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Men and Women of the Corporation is an important, perhaps even a landmark, book. As much like a symphony as a treatise on organizations, the book weaves into an amazingly coherent theory ideas and research on how organizations are structured, how people behave in those structures, and why women and other “minorities” seem so different. Needless to say, I liked the book.

Kanter's book is basically about corporate life and yet, as she has shown in two keynote addresses to the American Association on Higher Education, the implications for us in higher education are not difficult to find, even if they may be difficult to swallow. The basic thesis of the book is that the structure of jobs determines how job-holders will behave and therefore attempts should be made to alter the structure of jobs, not to change the behavior of job-holders. This orientation does not coincide with that of the human relations movement, perhaps not even with some basic tenets of the faculty development field which focuses exclusively on the person.

The core of Kanter’s structural determinants of behavior are opportunity, power, and proportions. Opportunity refers to “expectations and future prospects,” while the structure of opportunity is forged by such matters as promotion rates, access to challenge, and increase in skills and rewards. All jobs can be divided into those with opportunity for advancement or new challenge (the moving) and those without that opportunity (the stuck). The stuck behave in ways which are neither healthy for them, nor productive for the organization: with disengagement from the organization, conservative resistance, lower enthusiasm, and lower aspirations. Organizations with too many stuck people find that they can generate neither excitement, nor dedication, nor creativity.

Power, the capacity to mobilize resources, is the result of both
formal job characteristics and informal alliances. Some of the factors influencing power are the amount of routine in jobs, visibility of the job, approval of high status people, mobility prospects of subordinates, and favorable alliances with sponsors and peers. People in powerless situations tend to be rigid, rules-minded, controlling, and possessive. “The psychologically powerless turn to control over others. They want to be right all the time and are irritated at being proven wrong. . . . Rules represent their only safe and sure legitimate authority.”

Proportions refers to the relative numbers of social types (women, blacks, people without Ph.D.’s) in various parts of the organization. Kanter suggests that a “token” (because of the structural fact of being a token) does not perform as well as non-tokens. “The existence of tokens encourages social segregation and stereotyping and may lead the person in that position to overcompensate through either overachievement or hiding successes. . . .”

The real kicker in this analysis is the self-perpetuating cycle: the moving generate even more opportunity; the stuck get even less. The powerful create more power; the tokens tend to work out so poorly that even less opportunity is made available to minorities.

What does all this mean for professionals in the faculty/instructional/organizational development field? At the most basic level, this book helps us to understand the organizations we work with or in. On another level, the book raises compelling questions about the structure of the profession of academe. The academic field—teaching or administrative—is a low ceiling profession, with few opportunities for advancement and with final rungs reached fairly early in careers. Are mid-career and senior faculty subject to the effects of low opportunity described by Kanter? Which of Kanter’s structural remedies can be tested to increase opportunity and power in mid-career and senior faculty and administrators? Finally, it might be worthwhile to examine the profession of faculty/instructional/organizational development in higher education. Are our jobs low in opportunity, low in power?

Whether you read this book to examine your own position, to reflect on the structure of academe itself, or to study your own organization, you will find a way of looking at the world which makes sense and which leaves a clear challenge to those who wish to make the workplace better for the individual and the organization.

JOAN NORTH

This is the best single book on college teaching. None matches it in scope, use of research findings, or the blending of that research with theory and practical advice in a focus on classroom teaching. Throughout the book McKeachie emphasizes the linkage of instructional goals to teacher practices. Despite the subtitle, the book is useful for experienced as well as new college teachers, and for faculty development specialists. Many of the book's limitations derive from its relatively short length.

Reviewed here is the seventh edition of a book which first appeared in 1951. This edition makes much more use of theory and research in education than prior editions (the last of which appeared in 1969).

About one-third of the book's twenty-eight chapters treat a teaching method, technique or tool (e.g., lecture, discussion, PSI, CAI, audio-visuals, large class instruction, simulations, peer teaching, independent study). Another six chapters cover student assignments, examinations and grading, and teacher evaluation and improvement. Other chapters include course preparation; first class meetings; teacher roles (expert, facilitator, ego ideal, etc.); counseling students; motivation; cognition and learning; evaluating research on teaching; ethics and teaching; and faculty attitudes and teaching effectiveness. Appendices include a student evaluation of teaching form devised by McKeachie, a statement of course goals for his general psychology course, and a checklist on teaching methods. References to about 450 works cited and a subject and author index complete the book.

Topics new in this edition include: peer teaching by students, PSI, TIPS, contract and modular instruction, games and simulations, and teacher roles. Compared to the sixth edition, treatments of cognition and student ratings of instruction are much expanded. The subject index entries are not as detailed as in the 1969 edition.

McKeachie is currently Director of the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor) where he is professor in, and former chairperson of, the psychology department. He has been president of the American Psychological Association and the American Association for Higher Education, and has chaired the Committee on Teaching, Research and Publi-
cation of the American Association of University Professors. McKeachie's scholarship spans three decades and focuses on student and teacher attributes, their interactions, and effects on learning, teaching methods, and student ratings of teachers and courses. His syntheses of research on teaching have appeared in numerous journals and books.

Most chapters of *Teaching Tips* follow this format: an introduction and collection of tips (advice specially useful for the new teacher) followed by discussion based on practice, theory and research. Chapters average ten pages in length; longer chapters are those on lecture, student ratings, personalizing instruction, teacher roles, audiovisuals, large classes, examinations, and discussion. The tone of the book is notable: McKeachie does not shove research or his experience down the reader's throat. He writes with clarity and concern and displays an understanding of the opportunities and problems of the classroom teacher.

*Teaching Tips* should be useful for faculty development specialists and the teachers with whom they work. New faculty and teaching assistants may find most useful the discussions on preparing a course, choosing texts, the tips sections of many chapters, discussion, and grading. More experienced teachers may find helpful treatments of "newer" teaching techniques and the research portions of chapters. *Teaching Tips* can probably be well used in workshops and in teacher consultation processes.

McKeachie's chapters are good introductions to their topics and cite more extended treatments and pertinent research. Nonetheless, *Tips* is not a replacement, to take two examples, for books such as Donald A. Bligh's *What's the Use of Lectures?* (1972) or Kenneth O. Doyle, Jr.'s *Student Evaluation of Instruction* (1975). And *Tips*, as McKeachie notes, is not a textbook in the educational psychology of college teaching. It needs to be distinguished from books by Robert M. Gagné, for example. And it is not a work in faculty development; there is hardly any overlap with Bergquist and Phillips' *Handbook for Faculty Development* (1975, 1977).

*Teaching Tips* has some limitations: (a) sketchy treatment of some topics, (b) a relative lack of treatment of differences in teaching and learning of different disciplines, (c) relatively little discussion of social factors affecting the classroom, and (d) emphases in one or more chapters which some readers will, no doubt, find not to their liking.
This relatively short and inexpensive book should be required reading for all teachers who seek to be more effective, and for all whose profession it is to assist them in that on-going work.

CHARLES A. GOLDSMID


What first struck me about this research report on the academic profession was the similarity between the title: Old Expectations, New Realities and the heading I had chosen for a study of Danforth Fellowship recipients in mid-career: “Dreams and Actualities.” What is really important about Carol Shulman’s report, however, is not only that she provides a thoughtful review of the research literature on faculty, but that she struggles with the profound discrepancy in the profession between the defining myth, what she calls the academic model, and the day-to-day working lives of faculty. This short research report has particular significance for P.O.D. members because it helps us understand the institution with which we are involved, the people with whom we work, and the serious strains built into the new roles in this developing field.

Picking up on Jencks and Riesman’s notion of the “academic revolution,” Shulman tags the fifteen-year period of expansion that began in the late 1950’s as “the golden age” of higher education. It was during this period that the academic model that she now sees dominating the profession came into full bloom. The academic model is marked by four central elements: 1) the importance of research as the focus of the profession, 2) the reliance on peer judgment and the dominance of the discipline, 3) scholarship as a vocation in its own right, and 4) increased professional prestige and job mobility through serving important social goals. Shulman argues that “this concept of academic life served faculty well through the late 1950’s and early 1960’s,” but that the enrollment and fiscal problems of the 1970’s have demonstrated its crucial flaws. She organizes her review of the research on faculty in a way that graph-
ically illustrates the inappropriateness of that conception of the profession for "the new realities."

I question Shulman's depiction of the late 1950's and the 1960's as a "golden age" in higher education. It might be better seen as an aberration in the history of the profession, and it could be argued that faculty development became necessary in order to pick up the pieces and re-integrate a badly fragmented situation. The professional irresponsibility, the crass career hustle, and the institutionalized irrationality marking the period are best illustrated by the data on graduate program expansion (e.g., between 1968 and 1972 the number of doctorates awarded increased by 46 percent, and new Ph.D. programs were started in fields that were already glutted).

Carol Shulman's research report gives us a succinct overview of the profession. It helps us understand faculty resistance to student evaluation and interdisciplinary studies, the sense of status deprivation in the profession, the inherently inappropriate character of the academic reward system for most faculty, and the "organized anarchy" that characterizes most of the institutions in which we work.

Those interested in academic career paths will enjoy Shulman's discussion of the three strands that can be distinguished in the professional lives of faculty: the disciplinary career, the institutional career, and the external career. P.O.D. members should find that distinction useful in their own career assessment. This A.A.H.E.–E.R.I.C. Research Report might also prove useful in working with groups of faculty. It is a provocative statement that is loaded with information and data and speaks directly to the fundamental commitments shaping the profession.

R. Eugene Rice