eclectically derived and successfully given spatial meaning. Development planning, however, cannot be based on good ideas alone. Somehow, these ideas must be put into an operational context, into a framework from which a clear and feasible development strategy can be drawn by planners. After all, the reader is told, the book is not philosophical but methodological (p 340). Disappointingly, it is on the methodological aspect that *The Development Process* has been least effective.

After an initial, strong proclamation that the thrust of the book is on "*how to use* spatial forms, structures, and organisations to concentrate energies for people in underdeveloped countries to engage in their own development" (p 12; reviewer's stress), Mabogunje sends the reader groping for the operational mechanics of the strategy or strategies implied in the worked 'how'. After groping through to the end, this reviewer emerged with a hollow feeling that *The Development Process* is methodologically a bag of good sounding ideas, rich in hyperboles, metaphors, and tautologies, but virtually lacking in originality and rigour. Co-operativisation, rank-size rule urbanisation, national integration, information flows, and so forth, are all nice and old concepts in development and academic literature. Mabogunje's greates contribution would perhaps have been to illustratively show exactly how, for example, a rank-size rule urbanisation structure could be achieved or approximated in, say, an African nation-state. One of the geographer's distinctive skills is that of translating loose, verbal spatial models into graphic spatial models of varying levels of abstraction and sophistication. For illustrative purposes, this skill could have been employed to good advantage in presenting such strategies as co-operativisation, rank-size urbanisation, or the rationalisation of information flows. A judicious use of such illustrations could have facilitated the no-geographer's appreciation of the value of the spatial perspective to socio-economic development.

In all, *The Development Process* has been quite successful in bringing together good ideas on the subject of Third World development. However, it is grossly vague in its methodological prescriptions.

The Unproductive School*

S.M. Kapunda **

Very few analytical publications on education for self-reliance in Tanzania are available. Those with a emphasis on economics are unlikely to be found on the book-shelves. Malyamkono, who is currently a Professor in Economics of Education at the University of Dar es Salaam with *Higher Education and Development in Eastern Africa* and *Training and Productivity in Eastern Africa*[2] among his recent publications is well qualified to write such a book. The title of his book is opposite to *Thoma's Productive School*[3]. Although a comparative study on the two books could be useful, it is beyond the scope of this review.

Maliyamkono starts by defining the unproductive school as "one in which there exists a negative balance of costs between the education received by those who attend school for the service of the school community the larger society and the individual himself, and the cost of providing the education" (p 1). Without explaining directly to the readers the reason(s) for the choice of the title, the author does not only assume a novelistic approach but ends his fifth chapter by sounding a warning: the production ability per student, 65.55 shillings, offsets the total expenditure on education by only 2.5 per cent; yet this is not why this book is entitled *The Unproductive School.*

The book is essentially based on 1974/75 findings, which may be considered as one of the limitation of the book. The study aims at determining the degree of growth and at examining utilisation patterns of both *producia* and *academia* — terms which the author has courageously introduced. From his definitions — *producia* refvers to activities which generate domestic or marketable produce — such as produce from shamba work, animal husbandry, commercial activities and services rendered by members of the school community (p 16); *academia* covers the range of academic activities per se.

With that aim in mind the author, after discussing the nature of the education industry and the fungind of the education system as a social service, spends a significant amount of time discussing the theoretical background leading to, what he calls, the possible *course of direction* which assumes a correct combination of *producia* and *academia*. If schools in regions record simultaneously highest yield (from *producia*) and highest examination passes, sthis would be considered as an indication of development of the model of possible course. Since, as he emphasizes, "from a pedagogical point of view such evidence would lead one to the assumption that what students learnt (*academia*) was related to what they did practically (*producia*) — neither activity hampered the other" (p 46).

However, using Spearman's rank-correlation coefficient formula, he finds the correlation to be 0.399 and 0.564 at .05 and 0.01 significance levels respectively — and deduces that ranking of shools in terms of production of *academia* and *producia* is not statistically significant. Furthermore, the author argues, with empirical evidence, that in general *academia* has been growing at a fester rate than *producia.* The general conclusion is finally reached — "The data show sufficient evidence that schools do not advance both *academia* and *producia*

Lecturer in Economics, University of Dar es Salaam.

*Maliyamkono T.L. 1982. The Unproductive School Dar es Salaam Africana Publishers

complementarily — hence the need to apply the *possible course of action approach*" (p 50). It may argued that this is probably the reason, or one of the reasons, leading to the book's title — *The Unproductive School.*

In general, the theoretical, mathematical and statistical analyses leading to the empirical evidence is creditable. However, in some cases, further clarification may be useful to readers. For instance, the mathematical argument: QaPa—QpPp = 1 (p 32) may need at least a clarifying footnote. A more important aspect is the economietric approach. The author ran a regression analysis of eleven independent variables:

(i) management of self-help activities;
(ii) number of passes in the 'O' Level examination for 1974/75;
(iii) failure record in the same year;
(iv) degree of involvement by some members of the community;
(v) available labour tools per student;
(vi) sex;
(vii) day/boarding case;
(viii) sex;
(ix) seniority of school;
(x) location
(xi) public or private ownership; and
(xii) size of school.

The dependent variable was the average earning from *producia* activities. Since most of the information is neither clarified nor displayed some comments are in order. Firstly, it is important that readers, especially those who are interested in an econometric approach, should be exposed to some clarification or discussion of the choice of these variables, education — economic theory and specification of the mathematical function(s) used and the reason(s) for the choice. Secondly, problems related to quantification of the variables, e.g. those related to use of dummy variables; related variables, such as passes and failures, and multicollinearity problems, need at least all appendix clarification.

Although it was not the intention of the author to focus on primary education but post-primary education/higher education in discussing the issue of education and income distribution (see the emphasis on pp 6 and 17) the following is worth considering: A good number of primary school leavers especially those with good basis in scientific and technical courses tend to be well-off as peasants, technicians and 'masters' of other crafts. Some are involved in top village activities and management — village secretaries, teachers and so on. A study which concludes that many successful farmers in villages are at least ex-primary school leavers and not the ones who did not see the inside of the school, would not surprise some readers.

In fact, some authorities well-versed in public finance, income distribution and education have argued that primary education has a significant role in income distribution.

Indeed it has even been argued that Adult Education through functional education (which is relevant to learners activities) and through a scientific approach (which helps in breaking taboos and superstitions which hamper development) has a significant role in improving the standard of living of the (rural) people.

Finally, in the second edition the publisher should check a few areas with minor errors in order for the book to move from draft quality.

In general, however, *the Unproductive School* remains a very useful book to the intended readers and the included policy implications are equally important and should stimulate further research in this area.

1. Maliyamkono, T.L.; G. Ishumi & S.J. Welss; 1982 *Higher Education and Development in Eastern Africa* (Heinemann: London).

2. Maliyamkono, T.L.; A.G. Ishumi, & S.J. Wells & Migot Adholla 1982. *Training and Production in Eastern Africa* (Heinemann: London).

3. Thomas, J.A; 1979 *The Productive School: A Systems Analysis Approach to Educational Administration* (Wiley: New York).

4. See, for example: Bird, R.M.; 1974 "Public Finance and Inequalities" in *Finance and Development VIII.*

   Berry A & M Umatia 1976 *Income Distribution in Colombia* (YUP). Hoerr O.D; 1973 "Education, Income and Equity in Malaysia" in *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 21 (2).

   Kapunda, S.M; 1981 "Provision of Education, Development and Income Redistribution in Tanzania" (Unpublished paper: University of Toronto).

5. See, for example, articles by Kuhanga, N.A; Budd, L.H; and Kassm, Y.O; 1975 in Institute of Adult Education (Tanzania) *Literacy Discussion* Vol. VI (UNESCO).