

demonstrate how gender enforcement permeates our lives at the interpersonal, organizational, and institutional levels (in)formally.

The topics explored in Part II: Patterns hold great potential to implement Reid's (2016) visual essay assignment adaptation for students to document the patterns of gender performances, roles, and social norms with original photographs; the assignment details are published in ASA's TRAILS. The readings provide such a variety of content that shapes and reinforces gender patterns in society, once students take a critical eye through a sociological lens, they notice even the most seemingly mundane aspects about living and doing gender as potentially powerful and meaningful. Reid's (2016) TRAILS assignment blends a creative endeavor of photography and visual imagery for students to craft a narrative about how their chosen gender pattern(s) manifest in layered social realms.

PART III: POSSIBILITIES

The concluding part of the book, Part III, includes five essays within chapter 10. Chapter 10, "Nothing Is Forever," draws on social constructionist theory peering forward at the inevitability of change regarding gender dynamics, which stems back to the core of gender as a human invention rather than a biological absolute. The first of the five readings in the chapter is a roundtable on reproductive technologies and justice, followed by an essay on the potential for an online revolution with the proliferation of social and new media technologies spanning the recent feminist movement. The final three readings in the book invoke intersectionality specifically by framing ways to break down battles collaboratively, including a call for a feminist of color multidimensional lens by the Santa Cruz Feminist of Color Collective. This concluding section of Spade and Valentine's book presents an opportunity for drawing connections among the prisms, patterns, and possibilities self-reflexively in a mini-ethnography essay assignment that Ammons (2016) articulates in "Linking Gender to Lived Experiences." The ASA essay assignment published in TRAILS entails a threefold generational analysis to examine how gendered life remains dynamic and static.

The Kaleidoscope of Gender accomplishes a great deal with the inclusion of so many thought-provoking topics that prioritize intersectionality and a global paradigm alongside exploration and critiques of hegemonic Western gender ideals and norms. The kaleidoscope metaphor expertly bridges scholarly work with activism. As we see how online platforms fuel global feminist activism further in the twenty-first century,

perhaps a later edition will invoke more substantive outcomes derived through the various patterns through which activism is currently taking shape that have shown stark deviations from activist strategies used among feminists in prior decades. This textbook stands as an excellent introductory text with many short essays across a wide variety of topics on the cutting edge of the gender studies scholarly landscape. The book provides snapshots of complicated topics and resources to lead readers to explore intricacies of interest. Intersectionality woven throughout the book as an analytical tool, focus on the socially constructed and constantly evolving nature of gender on a global scale, and the inclusion of critical work that challenges the overwhelming dominance of Western-centric assumptions about gendered life make this collection of readings an asset to the sociological and interdisciplinary study of gender in the college classroom.

REFERENCES

- Ammons, Samantha K. 2016. "Linking Gender to Lived Experiences." Assignment published in *TRAILS: Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2016. *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hill-Collins, Patricia, and Sirma Bilge. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Reid, Matt. 2016. "Photo (Visual) Essay of Social Problems." Assignment, Essay published in *TRAILS: Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Rosen, Nicole, and Aya C de Chellis. 2016. "Understanding Intersectionality through a Roll of the Dice: What Might the Experience Be?" Assignment, Class Activity, Essay published in *TRAILS: Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Michael W. Kirst and Mitchell L. Stevens
Remaking College. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 336 pp. \$24.95.

Reviewed by: Kristin Kelley, *Indiana University, USA*

DOI: 10.1177/0092055X17711154

With funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Kirst and Stevens led a series of

national conferences in which an interdisciplinary group of scholars discussed how to improve collegiate experiences and outcomes. *Remaking College: The Changing Ecology of Higher Education* grew out of these conversations. This edited volume has a unique focus on broad access institutions (community colleges, for-profit institutions, and comprehensive public universities), the students who attend these colleges, and the challenges that these institutions and their students face. Because a majority of college students attend broad access institutions, this text is a welcome addition to the higher education literature. The book takes the perspective that organizations should address students' unique needs based on their backgrounds rather than expecting students to conform to what is viewed as the typical college student: a young, unmarried, and childless adult who has no responsibilities other than being a student. Kirst and Stevens critique past research that assumes that students have a linear experience through college. Instead, Kirst and Stevens use an ecological framework to view higher education as a field comprised not only of students but also of administrators, instructors, institutions, funders, and regulators cooperating and competing for resources (e.g., students, funds, prestige) in the production of education.

Remaking College has two key strengths. First, instructors can use the majority of the chapters in the text to teach higher education theory and research methods. Because *Remaking College* provides a robust research agenda for scholars of higher education, this is an essential read for graduate students just beginning their research careers. Second, although the volume does not provide quick solutions for fixing higher education, it illustrates how university administrators can work with social scientists to improve students' outcomes.

Remaking College's 11 chapters are divided into four parts; however, because the book is an edited volume, even chapters within parts have a different focus and to some extent a different target audience. To gain a broad view of the volume, readers can turn to chapter 11 first because it provides the ecological framework for research on higher education and shows how each chapter fits into this framework.

Remaking College identifies several gaps in higher education theory and research, making it an important read for students who are beginning to learn about research methods and theory. I recommend that sociologists and other instructors of higher education use chapters 1 and 11 to teach organizational theory in graduate-level seminars.

These chapters are theoretically dense and would be too abstract for most undergraduate students. In chapter 1, Scott argues that the organization field concept conceptualizes higher education as an ecology (see also Aldrich 1979; Baum and Shipilov 2006; Hannan and Freeman 1989) with multiple actors who have agency in supporting and challenging the status quo of higher education. In chapter 11, Klasik, Proctor, and Baker identify multiple research domains organized by topic (the field, markets, governance, learning, and careers) and three levels of analysis (the organization; the leaders, faculty, and staff; and the students). Instructors can have their graduate students identify how their research fits into the domains and levels identified in this chapter, which may illuminate and specify their aims more efficiently and effectively.

There are some chapters in the volume that are appropriate for both graduate and undergraduate student audiences. Chapters 7 and 10 discuss the challenges of research on institutions and best practices for research on higher education programs and policies, so they will be particularly useful for upper-level undergraduate students who are writing honors theses on higher education and for early career graduate students just learning the nuances of research. Chapter 10 introduces the importance of building high-quality data sources on higher education, the problems that selection effects create for researchers, and the importance of choosing the proper analysis approach when predicting policy effectiveness. Instructors can have students read this chapter to learn about the different decisions researchers need to make when designing any study. Chapter 7 discusses different ways to measure institutional effectiveness and argues that different measures reflect different values. Instructors can have students read this chapter and generate ideas about how colleges should measure institutional effectiveness and what methods should be used and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches.

Students (and their instructors) who are looking to understand the relationship between organizations and their students should turn their attention to chapters five and six, which illustrate several gaps in "diversity" research on students. Chapters five and six are accessible for most audiences, including early-career undergraduate students. In chapter five, Settersten discusses the importance of critically evaluating assumptions about the "typical" college student. In chapter six, Deil-Amen argues that scholars should broaden their conceptualization of diversity from the focus on minority

access to elite institutions to research on how student age, preparedness, living conditions, and parental status intersect with the type of institution they attend. Additionally, research should consider how “alternative” college experiences, such as online education and transitioning between schools, impact students’ labor market success.

Graduate instructors can use chapters five and six in tandem with Armstrong and Hamilton’s (2013) *Paying for the Party*, Stuber’s (2011) *Inside the College Gates*, Lee’s (2016) *Class and Campus Life*, or Stevens’ (2009) *Creating a Class* to better illustrate how university infrastructure benefits upper- and middle-class students. Undergraduate instructors who teach sociology from a multilevel perspective can use chapters five and six to show the intersection between organizational and individual levels of analysis. Instructors can use a modified version of a TRAILS activity by Hendricks (2014) that asks students to identify grade school, high school, and college processes; their manifest and latent functions; and how they produce inequalities. Instructors can limit students to identifying various aspects of the higher education ecology and ask students to identify the manifest and latent functions of university programs and policies, institutional evaluation schemas (e.g., Carnegie Classifications), student learning measurements (e.g., GPA, exams), the academic calendar (e.g., standard start and end dates, class times), and higher education funders and regulators. This lesson can teach both functionalist and conflict perspectives and broaden students’ perspectives on diversity by illustrating that the study of social inequalities requires a nuanced inspection of student characteristics and how these characteristics intersect with institutions.

Remaking College is also written for higher education evaluators and administrators. Much like the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) movement has tried to do, *Remaking College* argues that changes to higher education should be research based. In chapter 10, Kurlaender, Howell, and Jackson show how universities can create policies and programs that improve degree persistence. However, for this research to be possible, university administrators and scholars must create high-quality data sources, which may require original, longitudinal data collection or data collation from multiple sources. The best research will consider how students self-select into programs and how policies and programs may have differential impacts on particular groups of students.

Chapters four and seven also illustrate how administrators, who have the power to affect

change, can work with researchers, who have the expertise in collecting data and interpreting results, to improve university effectiveness. In chapter four, in regard to college classification, Ruef and Nag propose an alternative to the Carnegie Classification. Unlike Carnegie’s schema, Ruef and Nag’s proposed categories are based on theory and data, are not mutually exclusive, can capture complex distinctions among two-year colleges, and can sort colleges by their internal structure and routines, demographic niches, or mission statements. They argue that this schema could be more meaningful for making comparisons across universities. In chapter seven, in regard to college ratings, Arum and Roksa argue that current institutional assessments rely on factors like completion rates that encourage university selectivity and increase inequalities (e.g., disparities in attendance and completion rates based on student sociodemographic characteristics) and that measures of general collegiate skills, subject knowledge, and personal and affective growth could be better metrics. Researchers can determine what values particular measures reflect, the technical feasibility of various metrics, and whether metrics should differ based on institutional type. Those who want to better understand how institutions impact students’ learning should read Arum and Roska’s (2011) *Academically Adrift* and some of the responses to the book (for a summary of responses to *Academically Adrift*, see Arum 2013).

In conclusion, the research agenda in *Remaking College* has the potential to change the face of higher education, but improving collegiate outcomes requires cooperation from each actor in the field, including institutions, administrators, researchers, instructors, funders, and regulators. *Remaking College* outlines the necessary steps for developing the knowledge needed to improve learning in higher education and reduce inequalities between students from different backgrounds. College administrators and the public they serve need better data highlighting the problems higher education faces and the potential practices, policies, and programs that could serve as solutions. This volume is a great read for graduate students because the future of higher education partially relies on them. They must implement the proposed research techniques, examine understudied subject matter, further develop their theoretical perspectives, and test the efficacy of the classification and evaluation metrics proposed in this volume. According to Doyle and Kirst in chapter eight, if social scientists focus their efforts on giving a clear picture of how higher education

works to the public, this can generate the public demand for change to occur and for organizations to ameliorate inequalities.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, Howard. E. 1979. *Organizations and Environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth, and Laura Hamilton. 2013. *Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Arum, Richard. 2013. "Stakeholder and Public Responses to Measuring Student Learning." *Society* 50:230–35.
- Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roska. 2011. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Baum, Joel A., and Andrew V. Shipilov. 2006. "Ecological Approaches to Organizations." Pp. 55–110 in *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*. 2nd ed., edited by S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence, and W. R. Nord. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hannan, Michael T., and John H. Freeman. 1989. *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hendricks, Jerome M. 2014. "Differential Outcomes and Socialization (REVISED)." Class Activity published in *TRAILS: Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology*. Washington DC: American Sociological Association.
- Lee, Elizabeth M. 2016. *Class and Campus Life: Managing and Experiencing Inequality at an Elite College*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Stevens, Mitchell. 2007. *Creating a Class: College Admissions and the Education of Elites*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stuber, Jenny M. 2011. *Inside the College Gates: How Class and Culture Matter in Higher Education*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Debbie Rodan, Katie Ellis, and Pia Lebeck
Disability, Obesity and Ageing: Popular Media Identifications. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. 176 pp. \$149.95.

Reviewed by: Megan Lemmon, *The Pennsylvania State University, USA*

DOI: 10.1177/0092055X17711163

American adults watch more than five hours of television a day on average (Koblin 2016). Given that so much of our time is devoted to television viewing, critical analysis on the kinds of images and cultural messages we are receiving through television is warranted. While scholarly and popular media attention has been devoted to cultural

representations of gender, race, and class, other social categories—such as disability—have received less attention. *Disability, Obesity and Ageing: Popular Media Identification* addresses this gap in the literature by exploring how disabled, overweight, and aging individuals are portrayed on television and how viewers interpret and react to these portrayals. The authors argue that disability, obesity, and old age are stigmatized identities; historically, individuals with these identities have been depicted as abnormal or marginalized to peripheral roles. However, television is entering into an era where disabled, aging, and obese characters are occupying important and sometimes even complex roles. Additionally, online forums, blogs, and social media create spaces for viewers to engage with these portrayals and discuss the ways in which their own experiences resonate or contrast with television portrayals of disability, obesity, and aging. Television audiences are now exposed to an unprecedented volume and variety of television shows, which makes this an exciting time to analyze both the progress and stagnation of media portrayals of individuals with stigmatized identities.

The book is divided into two parts. The first section provides a brief overview of how disability, obesity, and aging are represented in media and explores how viewers connect with television content through online activity. The second section provides a deeper analysis of each of these three stigmatized identities, with separate chapters devoted to disabled, obese, and aging characters and audience reactions to them. The authors selected television shows to analyze from four genres—dramas, sitcoms, reality television, and documentaries—that were popular with audiences and initially aired during primetime.

Chapter one begins with a series of vignettes that introduce readers to several television characters and describes viewers' reactions to them. The authors point out that disability, obesity, and aging are becoming increasingly visible on television, yet many characters who embody these identities still reflect negative stereotypes. They also argue that we can better understand television representations of disability, obesity, and aging by considering the social model of disability. Unlike the medical model, which views disability as the result of defects or impairments within an individual's body, the social model argues that individuals *become disabled* through their interactions with the social world, that is, disabilities arise when barriers in society prevent individuals from being able to fully participate in social life. Although the social model