

to education, training, and full-time employment. The research and case studies could be used as models for future programs and policies. This volume reinforces the fact that many have not experienced a textbook linear progression from education to work to retirement, and that the non-linear route is more likely the norm for many people. The editors end the text with useful suggestions for improvements in policy and practice as well as ideas for future research focus.

Corina Walsh
Mount Saint Vincent University

PASSION AND POLITICS: ACADEMICS REFLECT ON WRITING FOR PUBLICATION

Eileen Carnell, Jacqui MacDonald, Bet McCallum, Mary Scott (Eds.). Institute of Education, University of London, London, 2008, 220 pages.

Even amidst the dramatic changes besetting the U.K.'s post-secondary institutions, this volume still offers rich insights about the realities of academic writing and publishing. The co-editors base their text on interviews with colleagues from the University of London's Institute of Education. All of these colleagues—selected to represent a balance of gender, disciplines, specialisms, and career experiences—have held senior positions with the Institute, have published extensively and successfully, and have distinguished records of contributing to education, theory and policy, and research. Additionally, a few have worked in areas of translation, most have worked as editors of others' works, and almost all have participated in collaborative writing arrangements. What the editors collectively offer as "academic publication" is refreshingly broad, including empirical studies, journal articles, books, reviews, syntheses, materials for teachers and students, press releases, writing for politicians, and fiction. Potentially, then, this work presents an impressive and substantive collective expertise on academic writing for publication. Happily, this proves the case.

The text itself is structured in two parts. Part I (constituting one third of the book) is divided into nine chapters that outline the history of the study, profile the 18 authors, illustrate the "rite of passage narratives" of each writer, and then focus more closely on the particulars of how authors actually go about writing. These latter chapters include, for instance, how writers find time, produce texts, locate themselves in debates, choose their writing tools and arrangements, accommodate the "game" of academic publication, and link writing with thinking and learning. Chapter 9 offers a useful summary and commentary on Part I, including references. Part II presents the transcripts of the interviews with each writer. The volume concludes with two brief appendices detailing the conduct of the research and the interview questions framing the areas of inquiry.

Though the structure of the text creates some redundancy (pithy quotes appear both as excerpts and in transcripts; summaries of the research are offered in multiple locations),

on balance this is a minor issue in a genuinely engaging volume. Largely this is due to the clear intention of the editors to reflect the approach that persuasive and effective writing is *situated* (“I can’t expect my reader to listen to me if I’m not listening to my reader.”). Taking that to heart, the co-editors appear to have constructed the volume especially for two distinct audiences.

The first is those interested in (or daunted by) writing for academic publication. The interviewed writers are vivid, personal, and generous in their extensive accounts of personal processes, false starts, dead ends, critical interventions of mentors and engaged readers, joyous moments of insight, early and later career strategies, the oddities of satisfying versus successful writing, and the loneliness and uncertainty of breaking new theoretical ground. As well as numerous practical tips and lucid self-reflections on how to “ink” a new set of ideas, what comes across powerfully is how consistently writers, writing, and audiences evolve with each other as conversations occur over time through texts, as writers gain confidence, and as readers and society at large challenge/ignore/validate new interpretations of ideas. This seems a message especially well constructed for those who are intimidated because they imagine writing (of any sort) comes easily or because they assume complex ideas appear intact and coherent rather than through careful attention, deep engagement with the critical insights of others, and an ability to live with ambiguity. As such, novice academic writers, and their teachers, would find many of these exchanges useful, accessible, and reassuring. So too would those critical adult educators who wish to illuminate the value of linking writing with thinking and learning.

The co-editors also successfully address a second audience—those interested in replicating this study for other institutions and contexts. For this audience, the co-editors summarize succinctly their study rationale and scope, locate their approach in academic literature, and even offer their precise protocols. Additionally, the co-editors model their own initial analyses (in the three-page introduction and interspersed in comments throughout Part I) and include thoughtful reflections on the study so far, as well as indicate intentions for future studies (Chapter 9).

An obvious strength of the book also paradoxically constitutes its weakness: its concentration on the U.K. There is extensive (and scathing) commentary from a number of writers on the impact of the U.K.’s Research Assessment Exercise on academic writing and publication. The text also, of necessity, is dominated by the relationships of U.K. publishers with the authors. Readers and educators from outside the U.K. have to modify, re-frame, and even ignore some of the content of the book to make sense of it, though suggestive instruction for how to do this is given in those few interviews in which writers speak about writing in translation or for academic publishers interested in linguistically and analytically different kinds of studies.

Finally, this is fundamentally a book about the importance and privilege of writing successfully to influence social progress, and it makes for a heartening tale. The authors clearly feel this calling, and are committed to “. . . imagin[ing] a new kind of future . . . a feasible future . . . trying to put into the world ideas that could, in the best of all possible

worlds, have a realistic chance of being achievable.” The co-editors have made a strong, inspirational, and provocative contribution in showing readers *how* these authors write for such purposes and what is involved in bringing their voices into successfully framing some of the most compelling educational discussions of our times.

Adrienne Burk
Simon Fraser University

MORE THAN IT SEEMS: HOUSEHOLD WORK AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Margrit Eichler, Patrizia Albanese, Susan Ferguson, Nicky Hyndman, Lichun Willa Liu, and Ann Matthews. Women’s Press, Toronto, 2010, 280 pages.

This expansive work seeks to fill a large gap in the scholarship on lifelong learning in Canada. By illustrating the many types of “unstructured” and “incidental” learning that occur during the informal process of engaging in household work, Eichler, Albanese, Ferguson, Hyndman, Liu, and Matthews (2010) describe for their readers of the rich and diverse learning that can occur within the home (p. 6). Eichler et al. invest household work with the recognition that it deserves, in an effort to effect changes to social discourses, policy, and systems that position household workers, both paid and unpaid, as inferior non-learners. Naming and affirming the menial and repetitive tasks of *housework*, as well as the creative and sustaining nurturance of *carework*, their combination of research, analysis, and narrative cautions their readers not to engage in blatant reductionism that characterizes household work as necessary, yet virtually insignificant.

In cooperation with the Work and Lifelong Learning research network (WALL), headed up by David Livingstone of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Eichler, an OISE professor, teamed up with Albanese, an associate professor at Ryerson, and four OISE graduate students to compile this book. The authors’ research concludes that not only is much of the work undertaken and accomplished within the home unpaid or underpaid, it is often downplayed by the mostly women who perform it. This book incorporates firsthand accounts of household workers struggling to identify and claim their learning rather than dismiss it as isolating, repetitive, and lacking in affirmation (p. 185). At the same time it gives voice to the insight of the most vulnerable among household workers by contextualizing the things they “should not have to learn:” denial, discrimination, harassment, neglect, and poverty (pp. 107, 142, 177, 205).

This publication seeks to reveal the assumptions that underlie both the lack of recognition and marginalization of household work. First, the authors challenge the notion that household workers do not serve the needs of society as a whole; their research disproves that paid household workers perform tasks that are only necessary to less significant members of society, such as mothers and their children, the disabled, the infirm, and the aged, while unpaid household workers’ efforts benefit only themselves and their dependents.