

academy. For some the stories will be familiar while for others they may be shocking. Regardless, this is a book for all to read who have any concern for ensuring the legitimacy of the broadest range of voices within the academy.



J. Braxton & A. Bayer. (1999). *Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press. Pages: 228. Price \$34.95 (hardcover).

Reviewed by Ruth Rees, Faculty of Education, Queen's University, Kingston, ON.

This book is a "must read" for college and university faculty — not just teaching faculty, but counselors, faculty in administrative positions and those involved in grievance procedures. The authors attempt to determine types of behaviours that are deemed inappropriate by teaching faculty. The authors echo Boice's (1996) contention that the growing concern of increased student misbehaviour is really a result of "professorial incivility" (p. 2). Additionally the authors seek to determine whether faculty members across various collegiate settings share views about inappropriate behaviors by their colleagues in the teaching role. Because most professors teach to varying degrees, the authors argue that inappropriate behaviour must be identified first and then dealt with. Both inviolable and admonitory patterns of behaviour constitute teaching misconduct, with inviolable patterns being the more serious of transgressions.

Specifically, the research questions (pp. 7–8) are:

1. What inviolable patterns of behaviour comprise the normative structure of undergraduate college (i.e., postsecondary) teaching?
2. What admonitory patterns of behaviour comprise the normative structure of undergraduate college teaching?
3. Are any of the inviolable norms or admonitory patterns similar across all types of education I institutions?

4. Are there core inviolable or admonitory norms across academic disciplines?
5. Do individual faculty characteristics, e.g., administrative experience, gender, professional status, research activity and tenure status, affect the espousal of inviolable or admonitory normative patterns above and beyond the effects of institutional type and academic discipline?

The authors compiled a questionnaire describing 126 behaviours that they and other faculty members deemed inappropriate into a College Teaching Behaviours Inventory (CTBI), cautioning that this questionnaire was developed with academics' input and feedback and not from an extensive literature review. Consequently they do not consider the 126 behaviours as comprehensive. Next they selected three types of US postsecondary institutions along a continuum of teaching and research universities to teaching colleges: research universities and comprehensive colleges and universities, highly selective and less selective liberal arts colleges, and community colleges. Institutions were randomly selected; three surveys were administered to 800 faculty. Faculty members were randomly selected to include 200 faculty in each of four pure life and non-life disciplines: biology, math, psychology, and history. Each was asked to rate the 126 behaviours on a five-point system from "appropriate" to "very inappropriate" behaviour. The response rates were: for survey one: 356 or 44.5 percent responses; for survey two, 382 or 47.5 percent responses; and for survey three, 265 or 33.1 percent responses. The aggregated sample had 72.3 percent male faculty, 27.7 percent women faculty, 47.2 percent full professors, and 46 percent tenure faculty. The survey was sent out over a six-year period.

Chapters three and four contain descriptions of types of teaching misconduct clarified by short fictional vignettes. Chapter three describes the worst types of faculty teaching misconduct toward students, termed inviolable norms, classified under seven normative headings: negativism, inattentive planning, moral turpitude, particularistic grading of student assignments and examinations, personal disregard, uncommunicated course details, and uncooperative cynicism. Chapter four describes the nine admonitory norms, defined as inappropriate behaviour of faculty

associated with the teaching of students, but less serious than the previous inviolable norms. These nine admonitory norms are: advisement negligence (lack of or inappropriate advising of students), authoritarian classroom (a rigid and closed approach to teaching), instructional narrowness (treatment of course content), inadequate communication with a class, inadequate course design, insufficient syllabus, inconvenience avoidance, and two types of poor relationships with teaching colleagues — teaching secrecy and undermining colleagues. The vignettes of these inappropriate behaviours make these chapters particularly useful and appealing as teaching tools in postsecondary management and orientation courses. Perhaps however, a more pro-active measure might be to make faculty aware of the breadth of *good* teaching behaviours expected of them.

Analyzes of the data were carried out using tests of significance. The core inviolable norms were found to be moral turpitude followed by preferential grading. Faculty in research universities expressed a lesser degree of disapproval for personal regard of students and uncommunicated course details. Faculty in all four of the disciplines identified inviolable norms as inattentive course planning and moral turpitude. Faculty members in biology expressed the greatest disapproval toward these inviolable norms.

Faculty across the different types of postsecondary institutions agreed on their level of indignation at the proscribed normative behaviors reflective of an authoritarian classroom, inadequate course design and teaching secrecy. These represent the core admonitory norms. Faculty in research universities tended to voice less contempt for the admonitory norms of advisement negligence, inadequate communication, inconvenience avoidance, insufficient syllabus, and undermining colleagues. They are not that condemning of instructional narrowness. Academics in more selective liberal arts colleges expressed less disapproval of inconvenience avoidance and instructional narrowness. A core admonitory norm, an authoritarian classroom, provoked comparable degrees of contempt from academic professional across all four academic disciplines. Again, academic biologists expressed a greater degree of concern for the remaining admonitory normative patterns than faculty in the other three disciplines (mathematics, history and psychology).

Chapter seven looks at five individual faculty characteristics in relation to norm espousal: administrative experience, gender, professional status, research activity and tenure. Only gender and research activity showed statistically significant relationships with the level of faculty disapproval voiced for moral turpitude. Women faculty tended to voice stronger disapproval of both condescending negative behaviour and personal disregard for students. Also faculty with administrative experience expressed strong sanctioning for personal disregard. Social controls of institutional type play a greater role than do personal controls, the authors concluded.

Similarly with the core admonitory pattern, both women and historians tended to voice stronger disapproval of colleagues having an authoritarian classroom. Women faculty expressed more disapproval of inadequate communication and undermining colleagues. Faculty with higher professorial status indicated a great aversion to inconvenience avoidance. As before, academic discipline and institutional type, i.e., social controls, accounted for greater difference than personal controls.

The...findings...strongly suggest that...the structural dimensions of the academic profession — the institutional type and the academic discipline — exert a greater influence on faculty espousal of inviolable and admonitory normative patterns than the individual and career characteristics of faculty do. (p. 112)

Social control mechanisms, then, must be put into place.

Chapter 8 identifies social controls existing in terms of the detection and deterrence of teaching misconduct. Three are mentioned: graduate school socialization through both informal and formal faculty relationship and tasks, such as teaching assistantships; the public and open nature of teaching at the post-secondary level; and students' course ratings. This chapter advances some theoretical perspectives on the social control of teaching misconduct.

Next, the authors investigated documents on teaching behaviours, such as from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), documents from 22 colleges and universities across the United States such as teaching assessment instruments, and post-tenure review policies at one large eastern public university. Only some contained a few of the prescriptive and proscriptive statements pertaining

to behaviours in the teaching role in the academy. These were expressed generally, not explicitly as in the CTBI.

This review revealed two points:

1. Little specificity exists to guide the professoriate in their professional roles as teachers.
2. Entire domains or clusters of behaviours were neglected in virtually all of the policy-related documents researched.

The authors summarily contend that these gaps should be addressed “whether for self-regulation as a profession, or for strengthened guidelines for appropriate administrative intervention” (p. 155).

The final chapter demonstrates reflective writing, and indeed an excellent concluding chapter for graduate students to follow. Seven weaknesses in the research are reiterated and suggestions for future research are outlined. Nine recommendations stemming directly from the research are offered for policy and practice (pp. 176–180):

1. Systematic records of incidents of teaching misconduct should be kept.
2. A formal code of teaching conduct should be developed.
3. Audits should be conducted within academic departments to identify variance in prevailing normative behaviours.
4. Formal committees should be established that consider reported incidents of teaching misconduct.
5. Sanctions for teaching misconduct should be formulated.
6. Graduate schools should consider their role of socializing future faculty members as to positive normative patterns for teaching.
7. Faculty should be rewarded for teaching integrity.
8. Normative expectations for teaching should be codified in collective bargaining agreements.
9. Formal policies should explicitly include a wider variety of general prescribed and proscribed teaching behaviours.

The conclusion, not surprising, is that greater attention to and formalization of teaching norms and sanctions are sorely needed at the

postsecondary level. Controls not only might prevent the erosion of the public trust and public esteem, but rather might strengthen the professionalism of the professoriate.

Frankly it is about time that such a book has been published. It makes for an excellent read for anyone in the postsecondary sector concerned about acceptable teaching behaviours and treating students appropriately and fairly. If we consider teaching to be an integral part of faculty members' roles, then the norms constituting good teaching and appropriate teaching behaviours must be clearly delineated, expected and rewarded. Moreover, teaching misconduct should not be sanctioned; consequences should be clearly and formally documented. As a previous Associate Dean, I for one would have benefited greatly from such policy and procedures.

References

Boice, R. (1996). Classroom Incivilities. *Research in Higher Education*, 37 (August), 453-485.

