



Exploring Pedagogic Frailty and Resilience: Case Studies of Academic Narrative

Ian M. Kinchin and Naomi E. Winstone, editors

Boston, MA: Brill Sense, 2018

(xx + 220 pages, ISBN 978-90-04-38896-3, \$55.00)

Reviewed By

Barbara A. Fears

Howard University School of Divinity

Evaluating teacher effectiveness is essential in assessing student learning, professor development, and institutional growth. This book offers insight for these evaluative purposes. Twelve contributors from a United Kingdom university apply the frailty model to their respective disciplines to evaluate the efficacy and widespread applicability of this model for reflecting upon the teaching and learning experiences of students and educators in higher education. The book provides a structural framework with which academicians can evaluate select attributes of educating believed to be common across disciplines. For editors Ian Kinchin and Naomi Winstone, the model is also suggestive of teacher resilience.

Exploring Pedagogic Frailty and Resilience measures four dimensions of the educative process: values (regulative discourse), theories versus practices (pedagogy and discipline), instructor focus (research-teaching nexus), and agency (locus of control). In this applied research, University of Surrey faculty and administrators from twelve departments (including chemistry, law, business, politics, acting, and learning development) provide written reflection upon a map-mediated interview. After each discipline-specific chapter, the editors provide a brief commentary highlighting points of interest relevant to educational research. The editors conclude the book by reiterating benefits of the model and noting implications of the research that include the following:

- concept mapping is a useful tool for surfacing values and beliefs as it offers structure and stimulus for reflection regarding regulative discourse (215);
- shifts in the pedagogy and discipline dimension from technical competence towards scholarly expertise necessitates a multidimensional package that goes beyond content knowledge (216);
- academic research may be pure or applied, which influences the ways it can be related to teaching (217); and
- with regard to locus of control, the regulation of teaching can be viewed as something done by others to restrict teaching or something teachers can engage in order to shape the development of the discipline (217).

While none of the contributors to this study are in religious studies, the insights shared from these award-winning scholars, teaching fellows, and administrators provide a range of thoughts and experiences beneficial to theological educators with responsibilities for assessing program requirements, deciding classroom assignments, creating syllabi, and determining tenure. Therefore, this book may prove helpful to post doctorates, junior faculty, curriculum developers, assessment specialists, and administrators in religious education settings in evaluating the effectiveness of curricular objectives of the institution as well as in reflecting upon one's teaching philosophy, deciding one's scholarly agenda, and assessing faculty or staff promotability. Moreover, the frailty model and the personal reflections on it are consistent with the evaluative recommendations of other education scholars including Parker Palmer who says we teach who we are; Stephen Brookfield who encourages critical reflection through the eyes of students, colleagues, theory, and personal experience; and bell hooks and Paulo Freire who advocate for teacher and student agency. Familiarity with the pedagogic frailty concept is helpful before engaging this text, which does provide tremendous insight on the practical application of the model. I recommend this book for faculty and administrators in religious education with course and personnel evaluative responsibilities.