

University of Wisconsin-Madison
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
Class meets Wed. 9:30-12:00
Social Work, 114

Betty J. Kramer, PhD, MSSW
Phone: (o) 263-3830; (h) 848-7546
email: ejkramer@wisc.edu
Office Hours: by appointment (Rm. 210)

SW 951 (PA 974): APPLIED THEORY SEMINAR: CAREGIVING
Spring, 2012

[T]he initial impetus for research is the search for theory. Theory development relies on research, and research relies on theory. (J. Fawcett)

To admit the importance of theory is to make an open-ended commitment, to leave yourself in a position where there are always important things you don't know...Theory makes you desire mastery....[but]...makes mastery impossible. (Jonathan Culler)

There is nothing so practical as a good theory. (Kurt Lewin)

Some theories are good for nothing except to be argued about (Georg C. Lichtenberg)

A theory is the more impressive the greater is the simplicity of its premises, the more different are the kinds of things it relates and the more extended the range of its applicability (Albert Einstein)

COURSE OVERVIEW

This interactive, intensive doctoral-level seminar is designed to introduce a broad range of topics related to the role of theory in caregiving research. Students will be introduced to the fundamental relationship between theory and research, with attention to how theories are developed, how they evolve, and how they may most appropriately guide social science research and be applied to research questions and design to ensure theoretical and methodological congruence. Caregiving research that is theory driven and also in which theory is developed will be reviewed. Several faculty scholars contribute to the seminar to assist in the exploration of a range of caregiving topics and the micro, mezzo and macro theories used to study them. Attention is given to theoretical assumptions, key concepts and definitions, how the theory is employed, and consideration of appropriate strategies for ensuring methodological and theoretical congruence.

Students will gain experience evaluating application of theories to caregiving issues. Though the course will focus on caregiving topics, the issues and theories associated with these topics are relevant to the study of a wide variety of other topics in the social and health sciences. The expectation in this seminar is that each of us will develop the critical skills necessary to evaluate many different kinds of research and that we will leave seminar able to more skillfully draw upon and use theory in our own work. Students will be assisted to think deeply about the application of theory to their own areas of interest.

While each seminar session may differ somewhat in discussion methods employed, each session will begin with a more general discussion of the topic or theory, followed by critique of the assigned empirical articles, and in-depth discussion of faculty and student generated open-ended questions relevant to the course objectives.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. To increase understanding of contemporary trends and issues associated with the phenomenon of family caregiving in the U.S.
2. To deepen student understanding about what constitutes good scientific theory, the functions and types of theory and conceptual and methodological congruence considerations for scientific enquiry.
3. To help students identify and clarify the connections and distinctions between conceptual frameworks, theories and models.
4. To enhance student understanding about how one's stated (conscious) or unstated (unconscious) theoretical perspective on social problems influences what one is drawn to investigate and the research questions one asks, and how the choice and use of theory influences the potential implications of one's research.
5. To help students become critical consumers of theory through examination of the strengths and limitations in the range of a sampling of micro, mezzo and macro theories employed in caregiving research and their potential implications (e.g., for policy and practice).
6. To provide students with experience in critically evaluating other scholar's use of and application of theory and congruence with research methods, using caregiving exemplars as the practice arena.
7. To help students identify and think deeply about the application of theory to their own areas of research.

COURSE FORMAT

This course is organized as a seminar that may be defined as:

Collaborative intellectual dialogue facilitated with open-ended questions about a text. (National Paideia Center, 2011).

A small group of advanced students in a college or graduate school engaged in original research or intensive study under the guidance of a professor who meets regularly with them to discuss their reports and findings. (American Heritage Dictionary, 2000).

A focused collaborative group discussion of a text or another common academic experience...asks that students develop responsibility and skills in working with their peers to understand the texts and their relationships to the learning community themes. (Evergreen State College, 2011)

In summary, a seminar is considered a collaborative learning environment allowing for an exchange of ideas. The purpose of this seminar is to achieve a deeper understanding about the use of theory in research (using caregiving as the focal area of exploration). This will be accomplished primarily through the process of group conversation and discussion to assist us in constructing meaning through listening, disciplined analysis, interpretation, and participation. For any seminar to be successful, seminar members must:

- Consistently complete weekly readings and be prepared to participate
- Speak openly to the whole group, not just to the leader
- Develop good interpretive, literal and evaluative open-ended questions
- Come prepared with written questions to ask (see below)

- Actively and respectfully listen to one another and seek to understand what is being communicated
- Actively share one's own insights, reactions, thoughts and ideas that are stimulated from the readings or the observations and comments of others
- Address an idea or argument by connecting it to what someone else has said; summarize the point you are responding to and then provide your own idea.
- Invite others into the discussion
- Be appropriate, respectful, and focused on topic
- Be comfortable with silence (Silence gives time to process thoughts)
- NOTE: The natural talkers will need to be disciplined in order to learn how to listen better; quiet individuals must learn to share their insights; everyone should speak during each seminar.

REQUIRED READINGS

All required and recommended readings (with the exception of a recommended texts) are posted and available in electronic reserves in Learn@UW.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

POINTS

A.	Class Attendance, Participation and Preparation of Weekly Active Engagement Requirements	15
-----------	---	-----------

Attendance, active participation, and regular assessment of the seminar process and student evaluation of participation are important components that contribute to the success of the seminar as a teaching forum (McCartney, 2011; Scarborough, 2011). Students will be asked to regularly evaluate the seminar process (see Appendix A) and their own level and quality of participation in the seminar (see Appendix B).

Participation credit will include mandatory submission of a weekly reflection paragraph and three typed questions that will become part of the basis for class discussion during the seminar period. The *weekly reflection paragraph* may address any of the following: 1) a personal response or reaction to the weekly readings; 2) a discussion of how a particular theory highlighted in the weekly reading is potentially relevant to one's own substantive area of interest; or 3) thoughts about the implications of some aspect of the reading for research, practice or policy. The typed *questions for discussion* should be open-ended questions, stemming from the theoretical and empirical articles that are in some way related to the course objectives for discussion. Students are encouraged to consider different types of questions such as interpretive (i.e., that ask for interpretations of the reading), literal (i.e., that elicit factual information that may be answered directly from readings to ensure comprehension), or evaluative (i.e., that elicit positions, or opinions about the reading). Students should write down the exact page and paragraph from the required reading that stimulated the question (if relevant). Students may design any questions relevant to the course objectives or consider using any of the following, but should consider what they would find most valuable to address learning needs:

- What puzzles me is...
- I'd like to talk with people about...
- Don't you think this is similar to...?
- Do you agree that the big ideas seem to be...?
- I have questions about...
- How would this theory be applied to a different topic or area of interest?
- This theory seems to ignore...what else is it failing to consider?
- What does it mean when the author says...?
- Do you agree with the assumptions that...?
- What does this word or phrase mean?
- How does this compare to theory X?
- Why is this point important?

B. Theory Handout**10**

Each student will be assigned to prepare a brief (no more than 2 page) handout, that summarizes one of the caregiving theories or models that are addressed in class and to present and review this handout at the beginning of each class. Doctoral students and researchers in general need to develop skills to critically review writings about particular theories, to determine the kinds of problems they are suited to address and to summarize the key assumptions and concepts relevant to the theory. This information is necessary to inform the development of prelim papers and proposals and a variety of other forms of scholarly writing. Preparing the theory handout will assist students to organize and share their own thinking about the following:

- 1) Primary problems or questions addressed by the theory or model;
- 2) Core assumptions;
- 3) Key concepts (conceptual definitions and operationalization of major concepts), and if appropriate,
- 4) A visual diagram or description of how the key concepts are linked to one another.

Students may use the course and/or supplemental reading to prepare the handout. Please note that it is not expected that these handouts will be flawless descriptions of theory. It will not be possible to draft a totally complete description. Rather this assignment will provide an opportunity for skill development and the handout itself will serve as a spring board for our discussion about the core ideas of the theory itself. Seminar participants and visiting faculty will be invited to contribute additional insights to the essential aspects of the theory.

Please submit the handout to Betty by Monday evening (8:00 p.m.) prior to class.

C. Brief Written & Oral Critique of One Selected Empirical Article**15**

Each student will be assigned to prepare and deliver a critique (approx. 15 minutes) and facilitate discussion (approx. 15-25 minutes) of 1 of the assigned empirical research articles. The critique (of no more than two written pages), should include: 1) a concise statement of purpose and methods; 2) critique of the strengths and limitations with special attention to the theoretical or conceptual framework employed, and theoretical and methodological congruence; 3) your overall assessment of the quality and contributions of the study or any other insights you would like to share; and 4) two or three discussion questions stemming from the critique.

Please submit your written critique by email to Betty by Monday evening (8:00 p.m.) prior to class.

D. Annotated Bibliography and Theoretical Critique (due March 7th)**25**

Each student will identify 4 articles that address a topic related to their substantive area of interest (caregiving or other). For each article, please provide the following: 1) the full citation; 2) a concise 1 paragraph abstract; 3) a concise 1-2 paragraph evaluation and critique of the use and application of theory; and 4) a copy of the articles reviewed. The critique should include attention to: To what extent was theory stated explicitly or implicitly and applied appropriately? How appropriate the theory seemed to be in relationship to the issue, problem or concept addressed in the article. If theory was absent, how and which theory (if appropriate) might have enhanced the study? What is your rationale? To what extent were the methods consistent with the theory? Provide examples to support your comments (e.g., to illustrate the ways in which the authors did or did not demonstrate theoretical and methodological congruence). Grades will be based on the quality of the evaluative commentary and the extent to which students demonstrate understanding of course content.

E. Presentation & Discussion – Selection of one of the following

The purpose of the “Presentation” assignment in its various forms is to: 1) Facilitate fuller investigation of one or more essential theoretical frameworks that have been used or that would be appropriate to use to study a problem area of interest (i.e., with attention to the strengths and weaknesses, and how the conceptual or theoretical approach would contribute to the existing knowledge base in the field, and how it would be operationalized) and to 2) further develop skills in articulating and presenting one’s rationale for choice of theory, while demonstrating one’s understanding of course content.

For this assignment students will need to:

1. Design a brief two page handout on the theory that is presented (similar to the “Theory Handout” assignment)
2. Submit one article a week in advance of their presentation to Betty that either describes the theory or provides background information on the substantive area that will be introduced;
3. Prepare a PowerPoint presentation or a Poster addressing any one of the following (Student’s choice):
 - a. Description of your own substantive area of interest and a theory that you believe would be suitable to inform a research question in your substantive area. You will be expected to provide your rationale regarding why you selected this theory as suitable to answering your research questions, how it would address gaps in the field, and what you would take into consideration to assure methodological and theoretical congruence.
 - b. Description of a theory or model that may be relevant to caregiving research you are interested in that we have not covered (e.g., attachment theory, caregiver identity theory, role theory, conflict theory, Roy Adaptation Model, Self-Regulation theory). You will be expected to provide an overview of how this theory has been applied to caregiving, and acknowledge the strengths and limitations of this theory.
 - c. Description of how you would apply one of the theories we have covered to a research study in your own substantive area of interest, with attention to the strengths and limitations of this theory to answering your research questions, and how you would assure methodological and theoretical congruence.
 - d. Comparative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of two theories in terms of their suitability to address selected research questions in a substantive area that interests you.

Grades Points: Grades will be assigned using the following conversion table.

100 point scale	Final Grade	Criteria of Work Quality
94-100	A	Outstanding
90-93	AB	Very good
84-89	B	Good
80-83	BC	Fair
74-79	C	Poor

- ** Required Reading (Available in Learn at UW)
- * Recommended Reading (Available in Learn at UW unless otherwise specified)

COURSE OUTLINE: TOPICS AND READINGS

Introduction: The Relationship between Theory and Research

Week 1: Wednesday, January 25

INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW

Welcome and introductions

Syllabus and assignment review

Getting oriented: Rationale for the course

Trends and issues in caregiving

Introduction to major areas of caregiving research range of theories employed in this area

- ** Marks, N.F., & Lambert, J.D. (1997). Family caregiving: Contemporary Trends and issues. National Survey of Families and Households, Madison, Wisconsin, Center for Demography & Ecology, National Survey of Families and Households, Working paper No. 78.
- ** Dow, B., & McDonald, J. (2003). Social support or structural change? Social work theory and research on care-giving. *Australian Social Work*, 56, (3), 197-208.
- Durant, Jr., T.J. & Christian, O.G. (2006). Caregiving to aging parents. *Forum on Public Policy*. Accessed January 10, 2012 at: <http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/archive07/durant.pdf>
- Dhar, V.E., (2011). Transnational caregiving: Part 1, Caring for family relations across nations. *Care Management Journals*, 12(2), 60-71.
- Singer, G.H., Biegel, D.E., & Ethridge, B.L. (2010). Trends impacting public policy support for caregiving families. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 13, 191-2010.

Week 2: Wednesday, February 1

WHAT THEORY IS? WHAT THEORY IS NOT?

Instructor: Betty Kramer

Conceptual frameworks, theories and models: Understanding the distinctions

What constitutes a good scientific theory?

Functions and types of theory

Conceptual and operational definitions & congruence considerations

Critiquing theory and methods in empirical research

- ** Carpiano, R.M., & Daley, D.M. (2006). A guide and glossary on postpositivist theory building for population health. *Journal of Epidemiology Community Health*, 60, 564-570.
- ** Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2000). Conceptual foundations of research. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (6th Ed., Ch. 2). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- ** Sutton, R.I. & Staw, B.M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 371-384.
- ** Robinson, M.A. (2009). Theory or bust: A doctoral student's insight on the role of theory in education and research. *The New Social Worker*, 16, (1), 24-27. Accessed January 12, 2012 at: http://www.socialworker.com/home/Feature_Articles/General/Theory_or_Bust%3A_A_Doctoral_Student's_Insight_on_the_Role_of_Theory_in_Education_and_Research/

- Jacques, R. (1992). Critique and theory building: Producing knowledge “from the kitchen.” *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 582-606.

Consider:

- How much consensus is there in what defines theory, what constitutes “good” theory and the difference between frameworks, models and theories?
- As we think about critiquing the use of theory in empirical research this semester, what kinds of things might we take into consideration?

Micro Theories Reflecting Costs and Benefits Associated with Family Caregiving

Week 3: Wednesday February 8

STRESS PROCESS, STRESS AND COPING, AND DIATHESIS STRESS MODEL

Faculty Guest: Jan Greenberg, Professor, Social Work

- ** Pearlin, L.I., Mullan, J.T., Semple, S.J., & Skaff, M.M. (1990). Caregiving and the stress process: An overview of concepts and their measures. *The Gerontologist*, 30, 583-594.
- ** (Empirical article). Bainbridge, D., Krueger, P., Lohfeld, L., & Brazil, K. (2009). Stress processes in caring for an end-of-life family member: Application of a theoretical model. *Aging & Mental Health*, 13, 537-545.
- ** (Empirical article) Clark, M.C., & Diamond, P.M. (2010). Depression in family caregivers of elders: A theoretical model of caregiver burden, sociotropy, and autonomy. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 33, 20-34.
- ** (Empirical article). Roscoe, L.A., Corsentino, E., Watkins, S., McCall, M., & Sanchez-Ramos, J. (2009). Well-being of family caregivers of persons with late-stage Huntington’s disease: Lessons in stress and coping. *Health Communication*, 24, 239-248.
- (Book Recommendation) Aneshensel, C.S., Pearlin, L.I., Mullan, J.T., Zarit, S.H., & Whitlatch, C.J. (1995). *Profiles in Caregiving: The unexpected career*. New York, NY: Academic Press
- Carretero, S., Garces, J., Rodenas, F., & Sanjose, V. (2009). The informal caregiver’s burden of dependent people: Theory and empirical review. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 49, 74-79.
- Haley, W.E., Levine, E.G., Brown, S.L., & Bartolucci, A.A. (1987). Stress, appraisal, coping and social support as predictors of adaptational outcome among dementia caregivers. *Psychology and Aging*, 2, 3233-330.

Handout summarizing Stress Process Model Prepared by: _____

Handout summarizing Diathesis Stress Model Prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Week 4: Wednesday, February 15

THEORETICAL APPROACHES REGARDING POSITIVE ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING: “CAREGIVER ADAPTATION MODEL,” “STRESS ADAPTATION”, AND “EXISTENTIALISM”

Instructor: Betty Kramer, Professor

Consideration of various theoretical approaches to studying negative versus positive outcomes.

- ** Kramer, B. J. (1997). Gain in the caregiving experience: Where are we? What next? *The Gerontologist*, *37*(2), 218-232.
- ** Farran, C.J. (1997). Theoretical perspectives concerning positive aspects of caring for elderly persons with dementia: Stress/Adaptation and existentialism. *The Gerontologist*, *37*, 250-256.
- ** (Empirical article) Kramer, B. J. (1997). Differential predictors of strain and gain among husbands caring for wives with dementia. *The Gerontologist*, *37*(2), 239-249.
- ** (Empirical article) Rapp, S.R., & Chao, D. (2000). Appraisals of strain and gain: Effects on psychological well-being of dementia patients. *Aging & Mental Health*, *4*(2), 142-147.
- ** (Empirical article). Morano, C.L. (2003). The role of appraisal and expressive support in mediating strain and gain in Hispanic Alzheimer’s disease caregivers. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *12*(2), 1-18.
- (Empirical article) Jervis, L.L., Boland, M.E., Fickenscher, A. (2010). American Indian family caregivers’ experiences with helping elders. *Journal of Cross cultural Gerontology*, *25*, 355-369.
- Samartkit, N., Kasemkitvattana, S., Thosingha, O., & Vorapongsathorn, T. (2010). Caregiver role strain and rewards: Caring for Thais with a Traumatic Brain Injury. *Pacific Rim International Journey of Nursing Research*, *14*(4), 297-313. [This article is available for free at the following website: http://www.tnc.or.th/files/2011/01/tnc_journal-468/pacific_rim_international_vol14_no4_pdf_60704.pdf#page=19]
- Baker, K.L., Robertson, N., & Connelly, D. (2010). Men caring for wives or partners with dementia: Masculinity, strain and gain. *Aging & Mental Health*, *14*, 319-327.

Handout summarizing Caregiver Adaptation Model: _____

Handout summarizing Theoretical Perspectives in Farran: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Week 5: Wednesday, February 22

LIFE COURSE PERSPECTIVE AND THEORY

Instructor: Betty Kramer, Professor

- ** Hutchinson, E.D. (2005). A life course perspective: A promising approach for bridging the micro and macro worlds for social workers. *Families in Society*, *86*, 143-152.
- ** (Empirical article) Marks, N.F., Lambert, J.D., Jun, H., & Song, J. (2008). Psychosocial moderators of the effects of transitioning into filial caregiving on mental and physical health. *Research on Aging*, *30*(3), 358-389.

- ** (Empirical article) Chesley, N. & Moen, P. (2006). When workers care: Dual-earner couples' caregiving strategies, benefit use, and psychological well-being. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 1248-1269.
- ** (Empirical article). Zhan, H.J. (2002). Chinese caregiving burden and the future burden of elder care in life-course perspective. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 54(4), 267-290.
- Marks, N.F. (1998). Does it hurt to care? Caregiving, work-family conflict, and midlife well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 951-966.
- Kramer, B. J., & Lambert, J. D. (1999). Caregiving as a life course transition among older husbands: A prospective study. *The Gerontologist*, 39(6), 658-667.

Handout summarizing the Life Course Perspective and Theory prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Mezzo and Macro Theories

Week 6: Wednesday February 29

EXCHANGE THEORY –AND CHILD WELFARE SYSTEMS

Faculty Guest: Kristi Shook Slack, Professor

- ** Cook, K.S., & Rice, E. (2003). Social exchange theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Ch. 3, pp. 53-75). New York, NY: Plenum Publishers.
- ** Smith, S.R., Hamon, R.R., Ingoldsby, B.B., & Miller, J.E. (2009). Social Exchange Theory, In *Exploring Family Theories* (pp. 201-211)..New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- ** (Empirical article) Testa, M.F., & Slack, K.S. (2002). The gift of kinship foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 24, 79-108.
- ** (Empirical article) Timmer, S.G., Sedlar, G., & Urquiza, A. (2004). Challenging children in kin versus nonkin foster care: Perceived costs and benefits to caregivers. *Child maltreatment*, 9 251-262.
- McGregor, L., Parker, K., LeBlanc, P., & King, K.M. (2010). Using social exchange theory to guide successful study recruitment and retention. *Nurse Researcher*, 17, 74-82.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M.S., (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-899.

Handout summarizing Social Exchange Theory prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Week 7: Wednesday, March 7

Annotated Bibliography and Theoretical Critique Due Today

NOTE: Class will end a little early today for the PhD Faculty & Student luncheon at the Faculty Center

STIGMA THEORY AND CAREGIVING

Faculty Guest: Tally Moses, Associate Professor, Social Work

Conceptualizations of stigma and its various dimensions

The application of stigma theory to families of people with mental illness

- ** Link, B.G., & Phelan, J.C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 363-385.
- ** Corrigan, P.W., & Miller, F.E., (2004). Shame, blame, and contamination: A review of the impact of mental illness stigma on family members. *Journal of Mental Health*, 13(6), 537-548.
- ** (Empirical article) Phelan, J.C., Bromet, E.J., & Link, B.G. (1998). Psychiatric illness and family stigma. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 24(1), 115-126.
- ** (Empirical article). Chou, Y.C., Pu, C.Y., Lee, Y.C., Lin, L.C., & Kröger, T. (2009). Effect of perceived stigmatization on the quality of life among ageing female family carers: A comparison of carers of adults with intellectual disability and carers of adults with mental illness.
 - Werner, P., & Heinik, J. (2008). Stigma by association and Alzheimer's disease. *Aging & Mental Health*, 12(1), 92-99.
 - Mak, W.W.S., & Cheung, R.Y.M. (2008). Affiliate stigma among caregivers of people with intellectual disability or mental illness. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 21, 532-545.

Handout summarizing Stigma Theory prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Week 8: Wednesday, March 14

FEMINIST THEORY

Faculty Guest: Stephanie Robert, Professor, Social Work

- ** Ray, R.E. (1996). A postmodern perspective on feminist gerontology. *The Gerontologist*, 36 (5), 674-680.
- ** Hooyman, N.R., & Gonyea, J.G. (1999). A feminist model of family care: Practice and policy directions. *Journal of Women & Aging*, 11 (2-3), 149-169.
- ** Ferree, M.M. (2010). Filling the glass: Gender perspectives on families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 420-439.
 - Stoller, E.P. (1994). Teaching about gender: The experience of family care of frail elderly relatives. *Educational Gerontology*, 20, 679-697.

Handout summarizing Feminist Theory prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

(NOTE: For this week there is no assigned empirical article. Instead, take one empirical article from a previous week, and use at least one of the feminist perspectives (preferably two) to critique the premise or theory of the empirical article you choose.

Theory Focused on Care Receiver - Implications for Caregivers

Week 9: Wednesday, March 21

THE LIFE SPAN MODEL OF SUCCESSFUL AGING -

Faculty Guest: Tracy Schroepfer, Associate Professor, Social Work

- ** Schultz, R., & Heckhausen, J. (1996). A life span model of successful aging. *American Psychologist*, 51, 702-714.
- ** (Empirical Article) Schroepfer, T.A., Noh, H., Kavanaugh, M. (2009). The myriad strategies for seeking control in the dying process. *The Gerontologist*, 49, 755-765.
- ** (Empirical Article) Wrosch, C., Schulz, R., Heckhausen, J. (2002). Health stresses and depressive symptomatology in the elderly: the importance of health engagement control strategies. *Health Psychology*, 21, 340-348.
- Mahmood, A., Yamamoto, T., Lee, M. & Steggell (2008). Perceptions and use of gerotechnology: Implication for aging in place. *Journal of Housing for the Elderly*, 22(1/2), 104-126.

Handout summarizing the Life Span Model of Successful Aging prepared by : _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Generating Caregiving Theory

Week 10: Wednesday, March 28

GROUNDING THEORIES OF CAREGIVING

Faculty Guest: Barbara Bowers, Helen Denne Schulte Professor, Associate Dean for Research, Department of Nursing

- ** Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Grounded theory methodology. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 158-183). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- ** (Empirical article) Caron, C.D., & Bowers, B.J. (2003). Deciding whether to continue, share or relinquish caregiving: Caregiver views. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(9), 1252-71.
- ** (Empirical article) Bowers, B.J. (1987) Intergenerational caregiving: Adult caregivers and their aging parents. *Advanced Nursing Science*, 9(2), 20-31.

- ** (Empirical article) Jansson, W., Nordberg, G., & Grafstrom, M. (2001). Patterns of elderly spousal caregiving in dementia care: An observational study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 34, 804-812.
- Wu, H.L., & Volker, D.L. (2009). The use of theory in qualitative approaches to research: Application in end-of-life studies.

Handout summarizing the Grounded theory
 Approach to generating theory prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Week of April 2: Spring break

Theories Informing Caregiver Intervention

Week 11: Wednesday April 11

SELF-EFFICACY THEORY:

Faculty Guest: Sandy Magana

Caregiver Interventions using promotora de salud.

- ** Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 82(2), 191-215.
- ** (Empirical article). Martin, M.A., Catrambone, C.D., Kee, R.A., Evans, A.T., Sharp, L.K., Lyttle, C. et al.. (2009). Improving asthma self-efficacy: Developing and testing a pilot community-based asthma intervention for African American Adults.
- ** (Empirical article). Kouri, K.K., Ducharme, F.C., & Giroux, F. (2011). A psycho-educational intervention focused on communication for caregivers of a family member in the early stage of Alzheimer’s disease: Results of an experimental study. *Dementia*, 10, 435-453.
- ** (Empirical article). Ip, W.Y., Tang, C.S.K., & Goggins, W.B. (2009). An educational intervention to improve women’s ability to cope with childbirth. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 18, 2125-2135.

Handout summarizing Self-Efficacy Theory prepared by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Research critique and discussion by: _____

Week 12: Wednesday April 18

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

- ** Required readings TBA. Each student presenting this week will submit one required reading that the instructor will post on Learn at UW at least one week in advance.

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

Week 13: Wednesday April 25

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

** Required readings TBA. Each student presenting this week will submit one required reading that the instructor will post on Learn at UW at least one week in advance.

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

Week 14: Wednesday May 2

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

** Required readings TBA. Each student presenting this week will submit one required reading that the instructor will post on Learn at UW at least one week in advance.

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

Week 15: Wednesday May 9

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

** Required readings TBA. Each student presenting this week will submit one required reading that the instructor will post on Learn at UW at least one week in advance.

Student Presentation by: _____

Student Presentation by: _____

INTEGRATION AND SYNTHESIS

Putting it all together

Course Review

Summary and Class Evaluation

Appendix A. SEMINAR PROCESS ASSESSMENTS

These scales represent your general perception of your seminar experience today. The descriptions represent each end of the scale. Please circle the number on the 10-point scale that best represents your evaluation of each dimension below (with 1 representing the lowest assessment and 10 representing the highest assessment)

Satisfaction with discussion

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Seminar was a waste of time

Seminar was useful to my learning

Contribution of seminar to personal learning

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Discussion did not aid my understanding of course objectives/ themes.

Discussion added a great deal to my understanding of course objectives/themes

Personal involvement in discussion

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not involved at all, participation limited, not interested

Totally involved, active participation, interested in topic and discussion

Climate of discussion

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

I felt judged, criticized, not listened to; I did not feel safe in the group

I felt free to share and participate
The atmosphere felt trusting and respectful

McCartney, K.A. "Approaches to assessment in the collaborative learning seminar/discussion. In *SEMINARS: A collection of Materials on Seminar Approaches and Evaluation Strategies*. Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, Olympia WA. Accessed January 22, 2012 at <http://www.evergreen.edu/washcenter/natlc/pdf/seminars.pdf012>

SEMINAR PROCESS ANALYSIS/DIAGNOSIS

The following scales represent some of the specific behaviors that can help make a seminar work well. By looking at your perception of how the group did on each scale and then comparing your perception with other members, you may gain understanding about what your seminar is doing that makes the seminar successful or not. Circle the number along the continuum to indicate your perception of that scale.

Climate creation and maintenance

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

No attention paid to involving people, setting goals/time, discussing process, support/confirmation, tension relieving

Attention paid to encouraging participation, goal setting, time keeping, supportive listening, discussion of process, etc.

Goal directed activity

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Aimless, topic jumping. Excursions into trivia, no directions all. Structure is non-existent, is resisted, or is seen as limiting.

Total occupation with working on discussion goals. Structure is at flexible, appropriate to situation, open to negotiation.

Response to contributions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Members ignore and do not respond to contributions; discussion is scattered; same points made over and over; members feel no progress is occurring.

Members respond to contributions so that speaker knows how contribution is received. Discussion is cumulative and The group moves together.

Information follow-through

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Information 'dumped', no connections no follow through

Information clarified, added to connected, Chains of ideas created.

Function in group

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Members use dysfunctional roles Member always participate In the same way.

All members participate in different and in complementary ways.

Safety/trust

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Members are distrustful of one another, are careful, guarded, listen superficially but reject what others say; are afraid to criticize or be criticized.

Members trust one another; all use and respect the responses they get. All freely express ideas, opinions and reactions without fear of reprisal.

Spread of participation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

A few dominate, some passive, some not listening, some not listened to. Several talk at once. Interruptions.

All get in. All are involved. All are listened to. Participation is active and intense.

Checking for meaning

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Members assume they know what others are saying and evaluate and judge what others say before checking for meaning.

Members use paraphrase, perception checking, provisional summaries to check their assumptions of what others are saying.

Creative Conflict

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Group is uncomfortable with differences in thinking and either avoids the conflict is focused on attacking and judging.

Differences in thinking are seen as useful to explore. Conflict is focused on checking, correcting and enlarging knowledge.

Authority/leadership

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Group needs for leadership are not met. Certain individuals are seen as having the authority. High dependence; one or two dominate; no sharing of leadership.

As needs for leadership arise various members, meet them; anyone feels free to volunteer as s/he sees a group need; leadership is distributed almost equally.

McCartney, K.A. "Approaches to assessment in the collaborative learning seminar/discussion. In *SEMINARS: A collection of Materials on Seminar Approaches and Evaluation Strategies*. Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, Olympia WA. Accessed January 22, 2012 at <http://www.evergreen.edu/washcenter/natlc/pdf/seminars.pdf012>

Appendix B. SELF ASSESSMENT OF LEVEL OF INTERACTION IN SEMINAR

Introduction: To a larger degree the intention of seminar is the process of active learning itself, made visible and audible to the entire learning community. It is the seminar that integrates the texts with the readers, and the readers with each other. Without a vital seminar, there is little hope that a coordinated studies class will be as healthy as it could be. The following is a seminar metric to help participants evaluate and consciously improve the vitality of the seminar. However, it is crucial to remember that no seminar will work if the participants have not read the material.

Metric: Because of the difficulty and complexity in discussing anyone's motivation to do or not to do anything, the following metric is based simply upon the seven levels of behavior (from least to most interactive) we have observed in seminar participants.

1- **Silent** - No response. Of the various reasons for this behavior, two need to be considered for our purposes: Lack of trust in the group and therefore the unwillingness to take a risk and share; or lack of confidence in one's own critical abilities a sense of being so overpowered by the material that it is hard to see the forest for the trees.

2- **Silencing the text** - Personal opinions, experiences and/or memories dominate, without much consideration for the text. This behavior indicates an inability to engage and is often accompanied by complacency or boredom. Possibilities for learning are greatly reduced. Often the participant is judgmental or dismisses the text altogether.

3- **Testing the water** - Some two or three general comments about the text to let people know s/he has read it. The participant is beginning to get their proverbial toes wet.

4- **Collecting** - Listing many observations and quotes from the text without analyzing them. The participant is still struggling a bit with being overpowered by the material, but what is important is that s/he is struggling with it.

5- **Engaging** - This signals real reading. In seminar it is usually accompanied by an emotional as well as an intellectual response to the material. At this level, participants are generally enthusiastic. Among the various responses possible: discussing the position and biases of the author: seeking to define terms (both the author's and the discussants'); seeking to make meaning out of the quotes; asking questions; answering questions about the quotes; asking questions; answering questions about the text posed by the group; clarifying each other's positions. This level indicates a strategy of learning.

6- **Understanding** - At this level, participants are structuring and integrating the material through association with personal experience (here, personal experience illuminates rather than dominates the text) and with other literature.

7- **Discriminating** - This level is the level of "critical" appreciation. The participant has fully understood the material from a number of perspectives and now makes a conscious evaluation or judgment about it.

YOUR NAME: _____ CLASS SESSION: _____

Which category above best matches your participation in today's class	Please briefly provide your rationale and share any observations you might have about your level of participation in today's session