

education for the attainment of these goals to all of its citizens" (p. 138). The goals are the pursuit of truth and knowledge. In other words, State involvement should not simply stop at training aimed at the acquisition of job skills, but rather the State must advocate for lifelong education as a right in that it improves collective life. The implied caveat, however, is that there needs to be a balancing of both individual and state interests.

Overall, Dame attempts to demonstrate that Rousseau's ideas are not outdated and that he not be excluded from the field of adult education. While we can always do with additional insights into the philosophy of adult education, and while Rousseau has leanings in the right direction, so do many others. It is difficult, however, to see him as a forefather of the movement.

Dame's central thesis is that Rousseau's "educational philosophy will enable us to receive worthwhile insights in educating adults to become contributing members of society and to change society for the better" (p. 27). In reality, this is likely the goal of all education adult or otherwise. If one asks does the book contribute to the literature on adult education, the answer would have to be "not particularly." If, however, one is looking for a primer on the educational and political philosophies of Jean Jacques Rousseau with some allusion to revolution, the reading time will have not been misspent.

*Jyllian Bonney*  
*Faculty of Education*  
*University of Calgary*  
*Calgary, Alberta, Canada*

Jipson, J. & Paley, N. (Eds.). (1997). *Daredevil research: Recreating analytic practice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 232 pp. (Softcover).

If one is to be titillated by provocative titles, Jipson and Paley's book certainly fulfills its goal. *Daredevil research* suggests to the reader some notion of risk and even, perchance, something new! Suffice to say "you can't tell a book by it's title!" What falls between the covers is another matter. This recent publication from the Peter Lang

Publishing Counterpoints series is less provocative than the title's claim. One could argue that some of the contributions are less about research and more about a kind of exhibitionism that is attempting to gain academic attention and legitimacy.

The introductory chapter is Jipson and Paley's attempt to describe their understanding of what many in qualitative research refer to as the crisis of representation; that is, the struggle we, in qualitative circles, have in articulating our research in modes which maintain the qualitative dimension of the research itself without being overly bound to the traditional forms of reporting inquiry. They make a claim for experimentation and the remaining chapters demonstrate some of the modes of representation they would consider as experimental. It becomes clear they wish to "raise questions about the status of pedagogic, representational, and research authority" (p. 5) as both political and epistemological issues which merit academic attention. Rather than to posit logical arguments they have chosen to demonstrate, through the various selections, how such independent inquiry can be reported.

It is not wholly clear that the editors themselves fully grasp all that they claim as "textual" content. A reader might wonder if the introduction is a bit like a promise that you will enjoy this because this is different and because it is different it is qualitatively superior to the usual research we read. Difference is not necessarily a sign of anything, much less improvement.

Having said this, the reader would find Anijar's and Bailey's chapters (Chapter 2 and Chapter 7) of considerable interest and merit. Anijar, on one hand, takes the reader on a journey of discovery of the cult surrounding the television series, *Star Trek*. It is an intriguing bit of research that reveals the exploitive power of the media through an articulation of the American myth. Anijar claims that "*Star Trek* rearticulates the American myth by displacing the myth in a futuristic technological setting, disguising the myth, reaffirming a monomyth and discourse for those who otherwise might have been alienated from the metaphors of the original discourse" (p. 48). Bailey, on the other hand, describes three stories of memory, crisis, and struggle as an early childhood educator who momentarily loses her position as teacher in the midst of classroom life. Both selections are representative of the intent of

the book in ways which clearly demonstrate the value of research which attempts to go beyond what is the norm in analysis.

The remainder of the book is pretty mundane content. Blumenfeld-Jones and Barone attempt to do some reporting that is, at best, confusing and, at its worst, boring. There is not much to be gained by a kind of split-screen approach in an academic book of this nature; in fact, it is annoying and troublesome to have to skip and to search for the line of thought supposedly occurring between the two speakers. Casey's "Drop-off/Pick-up Panic" and Holm's "Teenage Motherhood" appear as examples of research representation in a different mode raising the question of what counts as research. Jipson and Paley join in the challenge of representation in their visual essay called "Curriculum and its Unconscious." The final four chapters represent the work of both editors solo and in combination with graduate students. This is the most troubling and/or disconcerting section of the entire book for two reasons. First, if this is, indeed, research it is not clear how it makes any contribution to knowledge. Secondly, if this is research it is both superficial and artificial. The Jipson/Wilson account of their relationship as teacher/student throughout a graduate program suggests some going beyond the normal teacher/student relationship to something they name as "daredevil research" (p. 172). Somehow the connection is allusive. This article's attempt to be provocative fails miserably. Paley's "Neither Literal nor Conceptual" piece is precisely that. The title says it all! What follows is neither literal nor conceptual but it does take up space – negative space! The last two contributions represent what some may view as a new way to report research; that is, if one is willing to be duped into accepting this as research. Jipson and Munro's contribution called "Deconstructing Wo/mentoring" represents their attempt to reveal the wo/mentoring relationship between the female doctoral student and her female dissertation advisor claiming, of course, that women really do dissertation advising differently – in a kind of mothering manner. The final piece, reserved for the primary authors, reflects their celebration of having shed all aspects of methodology. There are no boundaries; no points of intersection; only free floating galaxies of words.

While this book serves as an example of the current struggle in research with matters of representation and how the practice of

writing research is being challenged, it does little to provide direction for those pursuing the seriousness of research. The question at hand has to do with the textuality of research and whether or not the representation (research text) mirrors the reality under scrutiny. If research is a social practice, then the contents of this particular book must be carefully scrutinized by the relevant research community that is, in this case, the educational research community. Does this book represent or reflect the world it claims to be representing or is it creating just another representation of a world? If this is "daredevil" research, as the title claims, what is the substance of this research?

Does textual practice alone confine research reporting to written documents? Is research to be confined within a mere textual practice? What counts as representation? Do the visual representations stand alone? Perhaps the question is not so much what is research but what is acceptable in the reporting of research? How do we reconcile the personal with the social in the practice of research? In a postmodern vein it may be that we are coming to the end of form and structure in matters of research representation and moving towards a formlessness that some might take as daredevil research. Perhaps it is that we are bedeviled by our own practices.

*Marlene Taylor*  
*Chair, Graduate Programs in Education*  
*Faculty of Education*  
*University of Regina*  
*Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada*

Egan, K. (1997). *The educated mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (hardcover).

In 1990 I read *Primary Understanding*, Kieran Egan's first book in his proposed tetralogy which was to show the nature of four different stages of understanding. *Romantic Understanding* followed, and although I found it less complete than *Primary Understanding*, I waited with anticipation for the third in the series, *Philosophic*