Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Period \_\_\_\_\_\_

Modern Dilemmas *The Things They Carried*

 **Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development
 The Costs of War**People respond to moral dilemmas in various ways. In many cases people can act in similar ways, but justify their actions differently. Furthermore, people can attempt to resolve their dilemmas differently using the same justification for their resolutions. It is an enigma Lawrence Kohlberg found fascinating.

**PROMPT:** Using characters/real people from any of the works from the war unit, explore how a character’s inner struggles are resolved by examining his/her actions through Kohlberg’s moral lens. Sometimes a person learns a lesson too late to help him/herself or others. Other people use their life’s experiences as a lesson to help others.

**STRUCTURE:** Each developing paragraphwill focus on a different character of your choice. You will need to explain the character’s dilemma (through context, background/lead-ins), and how that person attempts to resolve the dilemma (through paraphrased and quoted evidence). Your analysis MUST include what stage of Kohlberg’s moral development best describes the character’s actions. Your exploration of the character’s actions should also attempt to shed light on these questions: Did the person’s means of resolution change him/her? Did the person learn anything? How effective was the person’s resolution overall? Did it help or worsen the situation? Was the price paid for the resolution worth the cost? What lessons can be learned from this person’s experiences?

**Please follow the Level modifications below:**

**Level 2:**  Your essay will be five paragraphs total. It will explore three characters from at least

 two different works, and have at least three DQs in the whole essay.

**Level 3:**  Your essay will be four paragraphs total. It will explore two characters from at least

 two different works, and have at least two DQs in the whole essay.

**Level 4:**  Your essay will be three paragraphs total. It will explore two characters and have at

 least two DQs in the whole essay.

**NOTE: There is not set number of DDs in each developing paragraph. This is an exploration of character-the amount of material you use to strengthen your argument is up to you.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development: The Costs of War Rubric****Due: March 24th at the end of class period.**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Student Name:     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  | On turnitin.com\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CATEGORY** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Introduction (Organization)** | The introduction is interesting and articulate. It previews the structureof the paper with a clear main idea, CI and the DIs. Thoughtful closing. | The introduction clearly states the main topic, CI and DIs, but is not particularly inviting to the reader. | The introduction states the main topic, but does not adequately previewthe structure of the paper nor is it particularly inviting to the reader. | There is no clear introduction of the main topic or structure of the paper. |
| **Evidence** | Relevant, telling, quality examples give the reader important information that goes beyond the obvious or predictable. | Supporting details and information are relevant, but not all examples support the developing idea. | Some relevant examples present, but several examples seem unconnected to the developing idea. | Supporting details and information are typically unclear or not related to the topic. |
| **Analysis** | Each example is analyzed in a clear, articulate way. The author thoughtfully connects examples to Kohlberg’s theory, showing a mastery of material and a critical analysis of character.  | Each example is analyzed in a clear way. The author connects examples to the Kohlberg’s theory,showing a mastery of material and some critical thinking. | Each example is analyzed. The author does not always connect examples to Kohlberg’s theory, showing an uncertainty of some of the text. Minimal critical thinking. | Each example is not analyzed. The author does not connect examples to Kohlberg’s theory, showing little knowledge of text. Analysis resorts to generalizations or repetition of evidence. |
| **Diction** | Writer uses vivid words and phrases that linger or draw pictures in the reader's mind, and the choice and placement of the words seems accurate, natural and not forced. | Writer uses vivid words and phrases that linger or draw pictures in the reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately or seem overdone. | Writer uses words that communicate clearly, but the writing lacks variety, punch or flair. | Writer uses a limited vocabulary that does not communicate strongly or captures the reader's interest. Jargon or clichés may be present and detract from the meaning. |
| **Capitalization & Punctuation (Conventions)** | Writer makes no errors in capitalization or punctuation, so the paper is exceptionally easy to read. | Writer makes 1 or 2 errors in capitalization or punctuation, but the paper is still easy to read. | Writer makes a few errors in capitalization and/or punctuation that catch the reader's attention and interrupt the flow. | Writer makes several errors in capitalization and/or punctuation that catch the reader's attention and greatly interrupt the flow. |
| **Conclusion (Organization)** | The conclusion is strong and leaves the reader with a feeling that they understand what the writer is "getting at." Articulate and mature RFS. | The conclusion is recognizable and ties up almost all the loose ends. RFS is clearly understood. | The conclusion is recognizable, but does not tie up several loose ends. RFS weak or obvious. | There is no clear conclusion, no RFS, the paper just ends. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |  | Grade: |  |