Department of Psychology
PSY 330
Moral Psychology and Cultural Values
4 Units

Fall, 2018

Meeting days: Tuesday/Thursday	**Instructor:** Dr. Ross Oakes Mueller
Meeting times: 10:00-11:45am	**Phone:** x2905
Meeting location: Taylor 314 (sometimes Fermanian Patio)	**E-mail:** RossOakesMueller@pointloma.edu
Credit Hours: 4 Units	**Office hours: Click Here to Schedule**
Final Exam: Thursday, December 13th from 10:30am-1:00pm (do not buy a ticket home before this date)	**Office Location:** Culbertson 213

PLNU Mission

To Teach ~ To Shape ~ To Send

Point Loma Nazarene University exists to provide higher education in a vital Christian community where minds are engaged and challenged, character is modeled and formed, and service becomes an expression of faith. Being of Wesleyan heritage, we aspire to be a learning community where grace is foundational, truth is pursued, and holiness is a way of life.

Catalog Description

Introduction to the psychological study of morality, prosocial behavior, and character development, including a survey of historical and contemporary theories of morality. Includes a particular emphasis on the role of cultural norms and values, as well as an analysis of the ways in which such values are developed and transmitted in contemporary culture (e.g., media, academics, family, etc.).

Learning Outcomes

In taking this class, you can expect:

1. To learn the historical and contemporary psychological theories of moral development and moral motivation.

2. To learn to apply moral psychological theories to better enhance character development in real-life situations (e.g., parenting, education, preaching, discipleship, etc.).
3. To better understand the differences in values across cultures, as well as factors that may contribute to such differences, and the implications that such differences have for a life of Christian discipleship.
4. To increase your ability to read, comprehend, and critically evaluate articles and studies published in psychological journals.
5. To learn to integrate multiple theories and findings into a single unified understanding of human character and morality.

The purpose of each class session is to highlight selected topics from the required readings and to supplement this material with related ideas. *Students are responsible for all assigned readings, whether or not discussed in class*. On a typical day, a 30-minute review of the material will be combined with a one-hour "graduate style" discussion. Each student is expected to have read the assigned reading for class discussion, and be prepared to think critically about and discuss the reading in class.

Course Credit Hour Information

In the interest of providing sufficient time to accomplish the stated Course Learning Outcomes, this class meets the PLNU credit hour policy for a 4-unit class delivered over 15 weeks. Specific details about how the class meets the credit hour requirement can be provided upon request.

Required Texts

Narvaez, D., & Lapsley, D.K. (Eds.) (2009). Personality, Identity, and Character: Explorations in Moral Psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coursepack of Articles to be purchased from University Readers.

Online articles available through links on Canvas.

Academic Accomodations

If you have a diagnosed disability, please contact PLNU's Disability Resource Center (DRC) within the first two weeks of class to demonstrate need and to register for accommodation by phone at 619-849-2486 or by e-mail at DRC@pointloma.edu. See Disability Resource Center for additional information.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Daily Reading Responses (15%) and Class Participation (10%)

By 8:00am on the morning of each class session you will turn in a **Daily Reading Response** on Canvas. This serves to help you prepare for each class discussion, and provides a record of your having read (and thought critically about) the material. It also allows me to read through your responses, and gauge your

level of understanding prior to our discussion. Each response will be given a letter grade for its thoughtfulness and clarity. A-level papers will include a brief (one-paragraph) summary of the main ideas of the article, and 1-2 short paragraphs of thoughtful response. The best papers are those that either a) critically question one or more of the assumptions or conclusions of an article, or b) use the article as a jumping-off place for thinking about how moral development may be either enhanced or hindered by parents, friends, schools, churches, etc.

FURTHERMORE, each class you are **graded on your participation in class discussion**, ranging from D/F ("Could somebody get this guy some coffee? Stat!") to A/B (Actively contributing to the discussion in meaningful ways). If you miss a class, no credit will be given for class discussion, and you will only receive (partial) credit for your daily reading reflection if you *turn it in before the next class in which you are present* (i.e. turn in missing reflections prior to the *very next class* to receive credit).

Reading Summaries and Discussion Leader (30%)

Many sessions two students will assist the Professor in summarizing the assigned reading. Approximately once every other month (2 times throughout the semester) you will be a discussion leader or co-leader for one class period. As discussion leader you will:

1. **Written Reading Summary (5/10%)**: Provide a written Reading Summary for each student in the class (format and length to be described in class), in which you will briefly overview the background, methods, and findings of the assigned article. You will also critique the article and suggest implications for the Christian life of virtue. This will likely require you to read the article 2-3 times to make sure that you understand it well … so plan ahead.

2. **Class Presentation and Discussion Leading (3.5/7%)**: Spend the first 15-25 minutes of class outlining the main points of the reading (as in your written Reading Summary above). Then use your knowledge of the text to help lead discussion of the reading.

3. **Wikipedia editing (1.5/3%):** Here is your first chance for publication!!! Once you finish summarizing the article, you will incorporate your article summary into the [Wikipedia entry for Moral Psychology](). Students from this class have been updating the entry for *Moral Psychology* over the last nine years. In fact, the MAJORITY of the information on this website was entered and refined by students from previous PSY 330 classes! However, as you will see, some of the statements are a little confusing, or poorly written, or include less relevant information from the studies. For this portion of your assignment, you should: a) check to see if the main idea and findings of your article have been summarized in 2-4 well-written (and cited) sentences, under the proper heading (e.g., Moral Intuitions, Moral Emotions, etc.); b) if not, then summarize/cite the key findings of your study/article; c) if so, then **edit what is written to make it more accurate/readable/concise/etc**. The key is to provide the world's population with the most accurate information possible on your topic, without overwhelming them with irrelevant details from the study. We will discuss, in class, the method for creating a Wikipedia account and editing an entry. This is an exciting chance for you to personally change the way that the world understands Moral Psychology (and get yourself some easy points in the process!).

Each mini-presentation will be given a letter grade, and is worth either 10% (1st Presentation) or **15%** (2nd Presentation) of your course grade. **See the attached grading rubric, for details.** (These are equivalent to unit exams in other classes). But there's more!!! Here is an OPPORTUNITY FOR EXTRA CREDIT:

1. **Media Clips: An additional 5% will be added to each reading summary/discussion grade** each time that you bring in **media clips** (electronic or photocopied) that are **relevant** to the discussion topic for that day (be aware, that as each summary/presentation is worth 20% of your grade, this one bonus grade on a single paper could bump your final grade up a partial grade level … e.g., from a B+ to an A-). NOTE: In order to receive this extra credit, you must adequately explain such clips and their connection to the material, and they must ACTUALLY BE RELEVANT to the topic at hand.

Moral Psychology "Cheat Sheet" (5%)

One of the primary goals of this class is to equip you to read, summarize, critique, and synthesize academic journal articles. However, "synthesizing" and applying ideas can become difficult when the topics change from week to week. One tool that many researchers use is an "annotated bibliography." You can think of it as the "cheat sheet" of the research world. It is a single document that briefly outlines the main points of multiple articles, and can be used to refresh your memory on past articles when needed (e.g., before or during class, when writing a paper, when lecturing your family about moral identity formation over Thanksgiving dinner, etc.). This assignment will involve updating a single GoogleDoc with information from each article that we read (see template and guidelines on Canvas).

Morality and Values in the Media Project (35%)

Throughout the semester, keep your eyes and ears pealed for instances of values, morality, character development, moral dilemmas, etc. as they appear in TV, movies, books, plays, artwork, and music. Your final project will consist of a paper and presentation written about one such instance, and the ways in which it either illustrates or contradicts one or more theories of moral psychology. Specifically, your paper will involve identifying a film, book, TV show, news clip, etc. in which morality or values are either discussed or illustrated by the characters. You must then relate this example to one or more of the theories/articles that we have discussed in class.

The paper should be 6-8 pages long, and will involve a more in-depth investigation of one or more of the theories we have discussed. Specifically, you should include the following elements:

1) **describe the media source** upon which you are drawing, including a brief sketch of the relevant thoughts/actions/discussions of each key character; (**1-2 pages**)
2) **discuss one or more of the theories** that we have covered over the course of the semester (e.g., willpower, moral reasoning, moral identity, etc.), and be sure to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the material (this section should include at least 2 outside articles—feel free to ask me about recommended articles); (**2-3 pages**)

3) discuss the relationship between your chosen media "clip" and the theory, specifically: **diagnose the ways in which the character either illustrates or violates the "virtues" of the theory** (i.e. using the language of the theory, in what ways does the character possess vs. lack compassion and/or "moral character," **1-2 pages**); and

4) using this theory, identify and describe **practical activities or interventions** would you prescribe for this person to help them become more compassionate and/or moral (for instance, according to this theory, what types of interventions might you suggest to help such a character develop morally; or, what might you suggest that teachers/parents/coaches/ministers/etc. do to help individuals develop into moral adults?) (**1-2 pages**)

Finally, you will **create a final PowerPoint presentation** for the class, which will include briefly discussing the theory/theories that you focused on (feel free to be creative in how you present this), setting-up and presenting the media clip (this could mean reading a passage, if you use a book), discussing the ways in which the theory(ies) relate to the media clip, and discussing the implications of the theory for one or more practical interventions that you would make into this character's life. This presentation can follow your paper quite closely, so the only trick will be to present it in a way that is interesting and engaging for the rest of the class. The overall presentation should be **between 13-17 minutes** including the media clip. Be sure to let me know what you will need from me as far as presenting the media clip. **See the attached grading rubric, for details.**

Act of Compassion (5%)

At some point in the first half of the semester, you and the rest of your classmates will plan a time when the entire class can get together for some sort of act of compassion or service. There are no limits to what this can be. I will leave it to your collective discretion both to generate and coordinate an activity in which we as a class can be of service to others. Your attendance at this activity will earn you full credit for this portion of your grade.

Attendance Policy (and contribution to your grade)

Because of the seminar-style nature of this course, regular attendance is absolutely essential. Indeed, each day in class you will earn up to ½% of your grade for your participation. Thus, any absence that is not for a "University-sponsored event" (see below) will result in an F for that day. Furthermore, this course will strictly follow the PLNU attendance policy as specified in the University Catalog. Regular and punctual attendance at all classes is considered essential to optimum academic achievement. If you are absent from more than 10 percent of class meetings (3 days), you will receive a written report which may result in de-enrollment. If the absences exceed 20 percent (6 days), *even if you have not yet received a written report*, you will be de-enrolled without notice. If the date of de-enrollment is past the last date to withdraw from a class, you will receive the appropriate grade for your work and participation. See Academic Policies in the (undergrad/graduate as appropriate) academic catalog. Please note the following key points and elaborations of the attendance policy.

- "There are no allowed or excused absences except when absences are necessitated by certain University-sponsored activities and are approved in writing by the Provost."

- You are not excused for being ill. Illness does not comprise an excused absence. You are not excused from class if you have a Doctor's appointment. You are not excused from class if you have a Doctor's excuse. The University allows you four absences for these (and other) situations outside your control.

- University-sponsored activities that are approved in writing by the Provost usually are for NAIA events for student athletes and occasionally field trips for other PLNU courses.

- When you are **absent** in this class **three times** (for any cause), a Notice of Deenrollment will be sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Administration. **Your fourth absence may result in deenrollment.**

Save your absences for situations that are outside of your control. Do not consider your allowable absences as the number of times that you can miss class without being deenrolled. If you become ill after you used your allowable absences you will be deenrolled from the course.

Ferpa Policy

In compliance with federal law, neither PLNU student ID nor social security number should be used in publicly posted grades or returned sets of assignments without student written permission. This class will meet the federal requirements by distributing all grades and papers individually (via Canvas). Also in compliance with FERPA, you will be the only person given information about your progress in this class unless you have designated others to receive it in the "Information Release" section of the student portal. See Policy Statements in the (undergrad/ graduate as appropriate) academic catalog.

Final Examination Policy

Successful completion of this class requires taking the final examination **on its scheduled day**. The final examination schedule is posted on the Class Schedules site. No requests for early examinations or alternative days will be approved.

PLNU Copyright Policy

Point Loma Nazarene University, as a non-profit educational institution, is entitled by law to use materials protected by the US Copyright Act for classroom education. Any use of those materials outside the class may violate the law.

PLNU Academic Honesty Policy

Students should demonstrate academic honesty by doing original work and by giving appropriate credit to the ideas of others. Academic dishonesty is the act of presenting information, ideas, and/or concepts as one's own when in reality they are the results of another person's creativity and effort. A faculty member who believes a situation involving academic dishonesty has been detected may assign a failing grade for that assignment or examination, or, depending on the seriousness of the offense, for the course. Faculty should follow and students may appeal using the procedure in the university Catalog. See Academic Policies for definitions of kinds of academic dishonesty and for further policy information.

Z Score

Grade	Percentage Score	Z-Score	Cumulative %	% Receiving Grade	
A	93-100%	1.33	0.0918	9.2%	
A-	90-92%	1	0.1587	6.7%	15.9%
B+	88-89%	0.67	0.2514	9.3%	
B	84-87%	0.33	0.3707	11.9%	
B-	80-83%	0	0.5	12.9%	34.1%
C+	77-79%	-0.33	0.6293	12.9%	
C	70-76%	-1	0.8413	21.2%	
C-	65-69%	-1.33	0.9082	6.7%	40.8%
D+	62-64%	-1.67	0.9525	4.4%	
D	55-61%	-2	0.9772	2.5%	
D-	50-54%	-2.33	0.9901	1.3%	
F	49% or below	<-2.33	1	1.0%	9.2%

A minimum of 50 % is needed to pass the course.

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
The Psychological Study of Morality and Compassion				
Week 1	8/30/18	Th	Syllabus	What is morality?
Week 2	9/4/18	T	Haidt (2008). Morality.	Two "stories" of morality.
	9/6/18	Th	Ch. 10 - Walker & Frimer (2009) Moral personality exemplified	Who is moral? What are they like?
Morality as Willpower				
Week 3	9/11/18	T	Baumeister, Miller, & Delaney (2005). Self and Volition	Theological implications of morality as willpower.
	9/13/18	Th	Metcalfe & Mischel (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification.	A theory of willpower.

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
Week 4	9/18/18	T	Muraven, Baumeister & Tice (1999). Longitudinal Improvement of Self-Regulation Through Practice	How to build willpower.

Morality as Reasoning

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
	9/20/18	Th	Kohlberg (1984). Moral stages and moralization. (pp. 183-205) AND Kohlberg (1977) Moral development: A review of the theory	Morality as moral reasoning … or, "Kohlberg, the 800-lb gorilla of moral psychology."
Week 5	9/25/18	T	Gilligan & Attanucci (1988) Two Moral Orientations: Gender Differences and Similarities	Theoretical, cultural, and empirical critiques of Kohlberg.
	9/27/18	Th		Review of Willpower & Moral Reasoning

Morality as Identity

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
Week 6	10/2/18	T	Colby, Damon, Killen & Hart (1999). The development of extraordinary moral commitment	The lives of moral exemplars.
	10/4/18	Th	Hardy & Carlo (2005). Identity as a Source of Moral Motivation.	Moral identity theory, as it stands today.
Week 7	10/9/18	T	Hart (1995). Prosocial Behavior and Caring in Adolescence or Ch. 9 - Hart & Matsuba (2009) Urban neighborhoods as context for moral identity development	How to measure moral identity & contextual influences on moral identity
	10/11/18	Th		Review of Moral Identity

Morality as Values

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
Week 8	10/16/18	T	Schwartz & Zanna (1992). Universals in the content and structure of value	Morality as universal values.
	10/18/18	Th	Kristiansen & Hotte (1996). Morality and the self	How values can lead to action.

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
Intermission: Cross-Cultural Differences in Values				
Week 9	10/23/18	T	Schwartz (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work	Cross-cultural differences in values.
	10/25/18	Th	Ch. 4 - Wong (2009) Cultural pluralism and moral identity	A new theory of culture.
Morality as Virtue				
Week 10	10/30/18	T	Lapsley & Narvaez (2004). A social-cognitive approach to the moral personality	Morality as virtue. Virtue as "moral expertise."
	11/1/18	Th	Ch. 6 - Narvaez (2009) Triune Ethics Theory and Moral Personality	The neurobiology & cognitions of virtue development.
Morality as Emotions				
Week 11	11/6/18	T	Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions	The broad spectrum of moral emotions
	11/8/18	Th	Ch. 11 - Emmons (2009) Greatest of the virtues? Gratitude and the grateful personality	Morality as moral emotions. What is a moral emotion? The example of gratitude.
Week 12	11/13/18	T	Batson, Klein, Highberger & Shaw (1995). Immorality From Empathy-Induced Altruism or Batson, Fultz & Schoenrade (1987). Distress and Empathy	Do moral emotions always lead to moral behaviors?
	11/15/18	Th	Review of Values, Virtue, & Moral Emotions	
Morality as Intuitions				
Week 13	11/20/18	T	Haidt (2001). The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail	Morality as moral intuitions.
	11/22/18	Th	**No class!!! Thanksgiving!!!**	
Week 14	11/27/18	T	Greene (2007). The secret joke of Kant's soul or Haidt &	Why some brilliant moral philosophers are still jerks.

Week	Date	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	Topic
			Graham (2007). When Morality Opposes Justice	
	11/29/18	Th	Ch 18 - Blasi (2009) The moral functioning of mature adults and the possibility of fair moral reasoning	A rebuttal against Haidt
			An Integrated Model of Moral Motivation	
Week 15	12/4/18	T	Final Presentations	An Integrated Model (Part 1)
	12/6/18	Th	Final Presentations	An Integrated Model (Part 2)
Final Present.	12/13/18	Th	Final Presentations from 1:30-4:00pm	

NOTE: THIS IS THE <u>THURSDAY</u> OF FINALS WEEK … DO NOT PURCHASE A TICKET HOME BEFORE THIS DATE. THIS IS THE ONLY TIME YOU CAN PRESENT.

<u>FINAL EXAMINATION POLICY</u>

Successful completion of this class requires taking the final examination on its scheduled day. The final examination schedule is posted on the <u>Class Schedules</u> site. No requests for early examinations or alternative days will be approved.

Article Summary, Presentation, and Wikipedia Entry   1st presentation is worth 10%, 2nd worth 20% of Final Grade

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large-scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re-write (50%)	Missing/ Incomplete (0%)
Grammar/ Phrasing (5%)	Perfect! No spelling or grammar errors. Fantastic organization and perfect writing. Arguments are structured well, sentences are clear, . Your sentences, and overall arguments flow well.	One or two spelling/grammatical errors or confusing passages. Otherwise, great!	2-3 spelling or grammatical errors; or A few (not more than 5%) confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences, or one dis-ordering.Other wise, good!	4-6 spelling or grammatical errors. And/or 4-5 confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences (not more than 10%) (or fewer, depending on the length); and/or slight disorganization.	7+ spelling or grammatical errors, beginning to affect readability. And/or a number (about 10-20%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or more significant disorganization.	Although your meaning is still relatively clear, many of your sentences have grammatical and spelling errors. A significant number (about 20%-30%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or significant disorganization.	Grammar and spelling errors are beginning to make it difficult to understand the meaning of your sentences. A large number (about 30%-50%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or pervasive disorganization.	A large number of grammatical and spelling errors, which make your text difficult to understand. Over 50% of sentences are confusing or poorly phrased and the overall structure is disorganized.	Most of your sentences include spelling and grammar errors, and make your text difficult to understand. The poor quality of most sentences and/the significant disorganization makes your meaning difficult to understand	Most of your sentences include spelling and grammar errors, and make your text quite difficult to understand. Most sentences are difficult to read, and your statements are quite unclear.	Nearly every sentence has errors in it, which make your text nearly illegible. Sentences are nearly illegible, and almost no meaning is clear.	Missing or completely illegible.
Background Problem (Why was this article written?) (5%)	Perfect! You have discussed the ways in which the author has drawn upon previous research and statistics to make their argument that their study is important. You have mentioned any unanswered questions from previous studies that led to this study/article.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor corrections or additions needed in discussing the background to this study.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors or additions needed on your discussion of the background problem, and/or slightly more specificity needed in discussing the background to this study.	Great start! You've just made a few errors or a few more additions needed in your discussion of the background problem that this study is attempting to address, and/or more specificity needed in your descriptions of these problems and how they link to this current study.	Good job, but your discussion of the background problem includes multiple errors and/or significantly more detail and examples are needed in your discussion.	You have two or more significant errors of omission or commission in your discussion of previous studies/problems and/or much more detail/specificity needed in these paragraphs.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your discussion of the background problems.	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing NEARLY HALF of the background problems/theories that drive this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing HALF of the background problems/theories that drive this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing OVER HALF of the background problems/theories that drive this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of the background problems/theories that drive this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.
Description of Methodology /Results (Empirical) or Theory (Theoretical) (20%)	Perfect! You have thoroughly and articulately explained the study (for empirical articles) or theory (for theoretical articles) that was central to this study. You have included complete descriptions of methods or terms that may be confusing.	Nearly perfect! This is a great description of the study/theory, but could use either a bit more detail, or is missing a few important details.	Excellent! This is still a thorough description of the theory, but you have either made one or two errors in describing the theory, or your description lacks some key details or is otherwise unclear in places.	Great start! This is a good description of the study/theory, but either lacks some detail throughout or includes a few errors in your descriptions, or becomes confusing in parts.	Good job in giving a broad overview of the study/theory, but you need to include significantly more details (and/or check the accuracy of your statements).	You have started to describe this study/theory, but have left out a number of key details and/or you have made a number of errors and/or your writing becomes significantly confusing.	Although you have started to describe this study/theory, you have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission), or your descriptions are confusing enough that it is difficult to tell whether or not you understood the paper.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of this study/theory, or are missing multiple significant details, or your paper is quite confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of this study/theory, or are missing many significant details, or your paper is very confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of this study/theory, or are missing many significant details, or your paper is very confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in ALL or NEARLY ALL of your discussion of this study/theory, and/or your paper is so confusing that it is nearly illegible (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.

Article Summary, Presentation, and Wikipedia Entry   1st presentation is worth 10%, 2nd worth 20% of Final Grade

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large-scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re-write (50%)	Missing/ Incomplete (0%)
Critical Evaluation (Strengths & Weaknesses) (15%)	Perfect! Your argument about the strengths and weaknesses of this study/theory draws upon, not only a solid understanding of its findings, but also previous theories as to why people do the things that they do. You have organized your argument such that your discussion of strengths/weaknesses is well-founded(not merely your opinion), and considers a variety of elements of the study/theory (e.g., operational definitions, methodology, analyses, alternate explanations for findings, statements of cause-and-effect, etc.). Where there are weaknesses, you have suggested alternate studies/theories that would overcome these limitations.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor additions needed in your discussion of strengths/weaknesses.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your descriptions of strengths and weaknesses, or a few more details needed, and/or slightly more specificity needed in your arguments.	Great! You've just made a few errors in your descriptions of strengths and weaknesses, and/or more specificity needed in your discussion and/or there one or more logical errors/omissions in your argument.	Good job, but your discussion of the study's/theory's strengths and weaknesses includes multiple errors or omissions and/or significantly more specificity needed in your critical examination of these issues.	You have two or more significant errors in your discussion of strengths and weaknesses, or are missing some key elements or critiques, and/or much more specificity needed in your critical analysis of this study/theory. You may have used a little too much personal opinion, and not quite enough reasoned argument.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of this study/theory, and/or you have over-used personal-opinion, and have not given enough reasoned argument.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of this study/theory, or are missing multiple significant critiques, or have drawn mostly on personal opinion rather than reasoned argument (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of strengths and weaknesses, or your argument is nearly all based on pure opinion, rather than reasoned argument (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of strengths and weaknesses or your argument is completely opinion-based with no support (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your discussion of strengths and weaknesses, and/or this section is nearly illegible or has almost no structure to the argument (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.
Remaining Questions & Theological Implications (10%)	Perfect! You have raised a number of very insightful questions regarding either the nature or implications of this research. You have also explicitly discussed ways in which this study/theory can be used (either positively or negatively) in our lives as Christians, and have attempted to examine this study/theory from a Christian theological perspective.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor corrections either on the questions you raise or on your connections between the findings/theory and the life of the Christian.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your connection between faith and theories and/or slightly more specificity needed.	Great! You've just made a few errors in your connection the study and the life of faith, and/or more specificity needed in your links between them.	Good job, but your discussion includes multiple errors (of either omission or commission) in your discussion of how the various theories connect to the life of faith, and/or significantly more specificity or critical thought is needed in your discussion and questions.	You have two or more significant errors (of commission or omission) in your attempts to connect the findings/theory to the life of faith, and/or much more specificity needed in your discussion of these connections and the lingering questions.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your discussion of these connections and the lingering questions.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of these connections and the lingering questions. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of these connections and the lingering questions (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of these connections and the lingering questions (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your discussion of these connections and the lingering questions (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.

Article Summary, Presentation, and Wikipedia Entry 1st presentation is worth 10%, 2nd worth 20% of Final Grade

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large-scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re-write (50%)	Missing/ Incomplete (0%)
Presentation - Organized (15%)	Perfect! Your presentation and discussion-leading showed that you were well prepared, had thoroughly read and thought about the article, and had organized your thoughts prior to class.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor errors or mis-organization in your leading of discussion.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your discussion during class.	Great! You've just made a few errors or had some noticeable disorganization in your class presentation and discussion-leading.	Good job, but your discussion included multiple errors and/or significantly more specificity was needed and/or there was some significant disorganization evident.	You have two or more significant errors (of omission of commission) in your discussion and class-leading, and/or much more specificity needed in your discussion, and/or significant levels of disorganization impeded the clarity of your presentation.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your class discussion, and/or disorganization impaired the clarity and effectiveness of the class discussion.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion and/or a good portion of your presentation was disorganized (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion and/or HALF of your presentation was significantly disorganized or unclear. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion and/or over half of your presentation was disorganized or unclear. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in ALL or NEARLY ALL of your discussion and or you had clearly done little preparation. (see previous grading categories for details).	You were either absent or clearly had not done the reading.
Presentation - Engaging and Thought-Provoking Questions and Applications (15%)	Perfect! You had prepared a significant number of engaging, and thought provoking questions for the class to consider throughout its discussion of this paper. You also identified multiple diverse applications (both practical and theological) to which this study pertains, and engaged the class in discussion regarding these applications.	Nearly perfect! Just one or two minor errors in clarity in the questions you asked and/or in your applications.	Excellent! Just a little more clarity or specificity needed in the questions you asked and/or in your applications.	Great! You just need to be clearer in a few of your questions, and/or more specificity needed in your applications.	Good job, but multiple questions were unclear and/or significantly more specificity needed in such descriptions (and/or the class could have benefitted from having a few more questions or applications)	Multiple questions were unclear, and/or you only had a few questions prepared, and/or much more specificity needed in such your applications (or only had a few applications).	You either only generated a couple of questions or applications, or they were quite unclear or vague.	You only prepared one or two questions and/or one or two vague applications(see previous grading categories for details).	You have prepared only one or two poorly phrased questions and/or applications (see previous grading categories for details).	You only engaged the class once using either a question or a vague/simple application (see previous grading categories for details).	You have either failed to generate any questions or applications, or they were so vague or confusing that they did not contribute to the conversation (see previous grading categories for details).	You were either absent or clearly had not done the reading.
Wikipedia Entry (15%)	Perfect! You have succinctly described the essence and/or implications of the study/theory that you had read in 3-4 sentences, and smoothly integrated your comments into the already-existing Wikipedia entry.	Nearly perfect! Just one minor correction in your otherwise perfect Wikipedia entry.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your Wikipedia entry and/or slightly more specificity needed.	Great! You've just made a few minor errors (or one significant error) in your Wikipedia entry and/or more specificity or clarity is needed.	Good job, but your Wikipedia entry includes multiple errors and/or significantly more specificity and/or clarity is needed.	You have two or more significant errors in your Wikipedia entry and/or much more specificity or clarity is needed.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your Wikipedia entry, or the entry itself is unclear.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is quite unclear (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is very unclear (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is so unclear that it is difficult to understand your writing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your Wikipedia entry, or it is nearly illegible (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.

Morality and Values in the Media Project

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large-scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re-write (50%)	Missing/In complete (0%)
Description of Media Clip (15%)	Perfect! You have discussed the characters and elements of the plot that are relevant to the theory you have chosen. You have included insights or summaries of the character's behavior that you will later use in your analysis.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor corrections or additions needed in discussing the plot and characters involved in this media clip.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors or additions needed on your discussion of the plot/character and/or slightly more specificity needed in your descriptions to help us make the links in the rest of your paper.	Great start! You've just made a few errors or a few more additions needed in your discussion of the plot/characters that your paper will address; and/or more specificity needed in your descriptions of these elements to better help us understand the rest of your paper.	Good job, but your discussion of the plot/characters includes multiple errors and/or significantly more detail and examples are needed in your discussion.	You have two or more significant errors of omission or commission in your discussion of character/plot (that are necessary for the rest of your argument) and/or much more detail/specificity needed in these paragraphs.	You have multiple significant errors in your discussion of the character/plot.	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing NEARLY HALF of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing HALF of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.
Description of Theory (25%)	Perfect! You have thoroughly and articulately explained the theory or theories that you have chosen. You have included complete descriptions of concepts or terms that may be confusing, and have provided a thorough overview of the most important elements of the theory.	Nearly perfect! This is a great description of the theory, but could use either a bit more detail, or is missing a few important details.	Excellent! This is still a thorough description of the theory, but you have either made one or two errors in describing the theory, or your description lacks some key details or is otherwise unclear in places.	Great start! This is a good description of the study/theory, but either lacks some detail throughout or includes a few errors in your descriptions, or becomes confusing in parts.	Good job in giving a broad overview of the study/theory, but you need to include significantly more details (and/or check the accuracy of your statements).	You have started to describe this theory, but have left out a number of key details and/or you have made a number of errors and/or your writing becomes significantly confusing.	Although you have started to describe the theory, you have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission), or your descriptions are confusing enough that it is difficult to tell whether or not you understood the theory.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of this theory, or are missing multiple significant details, or your paper is quite confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of this theory, or are missing many significant details, or your paper is very confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of this theory, or are missing many significant details, or your paper is very confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in ALL or NEARLY ALL of your discussion of this theory, and/or your paper is so confusing that it is nearly illegible (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.

Morality and Values in the Media Project

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large-scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re-write (50%)	Missing/Incomplete (0%)
Application of Theory to "Diagnose" and Explain Issues in the Compassion/ Morality of Your Character (25%)	Perfect! Your argument about the "diagnosis" of the character draws upon, not only a solid understanding of the theory you have described, but also a clear understanding of how this theory explains why people do the things that they do and HOW such tendencies develop. You have organized your argument such that your discussion of the diagnosis of the character is well-founded on concepts from the theory (not merely asserting your opinion), and displays appropriate use of theoretical concepts and terms in an explanation of how they might have developed in the way that they have.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor additions needed in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or a few more details needed, and/or slightly more specificity needed in your arguments.	Great! You've just made a few errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, and/or more specificity needed in your discussion and/or there one or more logical errors/omissions in your argument.	Good job, but your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state includes multiple errors or omissions and/or significantly more specificity needed in your critical examination of these issues.	You have two or more significant errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or are missing some key elements or concepts, and/or much more specificity needed in your argument of how this theory applies to (and explains) this character. You may have used a little too much personal opinion, and not quite enough reasoned argument.	You have multiple significant errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, and/or you have over-used personal-opinion, and have not given enough reasoned argument.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or your argument is nearly all based on pure opinion, rather than reasoned argument (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state or your argument is nearly all based on pure opinion, rather than reasoned argument (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state or your argument is completely opinion-based with no support (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, and/or this section is nearly illegible or has almost no structure to the argument (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.
Theory-Relevant Interventions for Your Character (25%)	Nearly perfect! You have identified two or three moral/compassion-related "goals" for your character, and have accurately and articulately described two or three different interventions that make sense in the context of this theory. All of these interventions are well-suited to the "areas of growth" that your character is facing, and they are well-tailored to help him/her grow toward a prescribed end. Further, you have used the language of the theory to discuss how (according to your theory) each intervention would specifically address the character's areas of growth.	Excellent! Overall, you have done a great job on this section. There are only minor issues of style and organization. All of the relevant information has been included.	Great! You have provided a very thorough overview of two or three interventions, and they make general sense with your theory. However, you have either made a few minor errors or omissions, have a few substantial errors in grammar/style, or need to use your own words more. You may also be missing a few connections between your character's "areas of growth" and the interventions you have suggested.	Very good. You have included general descriptions of two three interventions, but have made either a few small errors or one larger error with respect to linking your interventions to your theory, or with respect to shaping your interventions to the morally-oriented goals of your character. Or, this section of your paper might benefit from some re-organization.	Good. You have given a basic overview of two or three interventions, but may be missing some of the important details with respect to the theory or the specifics of the intervention. Or, you may have made a larger number of minor errors or omissions. Or, this section your paper might benefit from more in-depth re-organization.	Good, but there are some key errors or omissions, here. Specifically, you are missing at least one or two relevant core ideas of the theory, or you have not fully described two three interventions. Or, the links between your interventions and the theory may be a little vague. Or, this section could benefit from substantial organizational editing.	OK, but there are multiple (3+) aspects of these interventions that are either missing, or that have been poorly matched to either a) the theory or b) your character's areas of growth. Or, you have made a significant number of substantial errors. Or, you have a large number of either grammatical or organizational errors.	You have made a significant number of errors and/or omissions AND you have a number of stylistic and organizational errors.	Over half of your descriptions involve significant errors, or you are missing over half of the elements of these interventions or links to your theory. Or the interventions do not seem appropriate to the theory you chose or the goals of your character. Or, your errors, omissions, and/or organization has made this section difficult to read.	Over 75% of your descriptions involve significant errors, or you are missing most of the key elements of these interventions. Or there is very little link between your interventions and the theory/goals that you chose. Or, your errors, omissions, and/or organization has made this section very difficult to read.	You are missing nearly every single important element of this theory & intervention, or your grammar, spelling, and structure has made this section nearly unreadable.	This section of your paper is either missing, or is almost completely illegible.

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large-scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re-write (50%)	Missing/Incomplete (0%)
Grammar/Phrasing (10%)	Perfect! No spelling or grammar errors. Fantastic organization and perfect writing. Arguments are structured well, sentences are clear, . Your sentences, and overall arguments flow well.	One or two spelling/grammatical errors or confusing passages. Otherwise, great!	2-3 spelling or grammatical errors; or A few (not more than 5%) confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences, or one dis-ordering. Otherwise, good!	4-6 spelling or grammatical errors. And/or 4-5 confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences (not more than 10%) (or fewer, depending on the length); and/or slight disorganization.	7+ spelling or grammatical errors, beginning to affect readability. And/or a number (about 10-20%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or more significant disorganization.	Although your meaning is still relatively clear, many of your sentences have grammatical and spelling errors. A significant number (about 20%-30%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or significant disorganization.	Grammar and spelling errors are beginning to make it difficult to understand the meaning of your sentences. A large number (about 30%-50%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or pervasive disorganization.	A large number of grammatical and spelling errors, which make your text difficult to understand. Over 50% of sentences are confusing or poorly phrased and the overall structure is disorganized.	Most of your sentences include spelling and grammar errors, and make your text difficult to understand. The poor quality of most sentences and/or the significant disorganization makes your meaning difficult to understand	Most of your sentences include spelling and grammar errors, and make your text quite difficult to understand. Most sentences are difficult to read, and your statements are quite unclear.	Nearly every sentence has errors in it, which make your text nearly illegible. Sentences are nearly illegible, and almost no meaning is clear.	Missing or completely illegible.
Presentation - Organized (15%)	Perfect! Your presentation and discussion-leading showed that you were well prepared, had thoroughly read and thought about the article, and had organized your thoughts prior to class.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor errors or mis-organization in your leading of discussion.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your discussion during class.	Great! You've just made a few errors or had some noticeable disorganization in your class presentation and discussion-leading.	Good job, but your discussion included multiple errors and/or significantly more specificity was needed and/or there was some significant disorganization evident.	You have two or more significant errors (of omission of commission) in your discussion and class-leading, and/or much more specificity needed in your discussion, and/or significant levels of disorganization impeded the clarity of your presentation.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your class discussion, and/or disorganization impaired the clarity and effectiveness of the class discussion.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion and/or a good portion of your presentation was disorganized (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion and/or HALF of your presentation was significantly disorganized or unclear. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion and/or over half of your presentation was disorganized or unclear. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in ALL or NEARLY ALL of your discussion and or you had clearly done little preparation. (see previous grading categories for details).	You were either absent or clearly had not done the reading.
Presentation - Engaging and Thought-Provoking Questions and Applications (15%)	Perfect! You had prepared a significant number of engaging, and thought provoking questions for the class to consider throughout its discussion of this paper. You also identified multiple diverse applications (both practical and theological) to which this study pertains, and engaged the class in discussion regarding these applications.	Nearly perfect! Just one or two minor errors in clarity in the questions you asked and/or in your applications.	Excellent! Just a little more clarity or specificity needed in the questions you asked and/or in your applications.	Great! You just need to be clearer in a few of your questions, and/or more specificity needed in your applications.	Good job, but multiple questions were unclear and/or significantly more specificity needed in such descriptions (and/or the class could have benefitted from having a few more questions or applications)	Multiple questions were unclear, and/or you only had a few questions prepared, and/or much more specificity needed in such your applications (or only had a few applications).	You either only generated a couple of questions or applications, or they were quite unclear or vague.	You only prepared one or two questions and/or one or two vague applications(see previous grading categories for details).	You have prepared only one or two poorly phrased questions and/or applications (see previous grading categories for details).	You only engaged the class once using either a question or a vague/simple application (see previous grading categories for details).	You have either failed to generate any questions or applications, or they were so vague or confusing that they did not contribute to the conversation (see previous grading categories for details).	You were either absent or clearly had not done the reading.
Wikipedia Entry (15%)	Perfect! You have succinctly described the essence and/or implications of the study/theory that you had read in 3-4 sentences, and smoothly integrated your comments into the already-existing Wikipedia entry.	Nearly perfect! Just one minor correction in your otherwise perfect Wikipedia entry.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your Wikipedia entry and/or slightly more specificity needed.	Great! You've just made a few minor errors (or one significant error) in your Wikipedia entry and/or more specificity or clarity is needed.	Good job, but your Wikipedia entry includes multiple errors and/or significantly more specificity and/or clarity is needed.	You have two or more significant errors in your Wikipedia entry and/or much more specificity or clarity is needed.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your Wikipedia entry, or the entry itself is unclear.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is quite unclear (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is very unclear (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is so unclear that it is difficult to understand your writing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your Wikipedia entry, or it is nearly illegible (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.