

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

1: Discord coming to Xbox One - AbsoluteXbox

Project MUSE promotes the creation and dissemination of essential humanities and social science resources through collaboration with libraries, publishers, and scholars worldwide. Forged from a partnership between a university press and a library, Project MUSE is a trusted part of the academic and scholarly community it serves.

The Concepts of Beneficence and Benevolence The term beneficence connotes acts of mercy, kindness, and charity. It is suggestive of altruism, love, humanity, and promoting the good of others. In ordinary language, the notion is broad, but it is understood even more broadly in ethical theory to include effectively all forms of action intended to benefit or promote the good of other persons. Many dimensions of applied ethics appear to incorporate such appeals to obligatory beneficence, even if only implicitly. For example, when apparel manufacturers are criticized for not having good labor practices in factories, the ultimate goal of the criticisms is usually to obtain better working conditions, wages, and benefits for workers. Whereas beneficence refers to an action done to benefit others, benevolence refers to the morally valuable character trait "or virtue" of being disposed to act to benefit others. Many acts of beneficence have been understood in moral theory as obligatory, as determined by principles of beneficence that state moral obligation. However, beneficent acts also may be performed from nonobligatory, optional moral ideals, which are standards that belong to a morality of meritorious aspiration in which individuals or institutions adopt goals and practices that are not obligatory for everyone. Exceptional beneficence is commonly categorized as supererogatory, a term meaning paying or performing beyond what is obligatory or doing more than is required. This category of extraordinary conduct usually refers to high moral ideals of action, but it has links to virtues and to Aristotelian ideals of moral excellence. Such ideals of action and moral excellence of character need not rise to the level of the moral saint or moral hero. Even moral excellence comes by degrees. Not all supererogatory acts of beneficence or benevolent dispositions are exceptionally arduous, costly, or risky. Sainthood and heroic beneficence and benevolence are at the extreme end of a continuum of beneficent conduct and commitment. This continuum is not merely a continuum mapping the territory beyond duty. It is a continuum of beneficence itself, starting with obligatory beneficence. An absence of this sort of beneficence constitutes a defect in the moral life, even if not a failure of obligation. The continuum ends with high-level acts of supererogation such as heroic acts of self-sacrifice to benefit others. Beneficence is best understood as spread across this continuum. However, there is considerable controversy about where obligation ends and supererogation begins on the continuum. A celebrated example of beneficence that rests somewhere on this continuum, though it is hard to locate just where, is the New Testament parable of the Good Samaritan. In this parable, robbers have beaten and left half-dead a man traveling from Jerusalem to Jericho. A Samaritan tends to his wounds and cares for him at an inn. However, they do not seem "on the information given" to rise to the level of heroic or saintly conduct. The morally exceptional, beneficent person may be laudable and emulable, yet neither a moral saint nor a moral hero.

The Historical Place of Beneficence in Ethical Theory The history of ethical theory shows that there are many ways to think about beneficence and benevolence. Several landmark ethical theories have embraced these moral notions as central categories, while proposing strikingly different conceptual and moral analyses. Beneficence in these writers is close to the essence of morality. Other writers, including Kant, have given less dominance to beneficence, but still give it an important place in morality. He argues that natural benevolence accounts, in great part, for what he calls the origin of morality. A major theme is his defense of benevolence as a principle in human nature, in opposition to theories of psychological egoism. Hume finds benevolence in many manifestations: Although he speaks of both benevolence and justice as social virtues, only benevolence is a principle of human nature. Rules of justice, by contrast, are normative human conventions that promote public utility. He acknowledges many motives in human nature and uses metaphors of the dove, wolf, and serpent to illustrate the mixture of elements in our nature. Principally, he sees human nature in the domain of moral conduct as a mixture of benevolence and

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

self-love. Whereas the egoist views human nature as limited to motives such as survival, fear, ambition, and the search for happiness, Hume regards persons as motivated by a variety of passions, both generous and ungenerous. He maintains that these elements vary by degree from person to person. Lacking distinctive information about a particular individual, we cannot know whether in that person benevolence typically dominates and controls self-love, or the converse. Actions are right in proportion to their promotion of happiness for all beings, and wrong as they produce the reverse. This is a straightforward principle of beneficence and potentially a very demanding one. Mill and subsequent utilitarians mean that an action or practice is right when compared with any alternative action or practice if it leads to the greatest possible balance of beneficial consequences happiness for Mill or to the least possible balance of bad consequences unhappiness for Mill. Mill also holds that the concepts of duty, obligation, and right are subordinated to, and determined by, that which maximizes benefits and minimizes harmful outcomes. The principle of utility is presented by Mill as an absolute or preeminent principle, thus making beneficence the one and only supreme principle of ethics. It justifies all subordinate rules and is not simply one among a number of prima facie principles. It is a consequentialist theory because the moral rightness and obligatoriness of actions are established by their beneficial results. It is an aggregative theory because a judgment about right or obligatory action depends on an appraisal of the effects of different possible actions on the welfare of all affected parties, which entails summing positive benefits and negative effects over all persons affected. Beneficence has rarely occupied such a central role in a moral theory. He seeks universally valid principles or maxims of duty, and beneficence is one such principle. The motive likewise cannot rest on utilitarian goals. Kant argues that everyone has a duty to be beneficent, i. Nonetheless, the limits of duties of beneficence are not clear and precise in Kant. While we are obligated to some extent to sacrifice some part of our welfare to benefit others without any expectation of recompense, it is not possible in the abstract to fix a definite limit on how far this duty extends. Kant here anticipates, without developing, what would later become one of the most difficult areas of the theory of beneficence: How, exactly, are we to specify the limits of beneficence as an obligation? Deep disagreements have emerged in moral theory regarding how much is demanded by obligations of beneficence. Some ethical theories insist not only that there are obligations of beneficence, but that these obligations sometimes demand severe sacrifice and extreme generosity in the moral life. Some formulations of utilitarianism, for example, appear to derive obligations to give our job to a person who needs it more than we do, to give away most of our income, to devote much of our time to civic enterprises, etc. By contrast, some moral philosophers have claimed that we have no general obligations of beneficence. We have only duties deriving from specific roles and assignments of duty that are not a part of ordinary morality. These philosophers hold that beneficent action is virtuous and a commendable moral ideal, but not an obligation, and thus that persons are not morally deficient if they fail to act beneficently. An instructive example is found in the moral theory of Bernard Gert, who maintains that there are no moral rules of beneficence, only moral ideals. The only obligations in the moral life, apart from duties encountered in professional roles and other specific stations of duty, are captured by moral rules that prohibit causing harm or evil. Rational persons can act impartially at all times in regard to all persons with the aim of not causing evil, he argues, but rational persons cannot impartially promote the good for all persons at all times. Those who defend such a beneficence-negating conclusion regarding obligation do not hold the extreme view that there are no obligations of beneficence in contexts of role-assigned duties, such as those in professional ethics and in specific communities. They acknowledge that professional and other roles carry obligations or duties, as Gert insists that do not bind persons who do not occupy the relevant roles; they claim that the actions one is obligated to perform within the roles are merely moral ideals for any person not in the specific role. That is, these philosophers present beneficence not as a general obligation, but as a role-specific duty and as institutionally or culturally assigned. In rejecting principles of obligatory beneficence, Gert draws the line at obligations of nonmaleficence. That is, he embraces rules that prohibit causing harm to other persons, even though he rejects all principles or rules that require helping other persons, which includes acting to prevent

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

harm to them. His theory therefore makes nonmaleficence central to the nature and theory of moral obligation while denying that beneficence has any place in the theory of obligation. However, the mainstream of moral philosophy has been to make both not-harming and helping to be obligations, while preserving the distinction between the two. This literature can be confusing, because some writers treat obligations of nonmaleficence as a species of obligations of beneficence, although the two notions are very different. Rules of beneficence are typically more demanding than rules of nonmaleficence, and rules of nonmaleficence are negative prohibitions of action that must be followed impartially and that provide moral reasons for legal prohibitions of certain forms of conduct. By contrast, rules of beneficence state positive requirements of action, need not always be followed impartially, and rarely, if ever, provide moral reasons that support legal punishment when agents fail to abide by the rules. The contrast between nonmaleficence and beneficence notwithstanding, ordinary morality suggests that there are some rules of beneficence that we are obligated to follow impartially, such as those requiring that we make efforts to rescue strangers under conditions of minimal risk. Even some legal punishments for failure to rescue strangers may be justifiable. The Problem of Over-Demanding Beneficence

Some philosophers defend extremely demanding and far-reaching principles of obligatory beneficence. In his early work, Singer distinguished between preventing evil and promoting good and contended that persons in affluent nations are morally obligated to prevent something bad or evil from happening if it is in their power to do so without having to sacrifice anything of comparable importance. In the face of preventable disease and poverty, for example, we ought to donate time and resources toward their eradication until we reach a level at which, by giving more, we would cause as much suffering to ourselves as we would relieve through our gift. Singer leaves it open what counts as being of comparable importance and as being an appropriate level of sacrifice, but his argument implies that morality sometimes requires us to invest heavily in rescuing needy persons in the global population, not merely at the level of local communities and political states. This claim implies that morality sometimes requires us to make enormous sacrifices. It would appear that the demand is placed not only on individuals with disposable incomes, but on all reasonably well-off persons, foundations, governments, corporations, etc. All of these parties have moral obligations to refrain from spending resources on nonessential items and to use the available resources or savings to lend assistance to those in urgent need. Singer has not regarded such conduct as an enormous moral sacrifice, but only as the discharge of a basic obligation of beneficence. This assessment has generated a number of criticisms, as well as defenses, of demanding principles of beneficence such as the one proposed by Singer. Critics continue today to argue that a principle of beneficence that requires persons, governments, and corporations to seriously disrupt their projects and plans in order to benefit the poor and underprivileged exceeds the limits of ordinary moral obligations and have no plausible grounding in moral theory. They argue that the line between the obligatory and the supererogatory has been unjustifiably erased by such a principle. In effect, the claim is that an aspirational moral ideal has redrawn the lines of real moral obligation. Singer has attempted to reformulate his position so that his theory of beneficence does not set an overly demanding standard. He maintains that no clear justification exists for the claim that obligations of ordinary morality do not contain a demanding principle of beneficence, in particular a harm-prevention principle. He apparently would explain the lack of concern often shown for poverty relief as a failure to draw the correct implications from the very principles of beneficence that ordinary morality embraces. Later in his series of publications on the subject Singer attempted to take account of objections that his principle sets an unduly high standard. He has not given up his strong principle of beneficence, but he has suggested that it might be morally wise and most productive to publicly advocate a lower standard—that is, a weakened principle of beneficence. He therefore proposed a more guarded formulation of the principle, arguing that we should strive for donations of a round percentage of income, such as 10 per cent, which amounts to more than a token donation and yet also is not so high as to make us miserable or turn us into moral saints. This standard, Singer proclaimed, is the minimum that we ought to do to conform to obligations of beneficence. Various writers have noted that even after many persons have donated generous portions of their income, they could still donate more while living decent lives; and,

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

according to a strong principle of beneficence, they should donate more. Establishing the theoretical and practical limits of donation and sacrifice is clearly very challenging, and perhaps an impossible ideal. However, it does not follow that we should give up a principle of beneficence. It only follows that establishing the moral limits of the demands of beneficence is profoundly difficult.

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

2: Systematic synthesis of barriers and facilitators to service user-led care planning

We are told that simply by sipping our morning cup of organic, fair-trade coffee we are encouraging environmentally friendly agricultural methods, community development, fair prices, and shortened commodity chains.

All students participated in the literature discussion but, as mentioned before, only to the extent that was required to pass the course. Consequently, there were no extended discussions. Ulla formulated six questions in her initiating text consisting of words and she wrote a total of words in the literature discussion. Svea formulated only one question in her word-long text, and she wrote words in total. The number of words the participants received in response from their peers differed as well. Anna received the largest number of words words and Svea the smallest amount words. Anna also contributed with the second most number of words words and questions 5. The students mostly addressed their replies directly to the student who initiated a discussion, with questions related to the literature. Your question is very importantâ€" Now and then they also turned to the whole group. Klara wrote, "â€"Hi Lena and the rest of youâ€" They did not turn to other participants and connect to their replies. Although, there are a few examples where the students referred to contributions from others see Table 2 , but only indirectly and when they agreed entirely with their thoughts. Beda answered, for instance, "â€"Hi Greta. I have the same opinion as Lena. I believe that people of average intelligence with social disabilities have a problematic situation in our societyâ€" There was no natural turn-taking either in the dialogue or in the group roles. They mainly followed the instructions, meaning that all participants first acted as questioners and then clarifiers when working with the assignment. There was no coordination of the discussions. All students initiated their discussions about the same time and the discussions took place in parallel. The opening contributions were mainly composed of summaries from the course literature never from other sources , and concluded with questions. The students did not communicate their viewpoints, justify their opinions or question the literature. Beda asked, for instance, "â€"Is anyone experienced with teaching autistic children in special classes? How does it work? Statements or opinions were often formulated with uncertainty see Table 2. In 35 out of 41 replies the students expressed uncertainty , e. A majority of the contributions contained sentences where the students expressed their uncertainty because of lack of experience from the discussed subject area. Greta wrote, "â€"Hi Ulla. Beda wrote, for example, to Svea "â€"your questions are very interestingâ€". Anna and Greta tried to maintain the discussions by asking further questions in their replies, but these questions did not receive any responses from the others. The discussion was concluded as soon as everybody had made the contributions required to pass the course. Performance Analysis and Group Processing: The students did not conclude their mutual efforts or learning experience nor did they discuss how to continue to promote further understanding of the subject matter discussed. They supported each other by answering questions they did not provide responses to responses nor answer further questions and they did not ensure that everybody in the group had learned. They stressed that on-campus activities were important for their learning because they could attend lectures, listen to oral presentations from their peers and join discussions. They stated that it was easier to communicate when meeting "face-to-face" compared to communicating via WebBoard. The opportunity to communicate via WebBoard was also highly appreciated. The participants stated that they had mainly communicated and collaborated regarding the course subject. The students felt community and security within the small study group. The students did not report any benefits from receiving feedback from others and they did not emphasize social or psychological dimensions of interaction. Consequently, the students perceived the study group as an important source for individual learning, but they did not use the group for mutual knowledge construction. The analyses of the postings during weeks indicate that the amount of obligatory, task-related postings were equal to the spontaneous postings. The students did not collaborate beyond what was expected from them. The spontaneous postings mainly had a social content and received most replies from peers. The students mostly shared and compared information, i. They did not connect to the contributions of others besides that of the

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

student initiating the discussion. In addition, the students did not question either the literature or each other. Instead there was an accumulation of individual contributions. Yet, the assignments and assessments did not promote further interaction between the students as the students had no requirements on having extended discussions leading to common conclusions. Anna and Klara, who worked full-time, stated that it was very stressful to work in combination with studies. Klara expressed, "I lived as if in a bubble. The course took all of my spare time. Anna wrote, "there was not enough time to read all contributions in the group conference. I plan to read them when the course is over!" Because collaboration is time consuming Weller, , it is likely that the students had to keep the collaboration at a low level. Therefore, they did not collaborate beyond the requirements of the assignments. Asynchronous computer-mediated communication increases reflection-time and thereby the possibility to generate more considered texts to discuss Weller, In this study, a majority of the texts initiating the discussions were extensive and formally written. This could also have influenced the collaborative activities negatively as creative half-finished thoughts, which could have resulted in further discussions, may have been filtered out. The students may have looked upon the contributions as more or less complete and further discussion was not necessary. Besides that, extensive posting takes more time to read. Studies show that students need practice, support, and guidance in how to learn collaboratively on-line Gunawardena et al. Due to the fact that most of the students in the course were familiar with computer-mediated distance education, the teacher might have assumed that they had the skills to collaborate in this environment and did not give an introduction to this mode of study. But having experience with distance education does not imply having the experience or ability to be involved in collaborative learning. Consequently, another explanation for the absence of effective collaborative learning activities could be that the students did not have this knowledge. The teacher in this study responded to queries raised by students including content and administrative matters and she encouraged the students with greetings, but she was not involved in the on-line discussions. Yet, had she modelled interaction and collaboration for effective learning, at least by way of introduction, the students would probably have been more successful in doing so. The lack of different opinions, argumentations and challenges during the "Literature discussion" phase of their studies could be explained by the group being caught in an early phase of the group-building process Schutz, ; Tuckman, They may have been afraid of destroying the warm climate in the group by arguing against each other. The development of a work-group on-line is probably more complicated and time-consuming in an asynchronous computer-mediated environment as compared to face-to-face settings due to a lack of nonverbal cues and the time delay. The students in the group had a common knowledge base because they were professional teachers with further studies in special education. This could have facilitated discussions and collaboration because the participants had a common understanding of fundamental ideas and useful concepts. On the other hand, the common knowledge base could also have had an impeding effect on the discussions because the participants may have had the same opinions or at least knew the "right" thoughts to make in the group. Most of the students were inexperienced in the subject matter discussed in the particular assignment "Literature discussion". They had no reason to argue. A majority of the students also expressed a certain degree of ignorance in their replies. Collaborative learning activities are based on interdependence among participants to reach a common goal. The students in this study did not have a common goal, they had the same goal, namely, to increase the individual competence in the subject area and to pass the course. They did not apply for the course to collaborate with others to create common knowledge. On the contrary, they had applied to the distance-education course because they were dependent on a course design offering maximum flexibility in terms of when and where they study. Because collaboration to some extent decreases flexibility the students may not have seen any advantages with collaborative learning activities. Moreover, as mentioned before, the learners were not dependent on each other to reach their goals according to the design of assignments and assessments. The analyses of the postings show, for instance, that two of the most active students, Anna and Klara, were to be found among the group-related students. One of the least active students, Svea, preferred to learn individually or together with only one other person. Furthermore, she did not like to

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

write, which could have influenced the collaborative activities negatively because the communication was text based. Conclusion The main purpose of this study was to develop a better understanding of factors that influence peer-learner interactions and collaborative learning activities in an asynchronous computer-mediated learning environment. Because the investigation was conducted in a small group of seven distance-education students, general conclusions cannot be drawn from the findings. Nevertheless, several possible influencing factors were found and discussed, e. The findings indicate that the students visited the conference and interacted with their peers when they were motivated for their own needs and had time for it. They also suggest that one can more or less force students to interact and collaborate by assigning them tasks with requirements of collaboration to pass the course. But if the students do not have the skills, motivation or time they do not interact or collaborate beyond requirements. In conclusion, there is a challenge to adjust a collaborative learning environment in which busy, adult, distance-education students perceive that collaboration and interaction add more in terms of learning than they lose in time and flexibility. References [1] Donath, J. Identity and deception in the virtual community. *Communities in cyberspace*, ed. Retrieved Mars, from <http://criticalthinkingandcomputerconferencing.com>; a model and a tool to access cognitive presence. *American journal of distance education*, 15 1 , [4] Gunawardena, L. Interaction analysis of a global on-line debate and the development of a constructivist interaction analysis model for computer conferencing. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 17 4 , A review of recent papers on online discussion in teaching and learning in higher education. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 9 3. Community development among distance learners:

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

3: Collective Healing: Shifting Historical Patterns That Divide Us - New Directions Collaborative

Obligatory Burdens: Collaboration and Discord within the Cooperative 81 5. The Political Economy of Organic and Shade-Grown Coffee Certification.

As the US Presidential election and the Brexit vote in the UK illustrate, our current political process tends to amplify divisions and generate more discord rather than greater understanding, stronger connections, and wise solutions balancing multiple needs. When people are divided and disconnected, it is not surprising that there is a lack of empathy, curiosity, and care for the experiences and well being of people different than us. It can be easy to label people and disdain their views versus seeing them as individuals whose stories and struggles I understand and have talked to them about. Finding new ways It is time to find ways we can work together that overcome these patterns of division and separation. This is already happening in many places, perhaps at the edges and not that visible yet, but real nonetheless. Global communities of practice are inventing and evolving these processes e. While these experiments may seem at the edges when all the attention is focused on the mainstream political debate, they can hold seeds of a better way. Over the last two years, I have been part of a rich dialogue with people who are exploring ways to bring people together that can help heal these long-standing harmful patterns. We focused on several key themes of what is needed: How can we facilitate groups in ways that generate a sense of belonging? How can we create group experiences that help us see those who are different not through the lens of a label but as full human beings with many stories, with complex emotions, and unique gifts and aspirations? Reweaving the fragments of community with positive collective experiences “ The pressures and pace of work these days means many are chronically rushed, super-busy, addicted, and distracted. Fulfilling human experiences of connection, belonging, friendship, creativity, meaningful work, and the opportunity to work with others on a bigger cause are sorely lacking. Changing these patterns starts with creating spaces for meaningful conversation about things that matter. Any initiative to look forward and make positive change takes place in a community or system that has a long history, which we often overlook. The fragmented relationships, broken bonds of community, and lack of trust did not arise out of nowhere. There is a story there. Events of the past created harms and burdens that are often unacknowledged. Promising processes are emerging to help communities or societies explore and work with history in ways that can enable healing, for example systemic constellation , restorative justice , and truth and reconciliation commissions. When trauma is pushed under the rug, mental and emotional turmoil arises. How can we generate a shared understanding and commitment to change so we do not repeat these harmful patterns? Accessing overlooked human capacities “ In much of the work world, there are unwritten rules of being professional and successful: We can access a broader range of human capacities, such as empathy and compassion, to understand the experiences and motivations of all those within a community and society. We are only beginning to explore how mindfulness and presence can help us understand past and present dynamics and make decisions. And there is more potential to explore weaving in arts, music, movement, and creative expression, which also tend to be left at the door. There is a hunger for real conversation, for connecting to our larger community to achieve greater results together, and for contributing to making the world a better place.

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

4: The Evolution of Cooperation | The Scientist Magazine®

use within NATO and for personal or educational use when for non-profit or non-commercial purposes is granted providing that copies bear this notice and a full citation on the first page.

This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Abstract Background Service user patient involvement in care planning is a principle enshrined by mental health policy yet often attracts criticism from patients and carers in practice. Aims To examine how user-involved care planning is operationalised within mental health services and to establish where, how and why challenges to service user involvement occur. Method Systematic evidence synthesis. Service users and carers attributed highest value to the relational aspects of care planning. Health professionals inconsistently acknowledged the quality of the care planning process, tending instead to define service user involvement in terms of quantifiable service-led outcomes. Conclusions Service user-involved care planning is typically operationalised as a series of practice-based activities compliant with auditor standards. Meaningful involvement demands new patient-centred definitions of care planning quality. New organisational initiatives should validate time spent with service users and display more tangible and flexible commitments to meeting their needs. Enabling service user involvement in care planning is a principle enshrined by contemporary mental health policy and guidelines, 1 – 3 and a potentially effective method of improving the culture and responsiveness of mental health services in the UK. Systematic synthesis of small-scale studies suggests that initiatives aimed at enhancing user-involved care planning can enhance service development, improve staff attitudes and increase service user esteem. Nationally commissioned surveys in the UK report high levels of dissatisfaction with service user and carer involvement across in-patient and community settings. The reasons underpinning a sustained lack of policy influence on practice are unclear. The Francis inquiry into failings in National Health Service NHS provision has highlighted the potential for organisational and governance deficiencies to negatively affect patient-centred care. Distinguishing features include a unique service history founded on aspects of containment and compulsion, the need for care teams to accommodate a greater multiplicity of service user experiences and the entrenched stigmatisation of those using mental health services. We sought to address this evidence gap through a systematic synthesis of the barriers and facilitators to service user involvement in care planning in secondary mental healthcare. The primary aim was to examine how service user involvement is typically operationalised within mental health services and to establish where, how and why key challenges to such involvement occur. Method This review examined the way in which service user involvement is operationalised within secondary mental health services compared with the theoretical principles upheld by contemporary mental health policy. Its scope was international, examining service user involvement in care planning across different organisational and secondary care settings. It did not extend to service user or carer involvement in service design or delivery. Search strategy The review began with a broad search strategy to develop a theoretical frame of reference for evidence synthesis. A scoping search of published literature was initially undertaken to identify key theoretical and conceptual papers delineating the different philosophies underpinning or driving patient-involved care planning. Search terms were developed from key facets of the research question, namely care planning, mental health and user participation see online Appendix DS1. Key psychiatry, medical and nursing journals were also hand-searched for the period – Grey literature including conference abstracts, policy documents and material generated by third sector or user-led enquiry was identified via the British National Bibliography for Report Literature, Google Scholar and the websites of relevant UK government departments and charities e. Searches were limited to articles published in English from database inception to December An update search was performed in February Full copies of the search strategies used in the review are available from the authors. All identified papers were screened by title, abstract and subject headings against pre-specified eligibility criteria, and full-text copies of potentially eligible studies were obtained. Studies focused solely on the outcomes of user involvement or user

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

participation for the purposes of service design were excluded. Single-person perspectives were also excluded in an attempt to limit bias from potentially non-representative views. Key policy reports and conceptual papers were identified and used to establish the core components and stages of the care planning process. Subsequent work sought to systematically confirm or refute the propositions inherent in this framework by narratively synthesising the empirical evidence. Evidence hierarchies for intervention implementation are not well developed. In the absence of any formal consensus we extracted data from all eligible randomised trials, non-randomised studies, and uncontrolled and qualitative designs. Key quality indicators were drawn from published guidelines. No study was rejected on the basis of quality unless it was deemed impossible to understand. This inclusive approach was driven by a lack of empirically tested quality criteria for service user-led enquiry, 13 and remains in accordance with other systematic syntheses involving patient views. By definition, these studies employed rigorous data collection and analysis techniques and met minimum British Sociological Association criteria for the evaluation of qualitative research. Thin data descriptions were derived from quantitative research designs e. A data synthesis tool enabled the consolidation of data across studies. Study characteristics and data contribution were tabulated and primary data were mapped to the relevant domains of the theoretical framework developed at the beginning of the review. Where present, verbatim quotations were extracted and indexed to capture the key themes and subthemes pertaining to service user involvement in care planning procedures. Narrative synthesis occurred within and across the framework domains. Synthesis was undertaken by P. For clarity, the development of our theoretical framework is presented prior to our synthesis of primary data. Results Initial scoping searches failed to identify any text that referenced an explicit historical driver for service user involvement in mental healthcare planning. Instead, the process was framed as a core component of three broader, contemporary care philosophies. These were patient-centred care e. Each philosophy exhibited some fluidity and overlap such that their comparison identified a common set of antecedents to successful service user involvement. These antecedents comprised adequate service user buy-in, meaningful information exchange, participatory deliberation and participatory decision-making. We acknowledged a priori that the successful implementation of any care philosophy invariably depends upon the respective power of the agents and agencies involved. We thus introduced three levels of intervening variables to our framework: In this way, theory articulation allowed for the conceptualisation of user-involved care planning as both a linear outcome-focused and a hierarchical process-focused event Fig.

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

5: Project MUSE - Coffee and Community

Obligatory Burdens: Collaboration and Discord within the Cooperative; FILLING CARGOS: COOPERATION AND SERVICE IN SAN JUAN; EXPANDING ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY AND COMMUNITY IMPACT; MANAGING THE MANAGER; FEARING CORRUPTION; FACING CORRUPTION; A MARKET OF OUR OWN: WOMEN IN THE COOPERATIVE; CONCLUSIONS.

Features The Evolution of Cooperation When and why individual organisms work together at the game of life, and what keeps cheaters in check Jan 1, R. Nestmates will climb on top of their nest mates to achieve collective goals, such as reaching food. For parasites living in or on other organisms, for example, maximizing reproduction is a tricky proposition. Using more host resources lets parasites produce more offspring, but overexploitation shortens host life span, reducing the amount of time the parasites have to reproduce. So it may make sense for parasites to avoid harming their hosts, and parasites that increase host life span may fare even better. If another parasite is using so many resources that it kills the host anyway, why should any organisms on the same host limit their own reproduction by using fewer host resources? Whenever there are different genotypes in the mix, cheaters can arise. Nevertheless, cooperation is found throughout the living world—from the cellular to the societal level. Our cells are descended from single-celled organisms that once competed with or preyed on one another, but now work together to function as a cohesive unit. Within our cells, the mitochondria that provide energy are descended from free-living bacteria that gave up their autonomy for a cooperative existence. Lichens, corals, and many plants host beneficial bacteria or fungi within their bodies and depend on them for vital nutrients; and different species of microorganisms living within a host may be interdependent on one another. Ants defend trees that house and feed them. Animals, from bees to lions, cooperate with close relatives, and human civilization depends on cooperation even among unrelated individuals. What drives the evolution of these relationships, and why are they not more widespread? And can humans harness cooperative biology for their own benefit, for example, to increase crop yields? Cooperating with kin An early example of different species coming together to work as a team—one that changed the course of the evolution of life on Earth—is the origin of the eukaryotic cell. The cells of animals, plants, and fungi all contain mitochondria, which generate energy via respiration. Mitochondria are distant descendants of symbiotic bacteria, surrounded by their own membranes and containing their own DNA. Mitochondria presumably passed through a cooperative-but-potentially-independent stage before becoming completely integrated with their host cells. Today, mitochondria have lost enough genes that they cannot survive and reproduce outside of host cells, solidifying the cooperative relationship. Interestingly, similarities among all mitochondria suggest that animals, plants, and fungi evolved from a one-time origin of this ancestral symbiosis between two microbial species. This is in stark contrast to the repeated evolution of multicellularity, which has appeared more than 20 times across the eukaryotic kingdom. This discrepancy highlights how it is easier for cooperation to evolve among genetically identical cells. Indeed, multicellular organisms serve as the ultimate example of cooperation on a cellular level, with millions, billions, or even trillions of cells working together to form the tissues and organs of a complex individual. Such organisms cannot exist without cooperation among their cells, and the cells cannot exist outside of the cooperative system. The surprising ease with which these systems arose may be attributed to the fact that all the cells of a multicellular individual carry an identical or nearly identical genome. In theory, multicellular organisms could have formed as individual cells banding together. For example, single-celled *Dictyostelium* amoebas and *Myxobacteria* both form multicellular structures that produce starvation-resistant spores, and bacteria can aggregate into seemingly cooperative multispecies biofilms, which show enhanced resistance to antibiotics. This process is recapitulated by most modern multicellular organisms, which develop from single-celled embryos that divide repeatedly but remain in contact. This ensures that the cells have a shared genotype. To determine how the first multicellular organisms may have arisen, my R. Cluster-forming mutants settled faster, and only these faster settlers were

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

transferred to fresh media. Simple multicellularity evolved within a few weeks, and closer analysis of the faster-settling mutants revealed that clusters were formed by cells staying together after division, not by independent cells aggregating together. The same outcome occurred when selecting for clumps formed by yeast strains—such as the flocculating yeasts used for brewing beer, which are known to aggregate under certain conditions—and when conducting the experiments with algae. Genetic similarity among multicellular individuals also plays a major role in the evolution of cooperation on the macro level. The great evolutionary theorist William Hamilton noted that a gene for cooperation can spread if cooperation helps others with that same gene to survive and reproduce. Many animals follow this basic philosophy. Most of these siblings will have the same hive-defense genes as the dying worker. Such systems are not immune to cheating, however. In the mids, Robert Heinsohn of Australian National University and Craig Packer of the University of Minnesota found that some lions, while no less closely related, are less likely to fight an intruder, thus reducing their own risk of injury. Rhizobia bacteria live inside root nodules of plants, fixing nitrogen in exchange for energy-rich organic molecules. But if the rhizobia fail to fix nitrogen, the plant will induce senescence of the nodules blue, far right. For example, when *Dictyostelium* cells aggregate to form a fruiting body with spores supported by a stalk, only spore cells produce progeny. When a fruiting body forms from a mixture of two strains, one strain may contribute less to the stalk and more to the spores. For cooperation to evolve in the face of such competition, a system of checks and balances must be in place to guard against cheaters—strains that enhance their own Darwinian fitness at the expense of the others. One way is simply to exclude dissimilar strains from the cooperative group, a practice of at least some *Dictyostelium* strains. Without the cost of making expensive nutrients, these mutants might have greater fitness than their nutrient-making ancestors. Researchers at Michigan State and the University of Tennessee have suggested that this could lead to cooperation among species, with each species evolving to make only a subset of the nutrients they all need and getting the rest from their neighbors. Planktonic bacteria floating around in oceans or lakes, for example, have only loose associations with one another, and selection would seem to favor species or strains that use, but do not make, any of these public goods. Why help neighbors who will soon leave? When pairs of bacterial species were mixed in liquid culture, selection favored the less-productive, not the more-productive, species. Christian Kost of the Max Planck Institute for Chemical Ecology and colleagues have shown that some bacteria connect to other cells, of the same and different species, via nanotubes through which they exchange amino acids. If such connections are common, that would allow cooperation based on reciprocity—trade rather than piracy. A similar example of interspecies trade can be found in just about every soil ecosystem, where most plant species depend on symbiotic fungi that help them acquire soil phosphorus, and a smaller number of plant species including legumes depend on symbiotic bacteria such as rhizobia to convert atmospheric nitrogen into compounds that plants use to make essential proteins. The nitrogen the rhizobia provide can allow greater host-plant photosynthesis, potentially generating more organic molecules for the rhizobia. That said, each plant typically hosts several different strains of rhizobia. One widespread form of rhizobial cheating is hoarding more plant resources for future reproduction, rather than using those resources only to power nitrogen fixation. But plants have evolved ways to prevent a two-way trade from degenerating into a one-way resource grab. If the bacteria inside one root nodule stop fixing nitrogen, the plant can shut off the oxygen supply to that nodule, limiting rhizobial reproduction. The best evidence that plants respond to rhizobial behavior comes from experiments by my R. Comparing soybean and alfalfa root nodules in normal air to nodules on the same plant in an atmosphere with only traces of nitrogen, we found that rhizobia reproduced less frequently when they could only fix enough nitrogen for their own needs, with no surplus for the plant. This presumably limits rhizobial metabolism so they waste fewer plant resources and may also explain their decreased reproduction. Similarly, plants supplied less energy to mycorrhizal fungi that provided them with less phosphorus. Some hosts manipulate their partners in ways that enhance current cooperation. Alfalfa and some other legume species cause rhizobia in their root nodules to swell to two or more times their usual size. Swollen rhizobia can no longer reproduce, but we Oono and R.

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

The nectar they give the ants contains chemicals that prevent the ants from digesting nectar from other plants. Individual ants apparently learn to stay on their host plant. But cooperation based on manipulation may lapse whenever manipulation does, and thus does not necessarily favor the evolution of cooperation over generations. Sanctions that reduce the frequency of cheaters in future generations may have longer-lasting benefits. For cooperation between species to withstand the inherently selfish nature of evolution, individuals that fail to cooperate must have fewer descendants than cooperators, on average. This could result from fitness-reducing sanctions against cheaters or strict dependence of each partner on the other for survival. Partners may also manipulate each other in ways that enhance cooperation in the short term, without necessarily favoring evolution of cooperation over generations. Among related individuals, kin selection favors cooperation with related individuals that are likely to also carry the same genes for cooperation. These mechanisms for enhancing cooperation are not always foolproof, however. Aphids, for example, rely on symbiotic bacteria contained in specialized cells for essential amino acids lacking in their diet of sugary plant sap. Such symbiont inheritance, known as vertical transmission, means that bacterial strains benefit from helping their host lay as many eggs as possible. Thus, the most beneficial symbionts become the most frequent in the host population. Even in these systems, however, cheating can arise. The winners in such within-host competitions will not necessarily be those that are most beneficial to the host, unless the host has specific mechanisms for favoring more-beneficial strains. The problem of competition between symbionts is somewhat alleviated by the fact that a very small fraction of symbiotic bacteria reaches the next generation of hosts. This bottleneck means that a hypothetical mutation that allows a strain to gain a slight advantage over a competitor by exploiting the host does not greatly improve its chances in reaching the next generation. To accomplish this advantage, a strain would have to exploit its host enough to reduce total egg production—“with negative consequences that could outweigh the benefits of occupying a larger fraction of those eggs. Harnessing cooperation Our own research focuses on the problem of mediocre rhizobia strains that provide soybeans or alfalfa with some nitrogen, but much less than the best strains. While host sanctions keep root symbionts that provide little or no nitrogen or phosphorus in check, rhizobia may not trigger sanctions until they reduce their nitrogen fixation rate by more than 50 percent of their potential. Within a few years, we should have enough data to tell whether this approach will work. In other systems, it may be beneficial to reduce cooperation. While research into the interspecies relationships of the bacteria, fungi, and protozoans living in and on the human body is still in its infancy, recent theoretical work has suggested that microbial cooperation causes instability of species networks, and that competition reduces cooperation and promotes network stability. Continued research on within- and between-species cooperation will be necessary to make the most of our social world. Ford Denison is an adjunct professor at the University of Minnesota. Katherine Muller is a PhD student in his lab. Darwin, *On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*, 1st ed. John Murray, , page The MIT Press, , ,

6: Coffee and Community: Maya Farmers and Fair-Trade Markets (): Sarah Lyon - BiblioVault

Competition, Unfair--Guatemala from ebrary University Press of Colorado Coffee and community. Print version: Guatemala Fairer Handel (Unlimited Concurrent Users) from EBSCO Academic Collection SOCIAL SCIENCE--General Ebook Central Academic Complete Multi-User JSTOR Electronic Book cou (Unlimited Concurrent Users) from ebrary Coffee industry.

7: Interaction and Collaborative Learning - If, Why and How?

“Successful community programs are community based and carried out in collaboration with many community partners” “Successful community programs are comprehensive in scope, based on an ecological or systems view of individuals, families, and communities.

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

8: The Principle of Beneficence in Applied Ethics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

coordination within small groups of countries, and other actors dissatisfied with the status quo. It seems clear, for instance, that the US-China accord of November was important in generating.

OBLIGATORY BURDENS : COLLABORATION AND DISCORD WITHIN THE COOPERATIVE pdf

Thermal Conductivity 14. The Happy Couples Sacred groves and ravaged gardens Essentials of healthcare finance 8th edition Introduction to management and business environment Fab fashion for your feet Six sigma project management methodology The Psalms are one book Tales of Peter Rabbit Benjamin Bunny Hereditary immunity to infections Gods Little Devotional Book for the Graduate/Book, Journal Gold Pen The Strategic Application of Information Technology in Healthcare Organizations Modeling and Simulation in Thermal and Chemical Engineering Turning to Christ Prepare for adventure Webster and his master-pieces. The Accidental Vampire (Argeneau Vampires, Book 7) Principles of electromagnetic compatibility Ship planned maintenance system New Perspectives on Microsoft Office Access 2003 The median citadel of Godin Period II Hilary Gopnik. Neutralizing the venom Jackie Jones Royster: radical pathways of nerve and sass Theater, Speech, And Dance V. 1. The world to 1500. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Marx and Engels Collected Works 1867-70 (Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collec Caregiving roles in older women Peggye Dilworth-Anderson and Lyn Rhoden. Tata bahasa korea Nominations of Harry J. Bowie, Armando Falcon, Jr. Martin N. Baily, Robert Z. Lawrence, Dorian Vanessa We Ancient Chalcatzingo Betty Crockers Facsimile Bundle Kyoto and the estate system in the Heian Period Toda Yoshimi ; introduced and interpreted by Janet R. Goo Tuti, Blue Horse, and the Nipnope Man Javafx scene builder tutorial netbeans The Cineaste Interview 2 Maintenance engineer roles and responsibilities Administration of intercollegiate athletics Present your best self Lonely Planet North India Loving involves following historys greatest example of love