



## education review // reseñas educativas

editors: david j. blacker / gustavo e. fischman / melissa cast-brede

a multi-lingual journal of book reviews

November 27, 2012

ISSN 1094-5296

Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center <http://nepc.colorado.edu>

Follow Education Review on Facebook



and on Twitter: #EducReview



Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012) *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society: A Modular Model for Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing, and Seeing*. New York and London: Routledge.

Pp. xiii + 148 ISBN 978-0-415-87738-1

Reviewed by Adnan Ajsic  
Northern Arizona University

Globalization and its implications for language education generally, and English language teaching (ELT) in particular, have been a hotly debated topic since the 1990s (see, e.g., Widdowson, 1997), but this debate has had only a limited impact on language teacher education so far. This book is an attempt to mount a challenge to the traditional pedagogical paradigm by “get[ting] to grips with the educational complexity that has become the hallmark of our globalized knowledge society” (p. 17). Based on systematic attention to the issues of postcolonialism, globalization, and methodology in L2 pedagogy in his previous work, Kumaravadivelu offers an innovative five-module model for teacher training

Citation: Ajsic, Adnan. (2012 November 27) Review of *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society: A Modular Model for Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing, and Seeing* by B Kumaravadivelu. *Education Review*, 15. Retrieved [Date] from <http://www.edrev.info/reviews/rev1189.pdf>

programs that is “sensitive to local demands and responsive to global forces” (p. xii); the modules include *knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*.

The book consists of seven chapters, five of which are dedicated to the five modules (Chapters 2-6). Each chapter follows the same organizational blueprint in textbook fashion: an introduction (with an epigraph), several sections discussing module components or other major points, a summary, and a follow-up reflection and discussion section (including the recurring subsections Rapid reader response, Reflective tasks, and Exploratory project). Chapter 1, (Re)Visioning language teacher education, provides a brief overview of the available research on teacher education in a number of related fields such as applied linguistics, general education, social sciences, and philosophy. Acknowledging these contributions, Kumaravadivelu cautions that “accumulation of insights in a disjointed fashion can only lead to a limited and limiting understanding” (p. 2), and proceeds to make the case for a comprehensive model which would pull all the various strands together into a coherent whole.

Kumaravadivelu’s model is premised on what he terms five global perspectives (postnational, postmodern, postcolonial, post-transmission, postmethod) and three operating principles (particularity, practicality, possibility), which are discussed in detail in Chapter 1. Essentially, the first three perspectives contextualize the impact of globalization on language education by reminding the readers of the broader contemporary historical and sociopolitical developments, including a macro-level shift in power from nation-states to supranational institutions (postnational), the deconstruction of the modernist meta-narrative and the postmodern embrace of complexity and identitary multifariousness (postmodern), and the new nature of agency reflected in language nativization efforts across the postcolonial world (postcolonial). The remaining two global perspectives are more directly related to language teacher education, calling into question the transmission approaches to education whereby pre-selected knowledge flows from expert to teacher in a top-down fashion (post-transmission), as well as the primacy of method (postmethod). The operating principles are defined as the

“core tenets” of the model: *particularity* puts emphasis on “local exigencies and lived experiences” (p. 13), prioritizing the teacher over expert perspective; *practicality* denounces “the dichotomy between theory and practice” and seeks to enable teachers to “theorize from practice” (ibid.); while *possibility*, based on Paulo Freire’s critical pedagogy, champions personally and socially transformative pedagogical approaches over the transmission of content knowledge.

Chapters 2-6, as mentioned above, discuss individual modules. Chapter 2 presents the module *knowing* and its three constitutive components (professional, procedural, and personal knowledge). Professional knowledge here refers to the “intellectual content of the discipline” (p. 24) which emanates from experts and includes knowledge about language as system, as discourse and as ideology, knowledge about language learning (e.g., second language acquisition, or SLA), and knowledge about language teaching. Procedural knowledge deals with classroom management strategies, while personal knowledge is about the teachers’ “sense of what works and what doesn’t” (p. 34) in the language classroom. Chapters 3 and 4, *Analyzing and Recognizing*, shift attention from theoretical discipline knowledge to the participants in the learning process: Chapter 3 considers learners and their needs, motivation, and autonomy, whereas Chapter 4 focuses on teachers and their identities, beliefs, and values. The argument here is that to ensure success teacher education must provide teachers, on the one hand, with the knowledge and skills necessary to analyze changing learner needs, motivation, and autonomy, and on the other, tools such as critical autoethnography for an analysis of their teaching Self and ways to connect the personal, the professional, the pedagogical, and the political in their practice. Crucially, in line with the tenets of critical pedagogy, teachers are invited not only to consider how their identities, beliefs, and values impact their work, but also to “strive to shape those of their learners as well” (p. 72).

The module *doing*, laid out in Chapter 5, moves the discussion on to pedagogical practice. Similar to the first three modules, *doing* also consists of three components: teaching, theorizing, and dialogizing. Here, teaching is seen as a dual mechanism which maximizes learning

opportunities in the classroom and mentors personal transformation. Theorizing reconnects directly with the three operating principles and calls for teacher education to equip teachers adequately for the kind of action research “that can potentially lead teachers to theorize what they practice and practice what they theorize” (p. 95) as well as connect the *professional* with *personal* theories of education. However, the problem with this aspect of teacher practice is that teachers usually do not get adequate guidance from professional researchers or teacher training programs and they thus “lack competence and confidence in their ability to do research” (p. 87). The discussion of dialogizing draws on the work of Mikhail Bakhtin and Etienne Wenger to underscore the necessity of responsive dialogic engagement with communities of practice and inquiry for both personal and professional development. The final module, *seeing*, in Chapter 6 considers three groups of stakeholders in language education (learners, teachers, and observers) and points to the differences in their perspectives, suggesting ways to overcome them. The concept of *seeing-that*, borrowed from the Norwegian educationist Kvernbekk, which helps to connect conceptual and perceptual knowledge, is used to suggest the introduction of new classroom observation frameworks for a better understanding of classroom practice. Finally, Chapter 7, (Re)Making a modular model, returns to the concept of model as “a network of mutually reinforcing as well as mutually restraining sub-systems” (p. 124), showing how they fit together to provide a framework for language teacher training for a global society.

*Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing* is a wide-ranging discussion of an innovative model for language education programs with a “global focus that is sensitive to local exigencies” (p. xii). The model it offers combines various strands of research on language teacher education, while providing a way to resolve the conflict between competing local and global pressures. The transparent, textbook-like organization of the book and the included module and model diagrams (reminiscent of those in Nation & Macalister, 2010) complement its contents and help guide the reader through the sometimes dizzying array of theoretical perspectives which Kumaravadivelu brings to bear on his argument.

However, this breadth of presentation, in one sense the biggest advantage of the book, is also its biggest disadvantage as its many strands are often difficult to follow, at times leaving the discussion on the brink of incoherence. This is especially problematic because the book was clearly intended to be used in teacher training programs, where it would also be the most useful, but even the streamlined organization and the helpful reflection and discussion sections which follow each chapter seem insufficient to compensate for the conceptual overreach.

Some readers will also be surprised that a book which is premised upon the impact of globalization takes it for granted rather than discussing this highly controversial topic in greater detail, even if such omissions have been previously noted as characteristic of discussions of globalization in applied linguistics generally (e.g., Bruthiaux, 2008). The editing is nearly perfect, with very few errors: on p. 10 some odd spelling choices are in evidence, i.e., ‘many-fold’ instead of ‘manifold’ and ‘one-size-fits-all-cookie-cutter’ instead of ‘one-size-fits-all cookie-cutter’; on p. 21 ‘to’ is missing in “according [to] his own judgement,” and on p. 31 ‘that’ has been left dangling in “...as to what kind of classroom climate that they can expect,”; finally, on pp. 82 and 131 ‘Freire’ is misspelled as ‘Friere’.

Despite a limited appeal on account of the challenging style, this book nonetheless represents an important and welcome contribution to the existing literature on language teacher education, particularly in ELT. This is so not only for its currency and sensitivity to globalization-induced changes, but also and especially for its rejection of the view of teachers as “passive technicians who merely play the role of conduits transmitting a body of knowledge from one source to another” and for its advocacy for teachers as “transformative intellectuals who play the role of change agents raising educational, social, cultural, and political consciousness in their learners” (p. 56). How much success it will see in a social environment increasingly hostile to emancipation through education remains an open question.

## References

- Bruthiaux, P. (2008). Dimensions of globalization and applied linguistics. In P. K. W. Tan, & R. Rubdy (Eds.), *Language as commodity: Global structures, local marketplaces* (pp. 16-30). London: Continuum.
- Nation, I.S.P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, 16(1), 135-146.

## About the Reviewer

Adnan Ajsic is a PhD student in Applied Linguistics at Northern Arizona University. His research interests include various aspects of English as a global lingua franca, as well as language policy and language education in postcolonial and post-communist societies.

---

Copyright is retained by the first or sole author, who grants right of first publication to the *Education Review*.

*Education Review/Reseñas Educativas* is a project of the National Education Policy Center <http://nepc.colorado.edu>



### Editors

David J. Blacker

[blacker@edrev.info](mailto:blacker@edrev.info)

Gustavo Fischman

[fischman@edrev.info](mailto:fischman@edrev.info)

Melissa Cast-Brede

[cast-brede@edrev.info](mailto:cast-brede@edrev.info)

Gene V Glass

[glass@edrev.info](mailto:glass@edrev.info)

Follow *Education Review* on Facebook



and on Twitter: #EducReview

