

## TEACHING EVALUATION – Karina

### Lecture in PSYC3366 – Social and Emotional Development

Overall, I felt that you did an excellent job in your lecture on the topic of Moral Development. On the positive side, you were clear and confident in your presentation, paced the class well, and used nice examples to illustrate many of the points you were making. You were enthusiastic, engaging, and tried to involve the students in discussion. I liked how you asked questions (“So what do you think is the role that peers and siblings play?”) and then responded to them in your lecture material – i.e., you got the students to be interested and then you provided explanations in answering your questions.

I liked the exercise of getting students to think about moral situations that might involve cognitions, emotions, and behaviors. It might have helped to get a few more examples from the students after you opened things up to class discussion (after they discussed their ideas in pairs) and to have students talk more about the 3 components – which is most important? are there developmental differences in which of these components people attend to? gender differences?

The class poll was a good way to test students’ understanding of Piaget. Perhaps you could have explored further why students answered the way they did (especially those who got it wrong) to help them understand the incorrect responses.

The clip of Carol Gilligan was fun to see. Perhaps you could have discussed some of the points she raised a bit more so students could draw connections between her thinking and the way her ideas (about the ethics of care and responsibility for others) affect individuals’ reasoning about moral dilemmas (such as the Heinz dilemma).

Here are some additional suggestions for trying to improve your already very strong lecture style.

1. The lecture was very much consistent with the information presented on the slides. Perhaps this was because you felt “constrained” by the material that I gave to you. If you were developing these slides on your own, I imagine that the slides could have been used to highlight points and your lecture material may have gone beyond what was included on the slides.
2. There might have been some ways to include the students more in sharing their ideas or talking about the many important points that you were making in the lecture. For example, rather than you highlighting the developmental differences between the different interviewees on the video about the Kohlberg dilemma, you could have asked the students to highlight what they saw were some of the developmental and/or gender differences. You could have tried to engage the students in exploring the WHY behind Mischel’s

finding from his longitudinal work that children who wait longer in the marshmallow and other delay of gratification experiments are found to be more successful, empathic, higher achieving, etc. in late adolescence and early adulthood. You could have asked the class what they observed when watching the Dille sextuplets video rather than pointing out the behaviors that the children used to distract themselves. What did they think about the consistency in the children's ability to delay? What role might parenting play? Sibling socialization?

3. The whole idea that was presented in the Karen Wynne and Paul Bloom series of experiments re: whether they clearly demonstrated that there is a bias to favor the self, how is this consistent with evolutionary theories, and is it possible to temper this bias? Why do some people still act in ways that reflect altruism and kindness?
4. In general, the whole goal of making lectures more interactive is one that we all struggle with a lot. One thought is that when you ask questions, you could wait a bit longer to see who responds. Let the class feel the uncomfortable silence; sometimes that gets someone talking. Don't jump in and answer the questions that you posed too soon because then the students don't feel that they need to respond.