

Guest Lecturer: Christabel Sarpomaa

Host Instructor/Evaluator: Sheyenne Grainger

SOC 1000 (102): Introduction to Sociology

15 April 2026

## Evaluation form

Please rate each area on a scale of 1-3

(1= improvement needed; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations)

1. Planning & preparation \_\_3\_\_

Comments: VERY well done and put together! I liked the breakdown of the outline, agenda, and learning objectives also.

2. Student Engagement & climate for learning \_\_3\_\_

Comments: Students were quick to engage with the questions you asked, and offered some really good insights on TopHat. They were clearly intrigued with what you had to say, and the examples you provided. I do *think* they were a bit confused with how exactly to engage with the activity—perhaps refining the instructions and extending the time to 5 minutes might have helped with this. 2 minutes to discuss, then 3 minutes to share? Responses to her [methods question](#) and overall [engagement survey](#) are hyperlinked!

3. Instructional style & content \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_

Comments: 1) Christabel clearly did not rely on her slides/notes and knew what she was talking about! This was clearly demonstrated by how she elaborated on the concepts from memory,

asking students questions about specific examples, and drawing notes on the board as she went along. 2) In particular, Christabel used a class generated word cloud with examples to continue drawing connections to points she made throughout the lecture. Specifically when it comes to issues regarding government, homelessness, and student issues like transportation and engagement. 3) Apart from her content, her delivery was phenomenal and she would often ask students if they were grasping the lecture as she went along and would ask if she was moving too quickly. My only note is that perhaps in the future, give a little bit more of a pause and a scan of the room to give students a chance to respond (if you are moving too quickly or to ask questions). Some students tend to hesitate for a second or two before raising their hand. Side note: Christabel did very well working with Tophat (a different platform) for the first time!

4. Please describe areas of strength you observed:

Aside from what was mentioned earlier, the biggest strength was her content and phrasing. I made note of several points/quotes she made—but there were 3 that stood out the most:

- 1) Firstly, she hammers in the **importance of sociological research** as a way to move deeper from guesses and assumptions about the social world. She then discusses how sociologists also use the scientific method to test hypotheses, so that they are “based on evidence and not ‘common sense’.”
- 2) Secondly, her explanation of **observation bias and the Hawthorne effect** was both relevant and timely! Before class started, she asked me if students tend to show up on time or be interactive during lectures. She referenced this during class in a hypothetical scenario: Professor Grainger says students tend to show up late and are not really engaged, therefore, [if] Christabel interacts with students as though they will not be

engaged or makes negative assumptions/preconceived notions about the students based on the regular instructor's assessment, that would demonstrate observer bias. To avoid bias, it would be better to treat students with a clean slate! She develops this deeper: on the flip side, students were told ahead of time that a guest lecturer would be present, and see that as an opportunity to interact in an entirely new way, show up early or on time, or be extra interactive to make a good impression because they are aware that they are being observed (hawthorne effect). This was a genius connection! I am thinking of adopting this explanation in the future.

- 3) Lastly, her example of the **survey research method** was relevant and timely. She started by talking about the pros: that it reaches a large population, and a sample can be drawn. Then she gives an example of potentially creating a survey on homelessness, perhaps refining it to a particular city (location) or being more concerned about how women experience homelessness (gender). She made a comparison to a transportation services questionnaire that was sent out the same morning and compared it, saying that the general survey might assess the whole student population, and a sample can be refined by, let's say, students who have cars (very well done!)

5. Please provide suggestions for improvement based on your observation:

- 1) Activity improvement suggestions: maybe reword or restructure it a bit for clarity?

ACTIVITY (5 minutes)

Step 1: select one of the 3 research scenarios and discuss with your partner. (2m)

Step 2: Of the three types of social research we mentioned (survey, interview, or observation) which one would you use to study the social issue and why? (3m)

- 2) For the research tools sociologists use, I think students might benefit from an image on each slide (survey, interview, and observation) that illustrates a bit more distinction between interview and observation. Christabel's explanation of the difference was eloquent, but a picture might assist in getting the message across also!
- 3) When comparing surveys to interviews, a distinction was that during surveys, the participants get the questions and answers, but in interviews, the researcher has the questions and answers. I got what she meant clearly, but I would reword or clarify that →  
**Example:** During surveys, it is a self-assessment where participants get the questions and provide answers. During interviews, it's the researcher who decides what questions to ask, and how participants' answers to the questions are recorded and interpreted.

6. Please provide a brief summary evaluation of the lecturer: Christabel's enthusiasm about her own experience with research was artfully translated into her guest lecture on "Doing Sociological Research." She focused on three specific areas of research, and used concepts and examples that built upon content that was already covered in our class (ex. Social stratification and inequality, etc.). I enjoyed listening to her introduce new concepts and suggestions on ethical research practices, using fun examples of observer bias, Hawthorne effect, confidentiality, and anonymity. The overarching message I got from it was that sociology is also a science, and it is a useful tool to help us move beyond assumptions...creating real explanations and solutions for societal issues!

## Rubric

**Learning outcome:** Learning outcome for the guest lecture is measurable and appropriate for the content and level of the class.

\_\_7.5\_\_ /7.5

**Content:** Content is connected to learning outcome and is appropriate for the content and level of the class. Content is organized in a structured and logical manner.

\_\_7.5\_\_ /7.5

**Visual aid(s):** At least one well-planned visual aid is used. Visual aid is appropriate for the content and level of the class and is connected to the learning outcome of the lecture.

\_\_5\_\_ /5

**Peer evaluation:** Lecturer attends the micro-lectures of their peers and provides meaningful and fair feedback by completing the feedback form and submitting it to the instructor.

\_\_5\_\_ /5

**Total:** \_\_25\_\_ /25 points

Comments: