

## A Comparative Web-Based Learning Activity for Teaching Family Theory

Daniel Perlman  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

### Author Note

I wish to thank Kimberly Kappler Hewitt, a University of North Carolina at Greensboro University (UNCG) Teaching and Learning Center Fellow for Teaching with Technology and Online Learning, who advised me on enhancing aspects of this assignment; Claire Wood, who did the lead writing on a related paper, thereby pointing me to several sources this report cites; Pam Howe and Jane Harris, my School's Instructional Technology Consultants, who continuously assist me in course delivery.

The author is happy to share detailed materials pertaining to the key assignment and the two secondary assignments discussed in this paper with interested readers.

**ABSTRACT.** This article describes a web-based comparative analysis assignment for a Human Development and Family Science theories course. Students worked in small groups, each of which studied one theoretical perspective. Then, groups used their theories to do VoiceThread-narrated analyses of child abuse cases. After presentation of VoiceThread to other groups in class, online discussion ensued; finally, students answered comparative and evaluative questions about the set of theories. This paper presents information on the assignment's pedagogical underpinnings and its technological systems, along with step-by-step description and information about students. The paper concludes with evaluative data on the assignment and recommendations for future use. Students gave the assignment a good overall rating. The assignment appears to have fostered higher order learning objectives relevant to Bloom's taxonomy and is generalizable to other courses with multiple perspective or choices among alternatives.

*Keywords:* family theory, comparative analysis, VoiceThread, blended learning

---

Direct correspondence to Daniel Perlman at [d\\_perlma@uncg.edu](mailto:d_perlma@uncg.edu).

### **A Comparative, Web-Based Learning Activity for Teaching Family Theory**

In their *Handbook of Family Theories* Fine and Fincham (2013) distinguish between theory of the week and content-based teaching approaches. The theory of the week approach typically involves presenting one theory per week. In a typical semester, such a course presents 13 to 15 theories. Students read chapters from textbooks, such as those by Smith and Hamon (2012) or by White, Klein, and Martin (2014), which cover major theoretical positions. These chapters often describe assumptions of theories, their concepts and propositions, illustrative research, strengths and weaknesses, et al. The content-based approach, which Fine and Fincham use for organizing their book, focuses on key content areas in family sciences and brings multiple theoretical viewpoints to bear on each topic (cf. Bengtson, Acock, Allen, Dilworth-Anderson, & Klein, 2005). As Fine and Fincham's volume shows, there are several advantages of the content-based approach: (a) it allows coverage of larger numbers of theoretical perspectives does than the traditional approach, (b) it shows linkages between theory and research more fully, and (c) it tends to deal with more focused and more contemporary theories than does the traditional approach. To my knowledge, however, no undergraduate theory texts for family science or human development employ the content-based approach.

In a theory course, I use a mixture of the traditional approach and a variant of the Fine and Fincham (2013) content-based approach, which I call the *comparative analysis approach*. Similar to Fine and Fincham's content-based approach, the comparative analysis approach has students use multiple theoretical lenses for considering specific topics. Where it differs (in degree but not totally in kind) from Fine and Fincham's content-based approach is that comparative analysis places less emphasis on showing how theory grounds research and more emphasis on fostering students' abilities to begin mastering and using various theoretical lenses actively.

The basic structure of my comparative analysis assignment is simple. First, I assign students to groups and have each group take a different theoretical perspective. All members of each group read the same theoretical article (each group has a different article to read). Next, members of each group work together to (a) deepen their understanding of the theory, (b) analyze a case (i.e., all groups analyze the same case), and (c) develop a narrated presentation analyzing the case from their theoretical perspective. All members of the class watch the other groups' presentations; there is interaction among groups about their presentations. Finally, students write individual reflections on different theories and complete surveys evaluating their peers' presentations and the assignment. Described in more detail later in this article, these steps are somewhat akin to what Moore (2015) has students do when learning the theory component in a family resource management course.

### **Pedagogical Underpinnings: Comparative Analysis Approach**

The comparative analysis approach has multiple pedagogical underpinnings including Bloom's (1956) classic cognitive learning objectives, Chickering and Gamson's (1987) highly regarded principles of good educational practice, and pedagogical literature on collaborative

learning. The example of the comparative analysis approach this paper describes is also grounded in discussions of online and blended (also known as *hybrid*) learning, VoiceThread, and peer evaluations. These strands of influence are largely complementary in suggesting that students should take active, intellectual roles in learning.

### **Bloom's Taxonomy**

Bloom (1956) identified six objectives: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. In the comparative theory analysis activity, learning the theory's key concepts and ideas would fall under Bloom's knowledge objective. Comprehension would involve understanding the theory and being able to explain it to others. Application involves using acquired knowledge in particular and concrete situations etc.; in the comparative analysis example, it involved using the theory to analyze the case. In part, synthesis involves putting pieces together to form a whole. Concisely explaining a theoretical position to another person requires this skill. Analysis involves activities such as comparison; a major objective of the comparative analysis approach is to help students see similarities and differences between theoretical approaches. Evaluation involves making and justifying evaluations of the quality of things. In the comparative analysis approach, I pose questions to students to get them to engage in comparison and evaluation.

### **Chickering and Gamson's Principles**

Chickering and Gamson's (1987) principles of good practice include (a) developing reciprocity and cooperation among students, (b) using active learning techniques, (c) providing prompt feedback, (d) communicating high expectations, and (e) respecting diverse talents and ways of learning. In line with these principles, I designed the comparative analysis activities to have students

- cooperate by working in teams;
- engage in active learning by teaching others;
- provide feedback by commenting on one another's presentations;
- strive for high standards by my setting challenging tasks for them;
- engage in diverse forms of learning (e.g., by educating others, employing technology to prepare and narrate slides, and not having regularly scheduled classes).

### **Collaborative Learning**

Apropos of Chickering and Gamson's (1987) principle of developing cooperation among students, there is a large body of literature on collaborative learning. Reviewing this literature, Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1998) concluded that cooperative learning fosters students' academic achievement via "meta-cognitive thought, willingness to take on difficult tasks, persistence (despite difficulties) in working toward goal accomplishment, intrinsic motivation,

transfer of learning from one situation to another, and greater time on task” (p. 31). Cooperative learning can also benefit students in terms of peer relations and personal adjustment.

### **Blended Learning**

The illustrative comparative analysis activity I describe was conducted as a blended (i.e., asynchronous, online) component of a predominantly face-to-face course. Although it showed signs of slowing (circa 2014), online delivery has been rapidly growing as a segment of higher education (i.e., during the period 2003-2014; Horn, 2015) and is now the focus of a considerable body of literature that articulates good practice and evaluates outcomes. Bele and Rugelj (2007) trumpeted blended learning as the “best of both worlds,” finding that 71 per cent of their participants preferred blended learning to traditional delivery and that 17 percent preferred traditional. A meta-analysis comparing traditional, blended, and exclusively online courses reached a similar conclusion, that blended courses are superior (Means, Toyama, Murphy, & Baki, 2013). Similarly, a nother recent meta-analysis that builds on earlier meta-analyses paints a positive picture of blended delivery (Bernard, Borokhovski, Schmid, Tamim, & Abrami, 2014). In comparison to traditional classes, Bernard et al. found that courses incorporating blended delivery had modestly higher (13%) outcomes in terms of academic achievement. In both meta-analyses, the advantage of non-traditional delivery was greater when it involved interaction among students. The comparative analysis approach described below involved student-to-student interaction.

### **VoiceThread**

In the example of comparative analysis this report features, I supported students in using VoiceThread, a free Web 2.0 tool, as a system for presenting their analyses. Akin to narrated PowerPoints, VoiceThread allows users to present a series of slides accompanied by narration. Photos, videos, and other materials can also be incorporated into VoiceThreads. VoiceThread offers four advantages over PowerPoint: (a) it uses a universal format that is easily accessible via an internet connection, (b) it does not require software downloads, (c) it functions equally well on today’s two main computer operating systems (Windows, Apple), and (d) it avoids problems with large-sized files often encountered when one uses narrated PowerPoints.

Available opinion and evidence points to VoiceThread’s success as an educational tool. Brunvand and Byrd (2011) have championed VoiceThread as a technique for helping students with diverse learning skills/styles and as a means to enhancing motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes. Orlando and Orlando (2010) observed that the way they used VoiceThread helped students who are usually quiet students to express their opinions. They also mentioned an art instructor whose use of VoiceThread helped build relationships and a sense of community in her class. McCormack (2010) conducted semi-structured interviews with early childhood education students training to be teachers. She found that for these students, VoiceThread had advantages in terms of motivation, reflecting, and higher-order thinking. In a small scale study involving eight interviewees, respondents in Chan and Pallapu (2012) said they found that using VoiceThread was easy and that they would recommend employing it again. When asked about

how well the use of VoiceThread fulfilled Chickering and Gamson's Principles of Good Practice, a majority of these students felt that VoiceThread fulfilled each principle.

### **Peer Feedback**

Consistent with Chickering and Gamson's (1997) principle of providing prompt feedback, students gave feedback to one another on their VoiceThreads shortly after the VoiceThreads were posted. Later, students made evaluative judgments of the VoiceThreads; as the instructor, I had sole access to these evaluations. In a review of studies of peer feedback, Topping (1998) concluded that giving and receiving formative feedback benefits students by increasing their motivation and personal responsibility for projects, encouraging active learning, and fostering development of the ability to negotiate constructive criticism. Peer feedback and evaluation encourages learning through having students assume the role of assessor: evaluating peer work encourages the evaluator to distinguish the good from the bad. In turn, this helps the evaluator do better work. Most studies (70%) show that peer evaluations have reasonable reliability and validity (Topping, 2009). This is another aspect of comparative analysis activity that is consistent with Chickering and Gamson's (1997) principles (e.g., pertinent to active learning and critical thinking).

### **The Web-based Comparative Analysis Assignment**

In presenting the comparative analysis activity, I indicate the student population with which I am using the assignment, identify technological systems that are involved, and describe the assignment chronologically in terms of steps involved. Two of the preliminary steps are (a) forming students into groups and (b) spending a few minutes in class to announce the assignment and to answer questions students might have. All main aspects of the assignment can be done in a week's time, during which face-to-face classes are cancelled. However, a week and a half's time—skipping a class, having a class, and skipping a class—is a more comfortable schedule. Using a weeklong schedule, groups post their narrated VoiceThreads on Tuesday, post comments on or before Thursday, post responses by Friday evening, and submit reflections and take a survey by Sunday.

### **Student Population**

The course in which I am using this assignment is a fourth year seminar. Because it is designated as a writing intensive course, the class size is typically limited to 25 students who can be divided into 4-6 groups. Only Human Development and Family Science majors take the course; most but not all of the students are women.

The course is offered at a comprehensive public university in the Southeast that enrolls approximately 17,700 students; more than 80 per cent of these students are undergraduates. In the Carnegie rating system, the university has the status of a high research activity institution. There is an emphasis on community-engaged scholarship. The university is the most racially and ethnically diverse in the state's 17 university system: major subgroups are Whites, 57%; African-Americans, 25%; Hispanic/Latina/os, 6%; Asian Americans, 4%. Many students are members of

the first generations in their families to attend college. Although roughly 80 per cent of first-year students live in university residences, that percentage is much lower by their fourth years. Many students work or are in internship positions and have complex schedules.

### Technological Systems

For doing the web-based version of this assignment as described here, students need to use electronic devices (e.g., computers, smartphones, tablets), VoiceThread, and the course Learning Management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, Desire2Learn). I use the Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness (CATME) system to establish groups.

**VoiceThread.** VoiceThread can be integrated with major Learning Management systems (<https://voicethread.com/howto/instructor-guide-for-learning-management-system-integration-tti/>) or used separately. Students who do not have VoiceThread accounts can obtain one at <https://voicethread.com/register/>. VoiceThread is relatively intuitive and easy to use. Within VoiceThread, students can access tutorials and help screens. There are several web pages and YouTube videos on how to use VoiceThread. Since VoiceThread does periodic updates, materials pertinent to the current version (2014, at present) are the most helpful. Once students have accounts, basic steps in using VoiceThread are (a) having material to be used (e.g., PowerPoint slides, PDFs, videos, digital photos), (b) uploading them into VoiceThread, (c) narrating them, (d) saving them, (e) making them available (sharing) and (f) providing information (i.e., a link) on where they are shared with others. When creating VoiceThreads, one can move slides around, delete them, and more; while doing narration, one can stop and restart, erase, etc. One can also come back to their work later and edit VoiceThreads. Users can also do narration via multiple devices (e.g., a headset, a webcam, or phone). A problem that can arise is poor sound quality of narration. Students should listen to their narration to ensure it is clearly audible. Using a headset with a microphone is advisable, if one is available.

**The Learning Management System.** In terms of the Learning Management System, this assignment can be set up in most major systems. Currently I use Canvas. With Canvas, I put class members into groups and create a discussion board for each group. Each group posts the link to their VoiceThread on that discussion board and members of other groups post comments about the presentation on the discussion board of the group that created the VoiceThread. The creators of the VoiceThread also respond to comments (i.e., on the discussion board of the person or group that made the comment). Exchange of views could occur via emails, but communicating within a discussion board system is preferable because all relevant parties including the instructor can easily access these exchanges. At the end of the assignment, students receive a set of questions to address; these questions are about theories presented via VoiceThreads. Students also take a short survey about the assignment. These activities are set up as a quiz and as a survey in Canvas.

**CATME.** When classes start at the beginning of the semester, I assign students to small groups, typically with five students for each group. Although sometimes I reconstitute groups for some activities, students do several activities during the semester with their group members.

Various procedures are possible for forming groups (e.g., haphazard assignment, systematic assignment to achieve some criteria such as equivalence in average GPAs, letting students select). I use the CATME system (<https://www.catme.org/>) that was developed with National Science Foundation funding. CATME includes Team-Maker, a web-based software survey tool that allows faculty members to create teams based on instructor-specified criteria (Layton, Loughry, Ohland, & Ricco, 2010). I specify that I want groups in which members have times when they can meet, have balance in terms of students' races and ethnicities, and have some members who enjoy leadership roles and others who are happy with others serving as leaders. Since students at my university have difficulty finding convenient meeting times, I make complementary schedules an important factor.

### Steps in the Assignment

**Reading a theoretical article.** Students' first task is to read an article. All members of a given group read the same article. As the instructor, I need to find multiple articles, one for each group in a class with four to six groups. I seek articles or chapters that mostly present a theoretical perspective. Articles that use a theory as the basis for doing research often present aspects of a theory, but I want articles whose prime purpose is to present theory per se. For comparative analysis of abuse, I have students learn about these perspectives: evolutionary (Lightcap, Kurland, & Burgess, 1982; Daly & Wilson, 1988), attachment (Crittenden & Ainsworth, 1989), cognitive behavioral (Azar & Weinzierl, 2005), stress and coping (Hillson & Kupier, 1994), ecological (Belsky, 1980), and transactional (Cicchetti & Lynch, 1993).

To encourage students to thoroughly read and fully comprehend their articles, I give them questions to consider. For the set of readings on abuse I have seven questions. One has to do with how the authors define abuse and what forms of abuse they address. A third has to do with steps based on specific theoretical perspectives that could be taken to reduce the odds of perpetrators acting abusively. A final questions pertains to the theory's prediction regarding the likelihood that the abused victim will grow up to be an abuse perpetrator.

**The narrated presentation.** After members of each group have read the case, they get together to prepare their group's 10-12 minute VoiceThread. In the VoiceThread, they must provide analysis of the case, working from the theoretical perspective they read. This involves giving general information about the theory and applying it to the case. The reading questions give ideas about types of issues the group might wish to address.

In this assignment, I use a case of approximately 500 words that describes a victim, Kenny, living with his mother and Sam, her boyfriend (see Appendix A). Sam inflicts injuries on Kenny such that Kenny's mother takes him to the hospital. Initially Kenny's mother says the injuries were due to an accident, but she admits the truth when the staff challenges her. The case describes some of Sam's views on child rearing and indicates that Kenny engaged in problematic behavior at home, but also says that these behaviors disappeared when Kenny was put in a foster home.

While the case gives some information, it also leaves other information to the reader's imagination. Where information is scarce or missing, I tell students they can speculate on what a theorist from their perspective might (a) look for or (b) believe might have occurred.

**Discussion.** For the discussion portion of this assignment, students receive relatively simple instructions.

Your group should formulate at least one comment/question about each of the other group's presentations. Put your remarks on their discussion board. You can work out who is drafting the comment to other groups. Your group as a whole only needs to write one comment to each of the other groups.

Your group should respond to all the comments you receive. Respond by putting your comments on the other group's discussion board. Again you only need one response to each incoming comment and you can decide how to divide the work.

**Reflective comments and survey.** Although individual students are not expected to comment on each of the other group's VoiceThreads, each student is expected to watch every group's VoiceThread. After the discussion period ends, students are required to write individual short reflection papers on the assignment's earlier parts. The six questions in the reflection paper, all of which are pertinent to the theories, are designed to be comparative and evaluative. In abbreviated form, sample questions are (a) Of the six different theories, which two do you see as most similar? [A parallel question asked "Which are least similar?]. Take one of the other group's theoretical perspectives and indicate (with an explanation) one or more criticisms a theorist from that perspective would likely level at your theory. What aspects of your theory make it a strong theory? Identify and explain why that is a strength.

The short survey asks evaluative questions about the presentation and the assignment. Regarding presentations, questions were: "Independent of what you thought of the various theories themselves ... Which two presentations do you rank most positively?" and "Which presentation do you rank least positively?" The survey also asks open-ended questions about the assignment itself: "What are the things you like most about this week's activities?" "What recommendations do you have for how this week's activities could be improved?" and two objective questions: "About how many hours did you spend this week on the online abuse activities?" and "Overall, how would you evaluate the contribution of this week's activities to the course?" (1 = Very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = fair, 4 = good and 5 = very good).

### **Student Evaluation of the Comparative Analysis Activity**

In the most recent (fall 2015) administration of this activity, students reported having spent an average of about 5 hours and 15 minutes (range 2 to 10 hours) doing all the aforementioned main steps in the assignment (see "Steps in the Assignment" above). One class member did not give a specific number of hours, but did write "A good [i.e., a lot] of time," with

additional comments suggesting that her group had challenges in coordinating effectively. Modal and median evaluation of the assignment's contribution to the course was four (good) on a one to five scale.

In terms of things class members liked, the case was the dominant theme that nearly two-fifths of respondents mentioned. For example, one student said, "What I enjoyed most of this week activities was analyzing the specific case study in order to relate it to our theory as it gave me a chance to apply the material." A substantial number of students mentioned no other theme, but three others were mentioned more than once. I labeled these as follows:

*Theory comparison* ("I liked comparing different theories. I believe that all play a role into Kenny's abuse. Having to evaluate other people's theory gave me a greater incite [sic] into why abuse occurs.").

*Presentations* ("I liked watching and commenting on everyone's presentations. It was interesting to see my classmates creativity come to light"), and

*Freedom and flexibility* ("I really enjoyed working outside of the classroom," "Being able to work at my own pace").

There was no dominant theme in terms of suggestions for improvement. About one of five students mentioned three themes. Two of these themes called for (a) clearer instructions and (b) more time. The third theme focused on problems that group members had when working together. For example, "Although you gave a hand out sheet and had instructions online... I was frustrated with my group. Overall the group was unprepared [when members got together]"

### **Discussion**

Overall, I have been pleased with this assignment. The task is a bit complex, but students generally find it to be a positive experience. Furthermore, I feel the assignment fosters achievement of Bloom's six learning objectives, including its higher order objectives of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

I see the basic idea of this assignment as being generalizable to other family science topics and to face-to-face classes. For instance, I also have an assignment in which students compare theories of aging. I do a similar class where students compare theories of sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research* had a very nice special issue (January 1998) presenting several theoretical approaches to sexuality. The special issue editor (Weis, 1998) asked each author to address the same set of 11 aspects of their theories, thus making comparison easier for students. More recently, Adamsons and Palkovitz (2014) had a collection of papers on fathering in the *Journal of Family Theory and Research* that would be a good nucleus for treatment of that topic. Fine and Fincham's book is another source with leads on finding clusters of theoretical articles on given topics.

In the past, I have conducted the abuse assignment in a single 75-minute face-to-face class without a case. This is still the way I conduct the sexuality and aging assignments. In this format, the focus is on explaining and comparing theories. Early in the semester, students find it especially challenging to understand the overall gestalt of a theoretical perspective. To scaffold student learning, I start with having all students who read about a particular theory discuss how to present its main ideas. Next, students go into groups in which everyone has read a different article and where each student presents her or his theory. Then I provide a few comparative questions that students discuss in small groups. I finish by having groups report on their answers to the questions to the whole class. This way of doing a comparative analysis works well. However, my course evaluation data show that students became more favorable to the abuse assignment when I switched it from being done without a case in a single face-to-face class, to a week's assignment with a case.

This approach is adaptable for uses beyond family science. Most of all, the approach could be useful for teaching theories in other social science domains (e.g., developmental science, psychology, and sociology). When I talked about the assignment with colleagues at my university, a faculty member in speech and audiology said she wanted to adapt it to having her students compare different types of hearing aids. Wherever there are multiple products or perspectives, adaptation of this assignment is likely to have potential.

As to recommendations for others wishing to use comparative analysis assignments, I have multiple suggestions. Some are specific to this example of comparison analysis. Others are more general. I would

- extend the abuse assignment across a week and a half, with a class in the middle;
- ideally, find ways of gradating the difficulty of the readings, starting with material that is easier for students to master, assuming I were doing more than one comparison assignment during the course;  
use case studies;
- be as clear as possible when giving instructions. In a companion educational innovation, Claire Wood and I (Wood & Perlman, 2015) found that two classes differed in their evaluations of a partner presentation assignment. Differences in evaluations could be explained largely by the fact that the class reacting more favorably to the assignment judged the instructions they received as more clear;
- continue to support group work as a key aspect of university teaching even though having students work in groups has pros and cons (e.g., members who do not do their share, difficulties meeting and coordinating; see Hansen, 2006). The trick is to make groups function smoothly (see Bacon, Stewart & Silver, 1999; Hansen, 2006);
- recommend experimenting with blended delivery. As noted earlier, students like this mode of delivery and it fares well in meta-analytic comparisons of learning outcomes resulting from traditional, blended, and exclusively online delivery. It also gives students

scheduling flexibility and can reduce commuting times. For faculty members who have not done online teaching, it provides a gradual entry into online delivery. Some universities use blended courses as a way to compensate for limited classroom space. In short, blended learning has advantages for all major stakeholders in post-secondary education.

### **Conclusion**

In closing, I want to emphasize that using the current version of the comparative abuse analysis assignment has made me consistently impressed with how well students do in providing theoretical analysis of the case. Perhaps this outcome is due partly to my giving the assignment late in the semester, after students become more familiar with theories. I also like to believe that the assignment structure contributes to this outcome. As one student said about the assignment, “It was super engaging. It probed us as a class to not only learn about a particular theory and their viewpoint, but apply that view point to an actual case study. I think it [is] a very creative assignment. It required some effort and thinking, but I can honestly say I enjoyed it.”

---

Daniel Perlman is Professor in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, P.O. Box 26170 Greensboro, NC 27402-6170.

## References

- Adamsons, K., & Palkovitz, R. (2014). Theorizing about fathering: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(4), 279-281.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12053>
- Azar, S. T., & Weinzierl, K. M. (2005). Child maltreatment and childhood injury research: A cognitive behavioral approach. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 30(7), 598-614.  
doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsi046
- Bacon, D., Stewart, K., & Silver, W. (1999). Lessons from the best and worst student team experiences: How a teacher can make the difference. *Journal of Management Education*, 23, 467-488. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105256299902300503>
- Barnett, O. W., Miller-Perrin, C. L., & Perrin, R. D. (2010). *Family violence across the lifespan: An introduction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bele, J., & Rugelj, J. (2007). Blended learning—An opportunity to take the best of both worlds. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 2(3), 29-33.
- Belsky, J. (1980). Child maltreatment: An ecological integration. *American Psychologist*, 35(4), 320-335. doi:[10.1037/0003-066X.35.4.320](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.35.4.320)
- Bengtson, V., Acock, A., Allen, K., Dilworth-Anderson, P., & Klein, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Sourcebook of family theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 26(1), 87-122.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3>
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.
- Brunvand, S., & Byrd, S. (2011). Using VoiceThread to promote learning engagement and success for all students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 43(4), 28-37.
- Chan, M., & Pallapu, P. (2012). An exploratory study on the use of VoiceThread in a business policy course. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 8(3). Retrieved from [http://jolt.merlot.org/vol8no3/chan\\_0912.htm](http://jolt.merlot.org/vol8no3/chan_0912.htm)
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *Biochemical Education*, 17(3), 140-141.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tl.37219914708>

- Cicchetti, D., & Lynch, M. (1993). Toward an ecological/transactional model of community violence and child maltreatment: consequences for children's development. *Psychiatry*, 56(1), 96-118.
- Crittenden, P. M., & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Child maltreatment and attachment theory. In D. Cicchetti & V. Carlson (Eds.), *Child maltreatment: Theory and research on the causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect* (pp. 432-463). doi:10.1017/CBO9780511665707.015. Retrieved from [http://www.patcrittenden.com/include/docs/Crittenden\\_Ainsworth\\_1989.pdf](http://www.patcrittenden.com/include/docs/Crittenden_Ainsworth_1989.pdf)
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). Evolutionary social psychology and family homicide. *Science*, 242(4878), 519-524. doi:10.1126/science.3175672
- Fine, M. A., & Fincham, F. D. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of family theories: A content-based approach*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hansen, R. S. (2006). Benefits and problems with student teams: Suggestions for improving team projects. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82, 11-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.82.1.11-19>
- Hillson, J. M. C., & Kupier, N. A. (1994). A stress and coping model of child maltreatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 14(4), 261-285. doi:10.1016/0272-7358(94)90025-6
- Horn, M. (2015, April 23). Report that says online learning growth is slowing misses big picture. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelhorn/2015/04/23/report-that-says-online-learning-growth-is-slowing-misses-big-picture/>
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998). Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidence is there that it works? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 30, 26-35. doi:10.1080/00091389809602629
- Layton, R. A., Loughry, M. L., Ohland, M. W., & Ricco, G. D. (2010). Design and validation of a web-based system for assigning members to teams using instructor-specified criteria. *Advances in Engineering Education*, 2(1), 1-28.
- Lightcap, J. L., Kurland, J. A., & Burgess, R. L. (1982). Child abuse: A test of some predictions from evolutionary theory. *Ethology & Sociobiology*, 3(2), 61-67. doi:10.1016/0162-3095(82)90001-2
- McCormack, V. (2010). Increasing teacher candidate responses through the application of VoiceThread. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3(11), 160-165.

- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-47.
- Moore, T. J. (2015). Teaching multiple perspectives: Family theory and case assignments. *Family Science Review*, 20, 21-29.
- Orlando, J., & Orlando, L. (2010). Using VoiceThread to improve educational outcomes. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning*. . Retrieved from [http://www.uwex.edu/disted/conference/Resource\\_library/proceedings/28642\\_10.pdf](http://www.uwex.edu/disted/conference/Resource_library/proceedings/28642_10.pdf)
- Smith, S. R., & Hamon, R. R. (2012). *Exploring family theories* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 249–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543068003249>
- Topping, K. (2009) Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48(1), 20-27.
- Weis, D. L. (1998). The use of theory in sexuality research. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35(1), 1-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224499809551912>
- White, J. M., Klein, D. M., Martin, T. F. (2014). *Family theories: An introduction* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wood, C. A., & Perlman, D. (2015). *A multifaceted partner presentation assignment for improving educational outcomes among college students*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

*Appendix*

## The Case of Kenny

Kenny was placed in foster care because his community's Department of Child Protective Services (CPS) determined that his family was "in conflict". The placement was made after 10-year-old Kenny was seen at the local hospital's emergency room for bruises, welts, and cuts on his back. According to his mother's report to emergency room personnel, the boy "fell off of his Razor" (scooter) while riding down a hill near the family home. Kenny was very quiet during the visit, never speaking but occasionally nodding his head in affirmation of his mother's report. The attending physician, however, believed that Kenny's injuries were unlikely to have occurred as the result of such a fall. Rather, they appeared consistent with the kinds of injuries a child might have from being slapped repeatedly or possibly whipped with a belt.

Initially, Kenny's mother persisted in her story that Kenny had fallen from his Razor, but after the doctor told her that the injuries could not have resulted from such an accident, she confessed that her boyfriend of several years, Sam, had some strong opinions about how children should behave and how they should be disciplined. She reported that Sam had a "short temper" when it came to difficult behavior in children and that he sometimes "lost his cool" in disciplining Kenny. She also suggested that Kenny's behavior could often be very difficult to control. She said that Kenny had numerous problems, including difficulties in school (e.g., trouble with reading) and with peers (e.g., physically fighting with other children); she described both acting-out behaviors (e.g., setting fire to objects, torturing and killing small animals, stealing) and oppositional behaviors (e.g., skipping school, refusing to do homework, breaking curfew, being noncompliant with requests).

In interviews with a CPS worker, Kenny revealed that he was, in fact, experiencing physical abuse inflicted by his mother's boyfriend. Kenny reluctantly acknowledged that Sam frequently disciplined him by repeatedly slapping a belt across his back. He also talked about an incident when he had been trying to teach the ducks to "swim underwater". When Sam saw Kenny submerging the ducklings' heads under the water, he became very angry and "taught Kenny a lesson" by holding Kenny's head underwater repeatedly. Kenny was tearful as he told this story and stated that at the time, he thought he was going to drown.

After Kenny had been in foster care for several weeks, his foster mother indicated that he was doing very well and described him as a "remarkably adaptive child". She said she found him to be a "warm, loving kid," and he had not exhibited "any behavior problems other than what you might expect from a 10-year-old boy." She reported also that Kenny "hoped to go home soon" because he "missed his mother and Sam." He believed that he was placed in foster care because he was disobedient toward his mother and her boyfriend, and because he hadn't been doing well in school.

Adapted from Barnett, O. W., Miller-Perrin, C. L., & Perrin, R. D. (2010). *Family violence across the lifespan: An introduction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.