how and *when* the development of what Green (91) terms 'critical musicality' (defined as 'being able to listen to music more attentively and knowledgably') might most effectively be supported.

Overall this is a fascinating book that says much about the potential for fostering deep engagement with music within classroom contexts. It also raises some interesting questions relating to how musicians from diverse genres may enhance one another's practice and performance by sharing of learning strategies. Lucy Green concludes by acknowledging the limitations of the project and highlighting many issues that demand further investigation. This is a highly readable and thought-provoking book that will be of interest to anyone who is concerned with the musical development of young people.

References

Creech, A., I. Papageorgi, L. Haddon, J. Potter, F. Morton, C. Duffy et al. 2008a. From music student to professional: The process of transition. *British Journal of Music Education* 25, no. 3: 315–31.
Creech, A., I. Papageorgi, J. Potter, L. Haddon, C. Duffy, F. Morton et al. 2008b. Investigating musical performance: Commonality and diversity amongst classical and non-classical musicians. *Music Education Research* 10, no. 2: 215–44.
Daniel, R. 2001. Self-assessment in performance. *British Journal of Music Education* 18, no. 3: 215–26.
Hallam, S., A. Creech, and I. Papageorgi. 2007. *EMI Music Sound Foundation: Evaluation of the impact of additional training in the delivery of music at Key Stage 1*. London: Institute of Education.
Nicol, D., and C. Milligan. 2006. Rethinking technology – Supported assessment practices in relation to the seven principles of good feedback practice. In *Innovative assessment in higher education,* ed. C. Bryan and K. Clegg, 64–77. London: Routledge.
Sinclair, H., and C. Kamii. 1970. Some implications of Piaget's theory for teaching young children. *The School Review* 78, no. 2: 169–83.

Andrea Creech
Institute of Education, University of London
a.creech@ioe.ac.uk

The handbook of academic writing: a fresh approach, by Rowena Murray and Sarah Moore, Maidenhead, Open University Press, 2006, 183 pp., £18.99 (paperback), ISBN 0-33-521933-0

The cracking of this particular book spine is likely to be followed by sighs of relief and the odd rueful chuckle, as many readers discover they are 'not the only one' harbouring half-finished papers, secretly filed along with the resultant feelings of guilt and inadequacy. In this book Murray and Moore explore the possible reasons for academics' underproduction of written work, providing a wealth of practical advice on how to get started on a writing project, and how to maintain motivation and momentum in a busy and demanding environment. By examining the complexities of the writing challenge and setting out developmental (as opposed to remedial) responses, Murray and Moore also raise interesting questions about the extent of institutional responsibility for development in this area of academic practice, hitherto assumed to be adequately covered by the 'apprentice model' of the PhD.

Bemoaning lack of time for academic writing seems to have become a formal requirement of even the most casual exchange between academics, the implication often being that the would-be writers are champing at the bit, battling to emerge from the mire of tedious tasks keeping them from their computer keyboards. However, Murray and Moore, in an entirely non-judgemental manner, reveal a far more complex and interesting picture. They open by conduct-

ing an examination of the various barriers (both practical and psychological) which impede progress in writing for publication for many academics, drawing on the literature and their own developmental experience and research. In doing so, they bring to light a set of issues which are seldom discussed in open forum. Taboo topics such as lack of confidence, fear of failure and low motivation are discussed in a refreshingly matter-of-fact tone, as the authors propose a series of 'paradoxes' which they see as being at the heart of under-publication. They describe a 'starting /finishing' paradox, which sees academics embarking on writing projects with enthusiasm only to find themselves in a 'psychologically dangerous' position where fears arise, causing the writer to abandon the project; they propose that in order to get through this stage techniques may be used to make the writing feel 'safe'. They also define a 'public/private' paradox – where writers get stuck due to tensions between the need to work privately on early drafts, and the need to receive feedback from peers.

In addition to psychological barriers, they also deal with practical issues such as tackling time frames, highlighting that lack of time is consistently cited as the single biggest factor in impeding progress in writing. However, the focus throughout is pragmatic rather than polemical; the tensions inherent in the fragmented and overloaded contemporary academic role are acknowledged with regret, but never allowed to dominate or to lead the writers to produce strategic or cynical advice for their readership. Although writing is occasionally referred to as a 'game', the emphasis is on the value of intrinsic motivation rather than the pursuit of exclusively extrinsic goals. The focus throughout is on practical, tested strategies for actually getting round to writing for publication, and sticking at it to the (maybe not-so-bitter?) end.

In common with recent work on student academic literacies, this book presents a challenge to the implicit assumptions of a bygone elite system: that ability and achievement in academic writing is gained largely by osmosis; that writers 'ought' to know how to go about it anyway; and that any hesitation is due to deficiency. Instead, issues surrounding emotion, identity and transformation are acknowledged and linked to writing in a reflexive paradigm. These issues are explicitly tackled via practical strategies which emphasise reflection, peer feedback and support structures for writers.

In the second part of the book they detail three types of interventions they have used: writers' retreats, writing for publication programmes, and writers' groups; each approach providing protected space, structured development and feedback, in differing degrees. Intriguingly, they report that attendance at writers' retreats has been overwhelmingly female, speculating that women may respond to the writing challenge differently from men, and are perhaps more drawn to this type of collaborative environment. In addressing emotional points, the authors occasionally employ a therapeutic, 'self-help' discourse – e.g. with exhortations to work towards a 'healthier' and 'more positive' attitude towards writing – this slant may alienate some readers. However, in the context of the isolation and negative emotions reported by some of their informants, this focus on empathy and confidence-building seems wholly justified. They conclude by proposing a scholarly ethos which is more collaborative and less aggressively competitive and individualistic – although in seeking to renegotiate the rules of engagement, they perhaps implicitly criticise the natural loner, the reluctant reflector, and those who actually relish an atmosphere of fierce competition. Overall though, there is clearly much to be gained from providing this type of institutional support for the many likely to benefit from it. They conclude by proposing a useful structural model designed to map out 'facilitators' and 'prohibitors' of writing, and factors residing in the individual and the environment; they also present a 'process' model which emphasises the need for contemplative, less active 'retreat' phases as well as more active, productive 'advances'.

One criticism might be that too much is attributed to difficulties with writing per se, as opposed to other aspects of practice. The authors are clearly working within an iterative

process model which views writing as integrated or even identical with learning, rather than regarding writing as a transparent means of display; in the context of research writing, this process is often tightly interwoven with the research processes themselves. Although this is acknowledged, greater emphasis could perhaps have been placed on the fuzziness of these boundaries between research, critical interpretation of literature and the production of writing; and the fact that the obstacles to publication for some academics may in fact reside in lack of confidence when conducting the actual research, rather than in the writing up alone. However, a full examination of this issue lies beyond the scope of this extremely useful book.

The authors provide a highly useful reflective and practical framework for the individual academic, which is likely to be well received by new and more experienced writers. But perhaps more importantly, they raise fundamental questions about assumed limits and potential scope of development in an area where traditionally academics have effectively been expected to 'sink or swim'. In doing so, they implicitly challenge common assumptions as to the role of the individual researcher/writer, and ultimately ask questions about the locus of responsibility for developing written scholarship throughout academic careers.

Lesley Gourlay
King's College, London
lesley.gourlay@kcl.ac.uk

From knowledge to wisdom: a revolution for science and the humanities, 2nd edition, by Nicholas Maxwell, London, Pentire Press, 2007, 484 pp., £8.99 (paperback), ISBN 0-95-522400-3

Immanuel Kant, towards the end of *Critique of Pure Reason*, identifies three fundamental questions that reason, in its different forms, can try to answer:
What can I know?
What ought I to do?
What may I hope?
Over many years the philosopher of science Nicholas Maxwell has been engaged in a project that one could describe as seeking to promote a correct understanding of the relationship between these questions, interpreted as questions not for individuals but for humanity collectively. Regular readers of *London Review of Education* will have encountered Maxwell's ideas as recently as July 2007, in a special edition on wisdom for which Maxwell served as co-editor. His own article in that issue, 'From Knowledge to Wisdom: The Need for an Academic Revolution', could serve as an excellent summary of the contents of this book.

Modern academic inquiry, Maxwell complains, has been devoted overwhelmingly to the pursuit of knowledge. But the fundamental aim of intellectual inquiry is to find answers to the question of what we should do, in a world in which humanity faces urgent problems of climate change, war, and injustice. The acquisition of knowledge must serve this more fundamental aim. Unless we can find 'cooperatively rational' ways of addressing our problems of living, the best we can hope for is dire.

For this central message, *From Knowledge to Wisdom*, published in its first edition in 1984, had and still has the potential to be a very important book. Given Maxwell's own statement of priorities, the book demands to be assessed not only for its intellectual quality but also for its capacity to effect some practical change. Against this background it is a pity that it is not a better book than it is. It reads as if Maxwell was never quite sure what readership he was