

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF COMMUNITY AND FAMILY HEALTH

COURSE NUMBER: PHC 7905-001
DATES: Aug. 28 - Dec. 11, 2007
DAY & TIME: Tuesdays, 2:00-4:50pm
ROOM: CFH Conference Room (LRC 221)
INSTRUCTOR: Dr. Jeannine Coreil
OFFICE HOURS: Mon. 10:00-12:00; Wed. 1:00-3:00

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course explores the theoretical and philosophical components which constitute the foundation for the study of community and family health. It is specifically designed for beginning public health doctoral students specializing in community and family health to encourage scholarly discourse of pertinent concepts, theories, and paradigms and the critical analysis of related scholarly works. The format of the course is a seminar requiring significant reading, discussion, oral presentation, critical analysis and original writing.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Analyze the components of concepts, theories, models, and frameworks pertinent to community and family health.
2. Discuss various philosophies and paradigms related to research, building knowledge, and public health practice.
3. Analyze the theoretical justification of selected research in community and family health.
4. Relate the historical foundations of public health to present day study of community and family health.
5. Develop competency in using theory to inform public health research and practice.

6. Provide a theoretical grounding for designing a doctoral dissertation project.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

- I. All students are expected to be ready and actively participate in class activities as demonstrated by regular attendance, interacting with others in class, and by being prepared to discuss the current topic and readings. Students should inform the instructor in advance of absences when possible. If more than 2 classes are missed, make-up work will be required in order to avoid loss of points for class participation.

The evaluation of class participation is at the sole discretion of the instructor. Evaluation criteria will include: (1) preparation for class discussion; (2) making an effort to contribute to all aspects of in-class activities; (3) demonstrating sensitivity to a balanced allocation of time for all members to participate; and (4) quality of oral contributions reflecting depth of understanding, critical thinking, synthesis of ideas and creative intellectual thought. The instructor will provide each student with written feedback at mid semester as to the status of their class participation. **20 points**

- II. Perform a concept analysis using the concept evaluation criteria presented in Morse, Hupcey & Tason (1996). A practice concept analysis will be done in class. This assignment is worth **5 points**.
- III. Critique two research articles that utilize a theoretical framework. The critique criteria are included in the course Resource Packet. (The Resource Packet will be distributed on the first day of class). The first critique is worth **5 points**, the second one is worth **10 points**.
- IV. Investigation of a theory, framework or model that is useful in furthering the knowledge base of community and family health. Each student will be required to write a paper (**25 points**) using the specified criteria (see Resource Packet) and to make a presentation to classmates (**10 points**).
- V. In-class comprehensive final exam in the format of short answer and short essay questions (**25 points**). Sample exams, grading key and study guide from previous class included in Resource Packet.
- VI. All papers are to use APA style guidelines. A portion of grades for each paper is dedicated to appropriate format and scholarly writing style.

- VII. You are expected to give a copy of all your written work to your major advisor. I will circulate your final papers with my comments to your advisors and ask them to discuss them with you.
- VIII. No student shall be compelled to attend class at a day or time prohibited by his or her religious belief. In accordance with the University policy on observance of religious holy day, students are expected to notify their instructor if they intend to be absent for a class prior to the scheduled meeting.

Summary of Grading

Grading Scale

Class participation	20	97-100 = A+	74-76 = C
Concept analysis	5	94-96 = A	70-73 = C-
Article critiques (5,10)	15	90-93 = A-	67-69 = D+
Theory paper	35	87-89 = B+	64-66 = D
- class presentation (10)		84-86 = B	60-63 = D-
- writer paper (25)		80-83 = B-	<60 = F
Final exam	20	77-79 = C+	
Total	100 points		

Required textbooks

Provided by the department:

Dyson, Simon & Brian Borwn. Social Theory and Applied Health Research. New York:Open University Press, 2006.

Available from HSC Bookstore:

Slife, B.D. & R.N. Williams. What’s Behind the Research? Discovering Hidden Assumptions in the Behavioral Sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage, 1995.

Online Resource

Glanz, K. & B. K. Rimer. Theory at a Glance: A Guide for Health Promotion Practice. NIH/NCI, 1995. <http://www.nci.nih.gov/cancerinformation/theory-at-a-glance/page1>

Supplementary Readings

Packet available from the COPH Copy Center.

Class Schedule

Aug. 28

Introduction to course; Exploring our preconceptions about theory

Sept. 4

Philosophical foundations of theory - I

Sep. 11

Philosophical foundations of theory – II (Ann Abbott)

Concept development

Sep. 18

Theory in public health - I

Guest presentation: Ms. Sharon DeJoy (doctoral student)

Turn in concept analysis

Sept 25

Theory in public health - II

Oct. 2

Theoretical traditions in the behavioral sciences

Oct. 9

Science and human behavior

Oct. 16

Theoretical bases of community & family health: health education and promotion

Guest lecture: Dr. Eric Buhi

Turn in written critique of first research article

Oct. 23

Theoretical bases of community and family health: sociological theories

Oct. 30

Theoretical bases of community and family health: social psychological

Guest lecture: Dr. Stephanie Marhefka

Nov. 6

Theoretical bases of community and family health: anthropological theories

Turn in written critiques of second research article

Nov. 13

Critical, feminist and post-modern perspectives in public health

Nov. 20

Thanksgiving – no class

Nov. 27

Student presentation of theory analysis

Dec. 4

Student presentation of theory analysis

Dec. 11

Final exam

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF COMMUNITY AND FAMILY HEALTH

Reading and Other Assignments

Aug. 28

Introduction to Course
Exploring our preconceptions about theory

Sept. 4

Philosophical foundations of theory – I

Dyson and Brown, Chaps. 1-3

Sep. 11

Philosophical foundations of theory – II
Concept development

Dyson and Brown, Chaps. 4-6

Morse, J.M, Mitcham, C., Hupcey, J.E. & Tason, M.C. Criteria for concept evaluation. Journal of Advanced Nursing 24(2):385-390, 1996.

Sept. 18

Theory in public health - I

Cassel, John. Social science theory as a source of hypotheses in epidemiological research. American Journal of Public Health 54(9):1482-1488, 1964.

Coreil, Jeannine (forthcoming, 2008). Social Science Contributions to Public Health. In Heggenhougen, K., ed., International Encyclopedia of Public Health. London:Oxford.

Earls, Felton and Mary Carlson, The social ecology of child health and well-being. Annual Review of Public Health 22:143-66, 2001.

Krieger, Nancy. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective. International Journal of Epidemiology 30:668-677, 2001.

Concept analysis due.

Sept. 25

Theory in public health – II

Criteria for evaluating theory

Van Ryn, Michelle and Heaney, Catherine A. (1992). What's the use of theory? Health Education Quarterly 19(3):315-330.

Potvin, Louise, Sylvie Gendron, Angèle Bilodeau and Patrick Chabot. Integrating social theory into public health practice. American Journal of Public Health 95(4):591-5, 2005.

Marriner Tomey, Ann. Chapters 1-3. Nursing Theorists and Their Work. 4th ed. St. Louis: Mosby, 1998, pp. 3-34.

Tzeng, Oliver C.S. and J. W. Jackson. Common methodological framework for theory construction and evaluation in the social and behavioral sciences. Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs.

Oct. 2

Theoretical traditions in the behavioral sciences
Slife and Williams, Chaps. 1-3

Oct. 9

Science and human behavior

Slife and Williams, Chaps. 4-7.

117:49-76, 1991.

Oct. 16

Theoretical bases of community and family health:
Health education and promotion

Bartholomew, L. Kay, Parcel, Guy S., Kok, Gerjo & Gottlieb, Nell H. Theories in health education and promotion. Chapter 4 in Intervention Mapping: Designing Theory-and Evidence-Based Health Promotion Programs. London: Mayfield, 2001, pp. 74-129.

Fishbein M, Triandis HC, Kanfer FH, Becker M, Middlestadt SE, Eichler A. Factors influencing behavior and behavior change. In: A. Baum, TA Revenson, & J. E. Singer, eds. Handbook of Health Psychology. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2001. p. 3-17.

Wingood, Gina M. & Ralph J. DiClemente (2002). The theory of gender and power: a social structural theory for guiding public health interventions. In DiClemente, RJ,

Crosby, RA, & Kegler, MC, eds. *Emerging Theories in Health Promotion Practice and Research: Strategies for Improving Public Health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 313-346.

Turn in written critiques of first research article

Oct. 23

Theoretical bases of community and family health:
Sociological theories

Link, B.G. and J. Phelan. Social conditions as fundamental causes of disease. Journal of Health and Social Behavior. (Extra Issue):80-94, 1995.

Brown, P. Naming and framing: the social construction of diagnosis and illness. Journal of Health and Social Behavior (Extra Issue):34-52, 1995.

Berkman, Lisa F., Thomas Glass, Ian Brissette, & Teresa E. Seeman. From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. Social Science & Medicine 51:843-57, 2000.

Frankish, C. James and Lawrence W. Green. Organizational and community change as the social scientific basis for disease prevention and health promotion policy. Advances in Medical Sociology 4:209-233, 1994.

Oct. 30

Theoretical bases of community and family health:
social psychological

Thoits, P.A. Stress, coping, and social support processes: where are we? what next? Journal of Health and Social Behavior (Extra Issue):53-79, 1995.

Emerson, Richard M. Social exchange theory. In Rosenberg, Morris and Ralph H. Turner. Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives. Transaction Publishers, 1990, pp. 30-65.

Contrada, Richard J. & Elliot J. Coups (2003). Personality and self-regulation in health and disease: Toward an integrative perspective. In Cameron, Linda D. & Howard Levanthal, eds. The Self-regulation of Health and Illness Behavior. London: Routledge, pp. 66-94.

Ewert, Craig K. Social action theory for a public health psychology. American Psychologist 46(9):931-946.

November 6

Theoretical bases of community and family health:
Anthropological theories

Turn in written critiques of second research article

Townsend, P.K. and A. McElroy. Toward an ecology of women's reproductive health. Medical Anthropology 14:9-34, 1992.

Baer, Hans A. The misconstruction of critical medical anthropology: a response to a cultural constructivist critique. Social Science & Medicine 44(10):1565-1573, 1997.

Dressler, W. W. and J. R. Bindon. The health consequences of cultural consonance: cultural dimensions of lifestyle, social support, and arterial blood pressure in an African American community. American Anthropologist 102(2):244-260, 2000.

Weiss, M. G. Cultural epidemiology: an introduction and overview. Anthropology & Medicine 8(1):5-29, 2001.

Nov. 13

Critical, feminist and post-modern perspectives in public health

Armstrong, David. Public health spaces and the fabrication of identity. Sociology 27(3):393-410, 1993.

Lantz, Paula M. & Karen M. Booth, The social construction of the breast cancer epidemic. Social Science & Medicine 46(7):907-918, 1998.

Loseke, Donileen R. Lived realities and formula stories of "battered women." In Gubrium, Jaber F. & Holstein, James A., eds. Institutional Selves: Troubled Identities in a Postmodern World. New York:Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 107-127.

Saulnier, Christine Flynn. Feminist Theories and Social Work: Approaches and Applications. New York:Haworth, 1996, Introduction, Chap. 1, Chap. 2, Conclusion.

Nov. 20

Thanksgiving – no class

Nov. 27

Student presentations of theory analysis

Dec. 4

Student presentations of theory analysis

Dec. 11

Final exam

SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS

Sept. 18	Concept analysis
Oct. 16	1st critique of research article
Nov. 6	2nd critique of research article
Nov. 27	Theory analysis presentation
Dec. 4	Theory analysis presentation
Dec. 11	Final exam

Course Policy on Plagiarism

The university and instructor reserve the right to submit any course work to an electronic plagiarism detection program such as turnitin.com.

Academic Dishonesty And Disruption Of Academic Process

Source: USF 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog - Pages 47 - 49

Students attending USF are awarded degrees in recognition of successful completion of coursework in their chosen fields of study. Each individual is expected to earn his/her degree on the basis of personal effort. Consequently, any form of cheating on examinations or plagiarism on assigned papers constitutes unacceptable deceit and dishonesty. Disruption of the classroom or teaching environment is also unacceptable. This cannot be tolerated in the University community and will be punishable, according to the seriousness of the offense, in conformity with this rule.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as "literary theft" and consists of the unattributed quotation of the exact words of a published text, or the unattributed borrowing of original ideas by paraphrase from a published text. On written papers for which the student employs information gathered from books, articles, web sites, or oral sources, each direct quotation, as well as ideas and facts that are not generally known to the public at large, or the form, structure, or style of a secondary source must be attributed to its author by means of the appropriate citation procedure. Only widely known facts and first-hand thoughts and observations original to the student do not require citations. Citations may be made in footnotes or within the body of the text. Plagiarism also consists of passing off as one's own segments or the total of another person's work.

1.Examples of proper citation (footnote format) are as follows [Footnoting/citation styles will depend upon those used by different academic disciplines. Many disciplines in the Natural Science areas, for example, will cite the sources within the body of the text.]

a."Plagiarism, from a Latin word meaning 'kidnapping,' ranges from inept paraphrasing to outright theft."

1[Direct quotation] 1Harry Shaw, Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms (McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. 209-210.

b.As Harry Shaw states in his Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms, "Plagiarism, from a Latin word meaning 'kidnapping,' ranges from inept paraphrasing to outright theft." 1[Direct quotation with an introductory statement citing the source.] 1(McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. 209-210.

c.Plagiarism is literary theft. To emphasize that point, Harry Shaw states that the root of the word comes from the Latin word meaning "kidnapping." 1[Paraphrasing] 1Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms (McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. 209-210.

d.In defining plagiarism, "Strategies for Teaching with Online Tools" suggests that visibility makes intellectual theft less probable. 1[Paraphrasing a Web site]

1<http://bedfordstmartins.com/technotes/hccworkshop/plagiarism.htm>

2.Examples of proper citation (in body of text):

a.Shaw (1972) states that the root of the word comes from the Latin word meaning "kidnapping." [Paraphrasing; complete information about source will be cited in a section at the close of the text.]

b.Shaw (1972) was correct when he stated that "plagiarism, from a Latin word meaning 'kidnapping,' ranges from inept paraphrasing to outright theft." [Quotation; complete information about source will be cited in a section at the close of the text.]

c. Plagiarism.org suggests that a searchable database of papers might assuage what Shaw called a “kidnapping” of intellectual content. [Paraphrasing of a Web site; the complete information on the Web site will appear in the works cited section.]

3. The following are examples of plagiarism because sources are not cited and appropriate quotation marks are not used:

a. Plagiarism, from a Latin word meaning “kidnapping,” ranges from inept paraphrasing to outright theft.

b. Plagiarism comes from a Latin word meaning “kidnapping” and ranges from paraphrasing to theft.

c. Plagiarism ranges from inept paraphrasing to outright theft.

d. Visibility online makes plagiarism much more difficult for the would-be thief.

Punishment Guidelines for Plagiarism:

The student who submitted the subject paper, lab report, etc., shall receive an “F” with a numerical value of zero on the item submitted, and the “F” shall be used to determine the final course grade. It is the option of the instructor to assign the student a grade of F or FF (the latter indicating dishonesty) in the course.

Cheating

Cheating is defined as follows: (a) the unauthorized granting or receiving of aid during the prescribed period of a course-graded exercise: students may not consult written materials such as notes or books, may not look at the paper of another student, nor consult orally with any other student taking the same test; (b) asking another person to take an examination in his/her place; (c) taking an examination for or in place of another student; (d) stealing visual concepts, such as drawings, sketches, diagrams, musical programs and scores, graphs, maps, etc., and presenting them as one’s own; (e) stealing, borrowing, buying, or disseminating tests, answer keys or other examination material except as officially authorized, research papers, creative papers, speeches, other graded assignments, etc. (f) Stealing or copying of computer programs and presenting them as one’s own. Such stealing includes the use of another student’s program, as obtained from the magnetic media or interactive terminals or from cards, print-out paper, etc.

Punishment Guidelines for Academic Dishonesty:

Punishments for academic dishonesty will depend on the seriousness of the offense and may include assignment of an “F” or a numerical value of zero on the subject paper, lab report, etc., an “F” or an “FF” grade (the latter indicating academic dishonesty) in the course, suspension or expulsion from the University. A student who receives an “FF” grade may not use the university’s Grade Forgiveness Policy if the course is subsequently repeated. An “FF” grade assigned to indicated academic dishonesty is reflected only on internal records and prevents the student from repeating the course using the Grade Forgiveness Policy. If a student who has been accused of academic dishonesty drops the course, the student’s registration in the course will be reinstated until the issue is resolved. Notice that a student has been dismissed for reasons of academic dishonesty may be reflected on the student’s transcript with the formal notation: Dismissed for Academic Dishonesty.

a. For observation of or exchanging test information with other students during the course of a classroom test, the students who receive or give such information may receive an “F” with a numerical value of zero on the test, and the “F” shall be used to determine the final course grade. It is the option of the instructor to fail the student in the course.

b. For the use of any prohibited device, such as a cheat sheet, recording, calculator if forbidden on exam, etc., during the course of a classroom test to assist the student or other students, the student

using such prohibited device may receive an "F" in the course.

c. For the use of another student, a stand-in, to take an examination for the enrolled student, it is suggested that the enrolled student receive an "F" in the course and be suspended from school for one year and that the stand-in, if a University student, be suspended from school for one year.

d. For stealing, borrowing, or buying of research papers, creative works, speeches or tests and other exam materials, or other graded assignments, or the dissemination of such materials, or the manipulation of recorded grades in a grade book or other class records, the student, if enrolled in the course, may receive an "F" in the course and may be expelled from the University.

e. It is suggested that students who receive or give stolen computer programs receive an "F" with a numerical value of zero on the program or programs, and the "F" be used to determine the final course grade. It is the option of the instructor to fail the student in the course.

Disruption of Academic Process

Disruption of academic process is defined as the act or words of a student in a classroom or teaching environment which in the reasonable estimation of a faculty member: (a) directs attention from the academic matters at hand, such as noisy distractions; persistent, disrespectful or abusive interruptions of lecture, exam or academic discussions, or (b) presents a danger to the health, safety or well being of the faculty member or students.

Punishment Guidelines for Disruption of Academic Process:

Punishments for disruption of academic process will depend on the seriousness of the disruption and will range from a private verbal reprimand to dismissal from class with a final grade of "W," if the student is passing the course, shown on the student record. If the student is not passing, a grade of "F" will be shown on the student record. Particularly serious instances of disruption or the academic process may result in suspension or permanent expulsion from the University.

Procedures for Handling Student Violations Involving Alleged Academic Dishonesty And Disruption Of Academic Process

Alleged violations of academic dishonesty or alleged disruptions of academic process will be handled initially by the instructor, who will discuss the incident with the student. It must be noted that the Faculty Senate considers the traditional relationship between student and faculty member as the primary means of settling disputes that may arise. If the instructor observes the alleged dishonesty occurring during an examination, he/she should, with discretion, notify the student of the fact before the student leaves the examination. In all cases, the instructor must attempt to schedule a meeting with the student to discuss the alleged dishonesty or disruptions.

After the discussion, if the student and instructor have reached a mutual agreement as to the solution, the instructor shall file a statement with the chairperson of the department or equivalent, e.g. campus dean, responsible for the course outlining the facts of the incident and the agreed-upon solution signed by both the instructor and student. A copy of this statement shall be given to the student. If no solution is reached, the matter should be referred to the chairperson of the department or the equivalent, e.g. campus dean, for attempt at resolution. If no resolution is reached, the matter should be referred to the dean of the college for attempt at resolution. If no solution is reached, the dean shall appoint a student/faculty committee consisting of an equal number of students and faculty to hear the two sides of the incident and to advise the dean regarding the disposition of the case.

Academic Committee Pre-Hearing Procedure. Within a reasonable time following the failure of the student/instructor/dean meetings to bring about a solution, and in no event later than three (3) months after such failure, the dean shall cause formal charges to be filed with the appointed

academic committee. The charged student shall be provided a written notice of charges, in sufficient detail to prepare for the hearing, no less than three (3) days before the hearing, except in cases of emergency as specified below.

Hearings

Emergency Hearings. An expedited emergency hearing may be held before an academic administrator appointed by the dean or by the appointed academic committee in cases which involve the safety, health or welfare of any student or staff member.

Non-Emergency Hearings. Non-emergency hearings are held before the Academic Committee.

General Principles for Non-Emergency Hearings

Burden of Proof. The burden of proof shall be on the complainant. The standard of proof for decision shall be "substantial evidence," that is, whether it is reasonable to conclude from the evidence submitted that the student did commit the violations for which he/she has been charged and shall not be the strict criminal law standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Record. The proceedings of all hearings shall be recorded.

Inspection of Evidence. The student may inspect the evidence that will be presented against him/her.

Present Evidence. The student may present evidence on his/her own behalf.

Question Witnesses. The student may hear and question adverse witnesses.

Self-Incrimination. The student shall not be forced to present testimony that would be self-incriminating.

Advisor. The student may have an advisor of his/her choice present; however, the role of such a person is as an advisor to the student only. The advisor may speak to and consult with the student but may not serve as the student's advocate, question witnesses or otherwise participate in the proceedings.

Decision Based on Evidence. The decision of the academic committee or appointed academic administrator shall be based solely on the evidence presented at the hearing.

Decision in Writing. The decision of the academic committee or appointed academic administrator, including findings of fact and a determination of penalty or sanction if any, shall be presented to the student in writing within a reasonable period of time following the hearing.

Enrollment Status. The student's enrollment status will remain unchanged pending final decision, except in cases of emergency, as described above. If the issue remains open at the end of the semester, the instructor shall give the student an "I" grade in the course until all issues are resolved.

Closed Hearings. All hearings shall be closed unless specifically requested otherwise in writing by the charged student prior to the hearing.

Failure to Appear. If a student against whom charges have been made fails to appear, the academic committee or academic administrator may proceed in his/her absence.

Hearing on Appeal. The charged student may appeal the decision of the academic committee or appointed academic administrator within thirty (30) working days of decision to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Dean of Graduate Studies, whichever is appropriate. The record of the initial hearing may be considered on appeal and the student is entitled to access the record when appealing. The decision of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Dean of Graduate Studies is final.