers have a number of activities both professional and personal that they must juggle. It would appear that reading the objectives of the unit,
make overhead notes, and disseminate these notes to students would take much less time and effort. Yet, the results may not be as productive in helping students to develop the reasoning abilities that moral development requires. Applying the principles of Kohlberg to classroom instruction has deepened the level of learning that has taken place. This was noted by the questions that students asked about personal matters in their lives. Their questions not only reflected a basic knowledge of the content of the lessons, but also a form of application. On one occasion, when working in the unit on communication and anger management. The students were asked to bring to make up a situation in which they believed that the methods taught in class would not work. Two people teams played out the scenario in class using appropriate anger management and communication techniques. The next day, a student approached the teacher. He told her that he had written a situation from his own life. After he witnessed others appropriately communicating his thoughts and feelings in the scenario, he tried the same in his life situation. The outcome was positive for him. This sort of outcome is at the heart of Kohlberg’s theory of moral development.

Lastly, the tests were developed to reflect the style of teaching described above. Tests contained higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy of learning (See Appendix A). Tests included portions of application, analysis, and evaluation questions and this poses another challenge. Grading these types of tests takes time and effort. Multiple choice, matching and short answer tests have an answer key. For tests that include scenarios, exact answers will not be able to be written in an answer key, rather, the teacher must read each test and look for the correct answer and the application of the material. This took much time. Another drawback from these types of test was the test scores. It seemed that
many students were challenged by the reasoning skills they needed to use on the tests and in the beginning the test scores were low. After the first couple of tests, however, the students’ high-test scores reflected their ability to adjust.

A definite plus to implementing Kohlberg’ principles to classroom instruction was the students affective replies to the lessons and activities. The students were eager to participate. They demonstrated with smiles, and comments that they enjoyed this form of teaching. The students would often come to class with stories of how they applied the units’ objectives. These stories reflected that the students not only learned the material, but were also incorporating reasoning to apply the material to their lives. This is the point of teaching and the gist of what Kohlberg was suggesting should take place in classrooms.

**Classroom Discipline Implementation**

In the first couple of days of class the students will be engaged in deciding what type of classroom atmosphere they desire. Using a four-quadrant chart, students are asked what things they expect or want and what things do not expect or want from the class. The teacher answers the same questions on his or her chart. See the example below of some of the answers that students and teacher may offer in regards to what they expect from the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Want</th>
<th>Things students don’t want</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Atmosphere of mutual respect</td>
<td>• Lectures all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A fun atmosphere</td>
<td>• Tons of notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activities in which to participate</td>
<td>• Busy work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class discussions</td>
<td>• A grouchy teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grades to be posted</td>
<td>• Unreasonable grading system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Wants

- Atmosphere of mutual respect
- Class participation
- Students to be on time
- Students to be involved in lesson
- Freedom to consider individuality of the class and change lessons if necessary.
- Respect to be shown at all times

Things teacher doesn’t want

- To be disrespected in front of the class with issues that should be handled one on one.
- Students to criticize teacher’s lesson plans
- To be blamed for student’s poor grades
- Students sleeping or doing other teacher’s work during class time.
- Students to ignore directions or instructions

The classroom teacher will give his or her expectations of class also. After writing the ideas on the board a discussion as to how to bring about the expectation of the class can ensue. Together, the students and teacher will have worked to form the policies of the classroom. At any time when the rules of the classroom are no longer being followed or new rules need to be written, the teachers and students could again revisit the classroom expectations and together decide what areas in the rules need to be rewritten.

For a specific example, let’s say it’s grading period time and many of the students are upset with the grade they received in class. At this time, the teacher would direct the students to make a four-quadrant chart and write down what they will do differently and what they think the teacher needs to do differently. While the students are working, the teacher makes his or her chart on the board and writes his or her expectations. After ample amount of time is given, a discussion takes place and together, new rules and expectations are agreed upon. The aspect of the teacher asking for input adds an element of democracy to the classroom. The students, feeling that their input counts, will be more apt to follow the rules.

Kohlberg’s Socratic questioning method could also be applied to in the classroom by using writing assignments and interview sessions when rules are broken. Students who break the rules could be afforded the opportunity to explore their actions in the context of
the classroom setting with the teacher acting as guide. For example, an adolescent is angry at the grade she received on a test. She then begins to make snide remarks to the teacher in earshot of the whole class. Following the disciplinary procedures set in place at most high schools, the adolescent is given a warning. If this does not prompt her to stop her behavior, she is then issued a detention with the teacher. When the adolescent arrives to serve the detention, the teacher hands her a writing assignment. The writing assignment should be specific to the offense. Some examples of questions could be as the following. What prevented you from keeping your negative remarks to yourself? What was appropriate or inappropriate about the time and place in which you chose to express your feelings about your grade? What rights of your peers did you violate when you took class time to discuss your grades? If your behavior continues, what might your peers and teachers expect from you? What might be gained by handling this situation differently in the future? After the adolescent completes the questions, the teacher and student then spend time together reviewing the answers. It would be appropriate at this time to allow the student to talk about her disappointing grade. It would also be an appropriate time for the teacher to restate the expectations of the class as voted upon by her peers.

**Evaluation**

The implementation of a more democracy type of approach to classroom discipline had more positive outcomes than negative. Some of the positive aspects were that the students and the teacher developed and agreed upon the desired classroom atmosphere, rules and policies. In the process, the students’ ideas sparked discussion of examples of how the agreed policies would look and feel within the classroom. For
example, one student described how in another class the students disrespected the teacher and other students. She lamented that it was an uncomfortable atmosphere and that not much learning took place. Another student shared how he was afraid to ask questions in a class that was run by a totally domineering teacher. Many of the students shared that they enjoyed the process and that it made them feel that their thoughts mattered.

Another positive aspect was referring students to the agreed informal contract when a problem arose. One example was when a third of the students in one particular class had received a low grade. Almost immediately the class took on an attitude of “us against them”. One student’s negative comment spurred another’s. The teacher asked them to take out a sheet of paper and to write what they needed/wanted and what they were willing to do to get better grades. Together as a class teacher and students discussed the reality of implementing the brainstormed ideas. The students wrote reasonable requests such as, more in-class assignments, at least one extra credit assignment per month, and opportunities to work in a group. The list of things they were willing to do was equally unanticipated. They said they were willing to quiet down more quickly so class time wasn’t wasted, to bring needed supplies everyday, and to not talk during the teacher’s lectures. Fearing that the angry students would write unreasonable requests and further waste class time, the teacher almost forwent the process of brainstorming. Yet, the surprisingly reasonable requests of the students made her glad she did not. The students demonstrated earnest interest in getting back to a more pleasant atmosphere than the one that had recently been developing. This process took approximately twenty minutes and for the rest of the class period, the students were well behaved, respectful, and attentive.
The only negative aspect experienced was that in some classes the students seemed to be preprogrammed to sit and listen. In these classes, usually upper classman, the students seemed to expect the teacher to dictate and lecture for in this way they didn’t have to actively take part in the class. In these classes, it seemed the students were eager to move on to the lesson, get the grade, and get out.

Implementation of the writing assignments on the other hand seemed to be more work. The main problem with the writing assignments was developing assignments that fit the offense. There seems a thousand ways to disrupt class and break the class policies. In the beginning, specific writing assignments were developed with offense. In order to accomplish this, the teacher had to remember in detail how the student broke classroom policy and then develop an appropriate writing assignment. After developing three such writing assignments, it was clear that there needed to be a more comprehensive writing assignment. The following questions were developed. 1. In detail, describe the your offense against the classroom policies or rules. 2. Who beside yourself was affected by your action? 3. List three alternative actions you could have taken in order to avoid going against established class rules? 4. What steps will you take to ensure that you will not behave in this manner again? 5. Explore how your present behavior could effect your life and relationships outside of this classroom.

Another problem was that although the questions included the phrase, “describe in detail” most students gave one sentence or single phrase answers. Their answers were so brief that many of them did not merit the paper in which they were written. After experiencing such short answers, the teacher gave the writing assignment at the onset of the offense to class policy. Expecting the student to write brief answers the teacher typed
the questions on a half sheet of paper. The student was expected to answer the questions before serving the detention and to bring the answers the day of their detention. At that time the teacher and the student would review and discuss the answers. This method work better for many reasons. One, it saved paper. Two, the student was forced to remember the details of the offense and it was no longer a responsibility of the teacher. Three, the teacher and student were able to forge a deeper appreciation for one another because the discussion over the offense took place when both parties had time to reflect upon their actions. And four the students seemed to enjoy the one on one attention from the teacher. The most important part of the process was that there was only one repeat offender.

Kohlberg was definitely on to something when he suggested that democracy reign in the classroom. The students did rise to the level of reasoning necessary to take personal responsibility in the type of classroom atmosphere they helped to develop. The students not only seemed to respect the rules, but they seemed to learn in the process how to respect others as well. The classroom could be seen as a microcosm of the macrocosm of society. If so, the skills needed to be a responsible citizen in society should begin in the classroom.

**School Wide Discipline Procedures**

Implementation of School wide discipline procedures was not performed due to lack of administrative staffing at the school in which it was to be tested. In the next couple of pages the plan and set up applying Kohlberg’s principles to school wide disciplinary procedures will be outlined.
At many high schools, students within the first couple of days of school are given a student planner with all the disciplinary policies written in the first pages of the planner. The students must sign a paper stating they received, read, and understand the school’s policies. A similar parental form is sent home and must be returned signed by a parent or guardian. This is the extent of transmitting the school’s disciplinary codes of conduct. Kohlberg believed that if you want to have students “buy into” a system of discipline the students must be a part of deriving the codes and the consequences. In a high school of over 2,300 students, having the students participate in a round table discussion of school policies would be impossible. Yet, adapting from what Kohlberg did in Just Community, one way of accomplishing this could be that by having the students review each of the policies of the school’s code of conduct in their homerooms. After which each student would be given the opportunity to vote or submit comments about each of the school’s policies. I believe some of the school’s codes of conduct could be rewritten to better reflect the needs of the teachers and students by having student’s input. This process would help stimulate a better understanding of how and why the codes are in place. As it stands now, the students hardly read the policy and only become aware of it when they have violated some portion of it, which leads me to my next point.

After a student has committed an offense against the school’s policy, the student is handled in a hierarchical approach to consequences beginning with a verbal or written warning. The hierarchy starts with verbal or written warning and progressively leads to more time consuming elements of discipline. They are as follows:

- verbal or written warning
- detention –which consists of having the student remain after school
Corrective learning – spending a full or half day in one room with students of similar offenses and having to complete work independent of classroom instruction

Saturday assignment – Students have to report to school for a full or half day of Saturday School. They must bring class work and complete the work on Saturday.

Suspension – Student is given days off school without being able to make up the work he or she missed.

Expulsion – Student is kicked out of school for 30-80 days without being able to make up the work he or she missed. This usually causes a student to fail a semester, or the whole year.

In each of the above punishments except the verbal or written warning, the student is expected to show up for a prearranged amount of time. While serving this time, students can bring a book to read or homework to complete. Usually the student is given ample time to “schedule-in” when he or she will be expected to serve the detention. The whole process of the discipline doesn’t have any connection to the offense. Students are “punished” by having to spend their time at school longer than desired yet nothing else is expected of them. They are not required to make connections between the offense and possible future consequences. They are not asked to speculate upon how their present behavior can effect their future choices and that of their classmates. They simply show up for their scheduled amount of time. Using Kohlberg’s theory of moral development, educators and school administrators could use this time to stimulate
students to reflect upon their actions and the possible impact of their actions have on others now and in the future.

Examine a specific example of how Kohlberg’s theory can be used in discipline. Take for an example, a group of students in a class that they aren’t enjoying. They don’t bring their needed materials to class, don’t pay attention to teacher’s instructions, and they are disrespectful and disruptive in class. Following the normal disciplinary procedures in many high schools, these students are given a warning first. If the warning doesn’t help the students to change and they continue their disruptive and uncooperative behavior, the teacher gives them a detention for a half-hour or more after school. If these students continue in their behavior their parents are called and they may get a day in CL (Corrective Learning), where they complete their homework at their leisure and sleep. The same can be expected from Saturday assignment. At this point these students have not been required to make connections between their behavior and the consequences they are receiving. In fact, if you were to ask them why they received the detention or CL, they may shrug their shoulders and say, “The teacher doesn’t like us.” By adapting Kohlberg’s model of Socratic questioning, educators and administrators can help stimulate growth in moral development.

Keeping the hierarchy of consequences in place, add to it a written form of evaluation that the student must complete in order for his or her detention to count. Involve the parents in the process also. The writing assignments would be coinciding with the school’s policies written in the student planner. When a student violated one of the schools policies, that particular writing assignment would be given. The broken policy number and a short description would be at the top of the page and Socratic
questions such as, describe how your behavior went against this policy (referring to the policy on the top of the page)? List three alternative behavior choices you could have made that would have not broken school policy. Who, beside yourself, was also affected by your behavior? Along with such questions there could be a parental component. When the administrator in charge called home the parent or guardian could be requested to fill out their portion of the assignment.

The writing assignment would force administrators to be uniform in their handling of school policy. The “crime” would have to be printed upon the referral and writing assignment. The students would have to become more familiar with school policy and would be given an opportunity to reflect and learn from their poor behavior. Connections between behavior and consequences could be a possible outcome of following these procedures. Lastly, parents would be involved in the discipline process at all levels. Each time their son or daughter received a writing assignment, they would know what policy was broken and what consequences will be administered.

Problems with this system are many. It would be vital for all members of staff involved with school wide discipline to support the system and work with in it. In a large school with varying personalities and styles of staff, one hundred percent support would be near impossible. In a high school with short staffing, especially in the administrative area, this system would have the potential of overwhelming an already overburdened staff. Who would review the answers to the Socratic questions? Who would be responsible for making sure the parental portion was indeed completed by the parent or guardian. Although many problems exist, involving the staff in the rationale for and the possible benefits, of the system could arrive upon a workable solution.
District Wide Implementation and Evaluation

Teen Buddy Program

Note: When referring to the implementation and evaluation of this program, references to each step as a stage will be made. This will make it easier for the reader to follow the process of establishing the program. Problems in each stage will be discussed within the particular implementation stage in which they took place. And possible remedies for these problems will be discussed in the particular stage in which they occur.

Stage One: Permission

Before contacting the elementary schools in the district, permission to develop the program obtained by the head administrator. Discussion of the program, possible benefits and problems of the program took place. After this initial meeting, support and permission was granted to begin the program. All of the above was done informally and verbally.

Stage Two: Initial contact

Initial contact was made with the principal’s of the elementary schools by email. An informal letter was drafted explaining the program, the possible benefits of the program and the program’s parameters. Four out of eight schools responded. Individual dates and times were made to meet with the principals of the schools. It was necessary to take three hours off of work to accommodate the individual’s schedules. Although in other districts this may not be necessary.
Discussion of the goals of the program and the benefits for my adolescent students as well as the benefits for the elementary students took place. Each principal expressed desired to participate in the program. Different needs of the principals and their school schedules were considered.

Stage Three: Selection of Children, Obtainment of Parental Consent, and Recruitment of “Teen Buddies”.

Each principal was concerned with finding a diplomatic way of choosing the elementary children that would be involved with the program. It was expressed at each meeting that in no way did these principals want to single out students in such a way as to cause harm to their self-images. It was decided that the individual classroom teachers would select children that they felt would benefit from the program. The selection and obtaining of parental consent was very time consuming. It took approximately three to four weeks. Unfortunately during this time, the enthusiasm was waning for the adolescents that volunteered for the program. In the time it took for the elementary school principals to select and obtain parental consent for the program, approximately one-fifth of my students dropped out of the program.

This unexpected notch of time posed another problem. At the high school the semester was coming to an end and many of the adolescents that signed up for the program would have different schedules. This posed a particular problem because ideally the program was developed for those students enrolled in class. In this way, students would receive ample supervision and support while they were involved in the program. Without their presence in class, an alternative method of keeping track of their progress
in the program was developed. Once a month the students involved in this program were expected to come to a short meeting after school.

Problems were anticipated in the first year of this program. It was anticipated that some students would drop out of the program because of changes in their circumstances. Unfortunately, there were five adolescent students who volunteered for the same school and dropped out at the same time. The principal of that school contemplated dropping the program, yet she gave the program a chance. More students were drafted and the program remained.

Recruitment of adolescents at the high school level took place at the same time of the initial meeting with the principals from the four schools. Yet, it was an ongoing and ever changing process because of the time it took for the selection and obtainment of elementary students and their parents consent.

The parameters of the program and the commitment expected were explained in each class. Those interested in developing skills for working with young children signed informal contracts and had to secure parental permission. Participants were expected to secure their own transportation to the schools for the six to eight week commitments. They were expected to visit their elementary buddy for the last half-hour of the elementary school day and visit at least once a week.

Stage four: Program implementation

After receiving all permission forms were in place the program commenced. Students were asked to give verbal reports each week about their progress. Emails were sent to the participating school’s principals every two to three weeks. One problem with the programs implementation process is that once started, the principal’s weren’t kept
aware of the weekly progress of the program by the individual teachers that were participating in the program. A principal’s duties are such that daily or weekly observances of individual classrooms are not possible, so keeping in touch with the progress of the program at their school’s was done informally by email. To remedy this problem, names of individual teachers who have participating elementary students will be need to be obtained. This way, weekly emails may be sent to these individuals directly.

Stage five: Evaluations and Suggestions for Future implementation

The all but of the students involved in the teen buddy program said they enjoyed the experience. The one student that had a difficult time was a special case. This student’s mother took a half-hour off of work to drive her to the elementary school in which she volunteered. The elementary buddy that her adolescent was assigned was absent about a lot. This produced stress in the relationship between the adolescent and their mother. The adolescent reported that the program would have been better if some type of transportation were provided by the school. All the students reported positive experiences and some decided to stay with the program although their committed time had lapsed.

Community Based Project Implementation and Evaluation

Adopt-A-Grandparent Program

Note: When referring to the implementation and evaluation of this program, references to each step as a stage will be made. This will make it easier for the reader to follow the process of establishing the program. Problems in each stage will be discussed within the
particular implementation stage in which they took place. And possible remedies for these problems will be discussed in the particular stage in which they occur.

Stage One: Permission

Prior to calling a community nursing home, permission was sought from the school’s administrator. Details of the program were outlined. Benefits of the program were discussed and approval was given. All the above was done informally and verbally.

Stage one: Initial Contact

After permission for the program was granted, a community nursing home was contacted. The nursing home director suggest the program be work in with the recreational director. The recreational director was immediately interested in starting the Adopt-A-Grandparent Program. A date was set to meet in person and plans were made for an introductory meeting for the students.

Stage three: Introductory Meeting for Students

An introductory meeting for the students was offered at the nursing home. At this meeting entrance and exit of the grounds, rules and policies, and codes of conduct were discussed. Students were briefed about what types of behaviors they could expect from their “adopted grandparent” and how to handle emergencies. The director volunteered her services in introducing the students to their adoptive grandparents on their first visit. In hope in making the initial meeting less awkward for the students. She also offered a calendar of events when the adolescents could visit and have an event or craft to focus upon with their “grandparents”. Students were asked to limit their visits to fifteen or twenty minutes in duration. This made it possible for students to “adopt” two grandparents. After the introductory meeting, many of the students mentioned that they
appreciated the tour of the grounds and that they now felt more comfortable to start the program.

Stage four: Matching Students with “Grandparents” and Implementation

After the introductory meeting, the director selected a number of residents of the nursing home that were lucid and willing to participate in this program. The director’s took much care and consideration in choosing the residents that would participate. The resident’s chosen were pleasant, lucid, and eager participants in the program. Many of my students reported having an easy time talking with and spend time with their “grandparents”. In fact, initially there were more “grandparents” than students available in the program. Yet, after the participating students reported to the class how much fun they were having in the program more students joined.

All efforts were made to match students with same sex grandparents however; more females were interested in the program than males. Students were asked to visit the nursing home in pairs. This provided the adolescents with support in case any problems may arise due to opposite sex matching and it helped solve transportation issues as well.

Stage five: Evaluation and Suggestions for Future Implementation

The eight students that participated in the program reported positive out comes. Six of the eight participants are going to continue to visit their adoptive on their own time after the program has ended. Two students were not going to continue the visits because of changes in schedules. One is getting a job and the other is playing on a spring sport. The director of the nursing home as well as the program director shared that they believed the program ran smoothly and would like to be considered to participant in the program next year.
Summary

In conclusion, the implementation of Kohlberg’s principles in classroom instruction and disciplinary procedures and district and community programs proved to be a positive experience for all involved. The students seemed to enjoy the lessons and having a voice in disciplinary procedures of the classroom. After teaching for ten years, the teacher experienced less discipline problems and more cooperation from the students than in previous years.

The district Teen Buddy Program and the Adopt-A-Grandparent programs were a success for all involved and the “who” that was involved surprised the teacher. Initially the teacher thought it would be the usual “A” or “B” students who would sign up for the programs. Yet, in many cases it was the “C” or “D” students that volunteered their time for the program. Even more surprising was the large number of upper classman males that volunteered for the Teen Buddy Program. The young men would be labeled by most as the “rough and tumble” type were the ones that volunteered. The impact they had on their young elementary buddies was tremendous. One particular elementary buddy had an extreme problem with shyness. For weeks, his teen buddy would report, “The little guy won’t talk to me.” Then around the fourth week, the young boy spoke to his teen buddy. This breakthrough so touched the teen buddy that this adolescent visits twice a week and plans on continuing the program until he graduates.

The response from the nursing home’s program director has echoed the successful results of the Teen Buddy Program. The program director has been so pleased with the “new life” that she has witnessed in some of her residents that she wants the Adopt-A-Grandparent program to a continued program yearly.
Lastly, this project has renewed the teacher’s passion for adolescents and this unique stage of development. She has been inspired to develop new ways to tap the almost unlimited talents of these adolescents and to connect adolescents with opportunities to explore their abilities to reason and work with others. In working with others these students are developing a sensitivity and respect for themselves and for others. According to Kohlberg, “Ultimately the standard of development both for the individual and society is the moral standard. And ultimately the development of the individual or society is the development of a higher level of moral awareness and action…” (1970). By providing the students a chance to explore their capacity to reason morally and by placing them in situations that challenge them to care for others they given an opportunity to develop themselves and society.
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Unit: Relating to Others

Objectives
Process Competency 0.0.3: Relate to others in positive, caring ways

Competency Builders:
0.0.3.1 Identify significance of caring, respectful relationships
0.0.3.2 Create strategies for relating to people of different ages, abilities, genders, and cultures.
0.0.3.3 Communicate effectively
0.0.3.4 Express personal feelings, needs, and ideas constructively
0.0.3.5 Manage conflict
0.0.3.6 Seek help when needed


Activity: Start the class asking each student to remove their shoes. The teacher should put one shoe in a basket behind her desk and the other shoes should be placed on a table in the front of the room for all to see. Give each shoe a number and have each student choose the number of a shoe that best suits the following questions.

If the shoes were to be the only representation of people:

1. Which shoe would you choose for your best friend? Why?
2. Which shoe would you choose for a date? Why?
3. Which shoe would you trust handle your money? Why?
4. Which shoe would you not trust under any circumstances? Why?
5. Which shoe would you marry? Why?

After all students have had a chance to answer the questions, the class discusses the validity of choosing assigning certain characteristics to people solely by their shoes. Allow the students to discuss how silly the assignment was and how untrue were the judgements. Jokingly say to the students, “It’s a good thing people do not judge people by such a trivial thing as shoes.” (This last statement usually prompts students into saying that indeed people do judge by such trivial things.)

Discussion Questions: Who in this school gets judged by silly things such as shoes? (Students can usually readily label the different types of groups or cliques in the schools. Questions are asked revealing stereotypes about different races. Such as if a Mexican or an Asian takes a test who do you believe will do better? The questions reveal certain biases and stereotypical beliefs. Lastly, are these accurate characteristics of people? Can one really judge another human being without having a first hand encounter with the person?)
Teen Buddy Program

Developed by

Colleen M. Schemrich
Teen Buddy Program

Rational

According to Lawrence Kohlberg, a moral development theorist, the highest level of moral reasoning emphasizes the respect and dignity of all human beings. In order for an adolescent to reach the depth of moral reasoning needed to respect the dignity of all humans, a deeper challenge must be provided than can be offered in the classroom setting. By developing a program that places adolescents in the role of caregiver for elementary aged children, adolescents may be afforded the opportunities needed to produce the sensitivity, understanding, and respect for human beings in a way that can not be taught in any other way.

General Information
The Teen Buddy Program is a district-wide program that couples high school adolescents with elementary aged students in order to form a buddy like relationship. The adolescents will provide added attention to children in need of extra academic support or social support. Ideally, this program will provide the high school students with opportunities to develop skills for caring for others, while also making them more aware of their responsibilities for becoming good role models. For the elementary student this program would provide the means for additional support both academically and socially.
Specific Information

The Teen Buddy Program will have two sessions. The first session will begin in mid October and last until mid December. The second session will begin mid February and last until the end of April. These sessions may be adjusted to follow the semester schedule of the high school. Each session will last approximately eight weeks.

The Teen Buddy will arrive within the last half-hour of the elementary school day and will remain until it is time for their elementary buddy to get ready for leaving school. During the half-hour session the teen buddy will provide additional academic and social support by helping their elementary buddy with homework, class assignments, or by playing a game provided by the classroom teacher. In order to afforded the most flexibility for the program, the elementary teacher and the teen buddy should decide upon the specific day for the teen buddy to visit. Once a particular day is established, the teen buddy will make all necessary schedule changes to ensure that they arrive on the same day each week. In case of illness or unforeseen schedule changes, the teen buddy will be asked to contact their elementary buddy’s school and let the school know that they will not be present that day.

The Teen Buddy Supervisor (TBS) from the high school will be responsible for coordinating the program on the high school side. He or she will establish a contact person at each participating elementary school that will be willing to work on behalf of their school coordinating which teachers and students who will be participating in the program. The TBS should be someone who can establish and maintain a direct
relationship with the students involved in the program. After initial contacts are made and the teen buddies are matched with their elementary buddies, the TBS will check in weekly to ascertain the integrity of the program and provide additional support to the EBS.

The Elementary Buddy Supervisor (EBS) is responsible for choosing those elementary students who will best benefit from this program and which teacher will be willing to allow the students to participate. After a list is generated, the EBS will provide each elementary buddy with the program’s permission slips to be signed and returned. After permission slips are returned the EBS notifies the TBS that the program may begin.

After the program has started, the TBS will meet with the high school students every two weeks. If there are any problems at the elementary level, the TBS should be informed immediately. Contact between EBS and TBS take place at least once week. At the end of the eight weeks, students will collect sign-in sheet and evaluation forms.
Teens Buddy Program Evaluation

Please circle the number that best describes your answer to the following questions.

1. I enjoyed participating in the program. 5 4 3 2 1
2. I believe I learned valuable skills in working with people. 5 4 3 2 1
3. This experience helped to improve my communication skills. 5 4 3 2 1
4. This experience improved my ability to care for others. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Because of this experience, I now feel more confident in my ability to work with others. 5 4 3 2 1
6. This experience has made me more sensitive to the needs of others. 5 4 3 2 1
7. This experience has helped me to develop leadership skills. 5 4 3 2 1
8. I believe that I can work with people of varying ages and abilities, because of my experience in this program. 5 4 3 2 1
9. This program has developed in me a deeper respect and sense of dignity for people with varying ages and abilities. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Overall, I believe this was a valuable experience. 5 4 3 2 1

Please comment to the following questions using the space provided below.

11. What was the most gratifying part of the program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

12. What was the most difficult part of the program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
13. What are some suggestions for improvement of the program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. Has this experience helped you to develop respect and sensitivity to others in a way that regular classroom instruction could not? If yes, please explain.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. In what ways, do you believe this experience will in any way effect how you deal now deal with others?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

16. Would you recommend this experience to others? Why or Why not?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Teen Buddy Parent Evaluation

Please circle the number that best describes your answer to the following questions.

5 Strongly agree
4 Mildly agree
3 Undecided
2 Mildly disagree
1 Strongly disagree

1. Overall, the program was worthwhile for my child. 5 4 3 2 1
2. The program provided my child with extra academic support. 5 4 3 2 1
3. I believe my child enjoyed having a teen buddy. 5 4 3 2 1
4. The program provided my child with extra social support. 5 4 3 2 1
5. My child spoke highly of his/her teen buddy. 5 4 3 2 1
6. My child seemed to look forward to seeing his/her teen buddy. 5 4 3 2 1
7. I would like my child to participate in the program next year. 5 4 3 2 1
8. My child didn’t like being taken out of class to visit with his/her teen buddy. 5 4 3 2 1
9. My child reported feeling uncomfortable working with his/her teen buddy. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Overall, I was glad this program exists. 5 4 3 2 1

Please comment on the following questions using the space provided.

1. Positive aspects of the program:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Negative aspects of the program:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Suggestions for improving the program:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Please circle the number that best describes your answer to the following questions about the Teen Buddy program.

5 Strongly agree  
4 Mildly agree  
3 Undecided  
2 Mildly disagree  
1 Strongly disagree

1. The program was a worthwhile endeavor.  5 4 3 2 1
2. The program provided my students with extra academic support.  5 4 3 2 1
3. I believe my students enjoyed having a teen buddy.  5 4 3 2 1
4. The program provided my students with extra social support.  5 4 3 2 1
5. The teen buddy came on a regular basis.  5 4 3 2 1
6. The teen buddy provided me extra time with other students.  5 4 3 2 1
7. The program was more work than it was worth.  5 4 3 2 1
8. I would like to be considered to participate in the program next year.  5 4 3 2 1
9. It appeared that the teen buddy enjoyed visiting my students.  5 4 3 2 1
10. Overall, I believe the program ran smoothly.  5 4 3 2 1

Please comment on the following questions using the space provided.

1. Positive aspects of the program:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Negative aspects of the program:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Suggestions for improving the program:
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Rational

According to Lawrence Kohlberg, a moral development theorist, the highest level of moral reasoning emphasizes the respect and dignity of all human beings (Duska, 1975). In order for an adolescent to reach the depth of moral reasoning needed to respect the dignity of all humans, a deeper challenge must be provided than can be offered in the classroom setting. By developing a program that places adolescents in the role of caregiver for elderly adults, adolescents may be afforded the opportunities needed to produce the sensitivity, understanding, and respect for human beings in a way that can not be taught in any other way.

General Information

The Adopt-A-Grandparent Program is a community based program that couple high school adolescents with elderly adults living in a near by nursing home. The adolescents will “adopt” one or two of the nursing homes residents and will visit them on a weekly basis. Ideally, this program will provide the high school students with opportunities to develop skills for caring for others, while also making them more aware of the needs and considerations of senior citizens. For mature adults, this program will provide the means of additional social interaction, stimuli, and warmth of human contact.

Specific Information

The Adopt-A-Grandparent Program will have two sessions. The first session will begin in mid October and last until mid December. The second session will begin in mid
February and last until the end of April. These sessions may be adjusted to follow the semester schedule of the high school. Each session will last approximately eight weeks.

The high school student will visit their “adopted grandparent” on a weekly basis at a time that is most convenient for the student and nursing home staff. The student will abide by the rules and policies of the nursing facility as to what they may or may not bring on their visits. The student will sign-in and sign-out at each visit and will not under any circumstances sign-out their adoptive grandparent. The students will acknowledge and follow any special concerns that the staff may have concerning their grandparents and will not bring in food or drink items until first checking with the nursing staff. If any concerns arise regarding the behavior or conduct of the student while visiting their grandparent, the student may be dropped from the program immediately by contacting the program’s supervisor.

The supervisor of this program will work closely with the recreation director to set up specific times and dates that will be convenient for the students to visit and any concerns the nursing staff may have in regards to the program. The students will be required to report once a week to the high school supervisor as to their progress in the program. When the eight week session has ended, students desiring to continue with visits with their adoptive grandparents will need to get permission from the program’s supervisor, the recreation director, and the resident, before continuing the visits. At this point, the student would be treated as a volunteer to the facility.
Adopt-A-Grandparent Program

Student Evaluation Form

Please circle the number that best describes your answer to the following questions.

5 Strongly agree
4 Mildly agree
3 Undecided
2 Mildly disagree
1 Strongly disagree

1. I enjoyed the participating in the program.   5 4 3 2 1
2. I believe I learned valuable skills in working with people.  5 4 3 2 1
3. This experience helped to improve my communication skills.  5 4 3 2 1
6. This experience improved my ability to care for others.  5 4 3 2 1
7. Because of this experience, I now feel more confident in my ability to work with others.  5 4 3 2 1
6. This experience has made me more sensitive to the needs of others.  5 4 3 2 1
7. This experience has helped me to develop leadership skills.  5 4 3 2 1
9. I believe that I can work with people of varying ages and abilities, because of my experience in this program.  5 4 3 2 1
9. This program has developed in me a deeper respect and sense of dignity for people with varying ages and abilities.  5 4 3 2 1
10. Overall, I believe this was a valuable experience.  5 4 3 2 1

Please comment to the following questions using the space provided below.

17. What was the most gratifying part of the program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

18. What was the most difficult part of the program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
19. What are some suggestions for improvement of the program?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

20. Has this experience helped you to develop respect and sensitivity to others in a way that regular classroom instruction could not? If yes, please explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

21. In what ways, do you believe this experience will in any way effect how you now deal with others?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

22. Would you recommend this experience to others? Why or Why not?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Adopt-A-Grandparent Program
Director Evaluation Form

Please circle the number that best describes your answer to the following questions.

5 Strongly agree
4 Mildly agree
3 Undecided
2 Mildly disagree
1 Strongly disagree

1. The program was a worthwhile endeavor.  
2. The program provided residents with social support.  
3. The residents reported enjoying having the adolescents visit.  
4. The adolescents came on a regular basis.  
5. The adolescents were kind and helpful to staff when needed.  
6. The program worked smoothly.  
7. Initially the program was a lot of work to set in place.  
8. Maintaining the program was effortless.  
9. The program will be welcomed back next year.  
10. The program is being considered to be a permanent program.

Please comment on the following questions using the space provided.

1. Positive aspects of the program:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Negative aspects of the program:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Suggestions for improving the program: