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In the field of international development, different decades seem to usher in new champions of change: the developmental state in the 1960s and 1970s; free market forces and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the 1980s and 1990s. The new millennium has offered up a hybrid variant of public-private partnerships (PPPs)… partnership has become a mobilising term implying all manner of desirable objectives can be achieved. (Utting and Zammit 2006, p.1)

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, significant changes in the governance of education systems have been put into place as international institutions, governments, firms, philanthropies and consultants have promoted more hybrid partnership arrangements, involving new combinations of state and non-state actors engaged in a range of activities within the education sector. These newer forms of education governance often operate across scales, through interactions between local, regional and national governments and intergovernmental organizations, and between these and national and transnationally configured profit firms, philanthropists, NGOs and religious organizations.

A wide range of terms have now emerged to capture these developments, though arguably in the international community it is the term Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) that has been globalized and acquired iconic status. At the broadest level, PPPs can be defined as ‘cooperative institutional arrangements between public and private sector actors’, or more elaborately as ‘…cooperation of some sort of durability between public and private actors, in which they jointly develop products and services and share risks, costs and resources which are connected with these products’ (Hodge, Greave and Boardman 2010, p.4).

Based largely on papers presented at a symposium held in 2009 at the University of Amsterdam,¹ this volume brings together both academics and
researchers from a variety of international organizations and aid agencies to
explore the complexities of PPPs as a resurgent, hybrid mode of educational
governance that operates across scales, from the community to the global.
The volume’s authors draw from different disciplines (economics, sociol-
ogy, political science and comparative education, among others); they look at
different types of partnership arrangements; and take different positions about
the value of PPPs. An initial section of the book contains chapters exploring
how PPPs, as a policy idea, have been constructed in transnational agendas for
educational development and circulated globally. A second group of chapters
looks at the role played by a new generation of multilateral and transnational
private sector actors (including the World Trade Organization, the International
Financial Corporation, transnational corporations, venture philanthropies and
international nongovernmental organizations). In a final section are chapters
exploring the role and implications of PPPs in developing countries, providing
arguments both for, and against, an expanding reliance on PPPs in national
educational systems.

Before turning to these chapters, this introduction provides a brief overview
of the origins, evolution and conceptual debates that frame current research on
PPPs in education. It explores the challenge of defining public and private roles
in education; and by corollary, of conceptualizing PPPs themselves. We review
different ways of understanding the historical resurgence of interest in PPPs
over the last two decades, and discuss some of the leading actors involved in
PPPs at the global level. A review of expanding forms of PPPs at the national
level is offered based on findings from chapters in this volume.

THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE AND THE PUBLIC
IN EDUCATION

Defining and unpacking the distinction between public and private roles in
education is an indispensible starting point for any conversation about PPPs.
Most educators and a majority of the authors in this volume take for granted
the idea that educational systems are putatively public, precisely because they
play a role in contributing to the public good. Yet private contributions, from
families, civil society and through the business sectors, have long played an
important role in the development of these putatively public systems.

Differentiating the public sphere from the private has been a target of
debate since Ancient Greece (with Plato pondering the two realms), through
the Middle Ages and into the sixteenth century, with political philosophers
including More, Locke and Hobbes struggling with associated definitional
issues (Mansbridge 1998). A basic understanding dictates that the ‘private
is contrasted with public to characterize that which lies beyond the states’
boundaries, such as the market…’ (Starr 1988, p. 8). Therefore, any educational actor or organization that is apart from the State can be defined as ‘private.’

However, in reality this distinction is not so clear-cut. For example, are religious or community schools that are funded by the public purse to be considered public or private entities? How does one categorize public schools which charge fees for enrolment? As Verger and Robertson point out in this volume, defining what is (and what is not) ‘public education’ is a recurring point of conceptual dispute in the World Trade Organization (WTO) educational negotiations. In the context of the Trade in Services Council of the WTO, Switzerland tried to solve this dispute by stating that private providers who fulfill the education standards fixed by the government can be part of the public education system (regardless of whether they are national or foreign in origin), should be considered to be providing a ‘public service’. It is equally opaque in OECD efforts to monitor private participation in educational systems, where countries like Canada and the Netherlands, typically described in World Bank publications as benefiting from large state-aided private education systems, are presented as having close to 100 per cent enrolment in public sector schools (OECD, 2010). As Starr concludes: ‘Many things seem to be public and private at the same time in varying degrees or in different ways. As a result, we quarrel endlessly about whether some act or institution is really one or the other’ (1988, p. 7).

Education exemplifies these quarrels, for it presents a case of a service, or institution, considered by many to be significant in both the public and private spheres. Levin describes ‘the peculiar nature of education’:

It addresses public interests by preparing the young to assume adult roles in which they can undertake civic responsibilities, embrace a common set of values, participate in a democratic polity with a given set of rules, and embrace the economic, political, and social life which constitute the foundation for the nation. All of this is necessary for an effectively, functioning democracy, economy, and society…At the same time, education must address the private interests of students and their families by providing a variety of forms of development which will enhance individual economic, social, cultural, and political benefits for the individual… Embedded in the same educational experience are outcomes that can contribute to the overall society as well as those which can provide private gains to the individual. (2000, p. 3)

As Levin’s comments suggest, even the expectation that private interests are antithetical to the ‘public good’ raises challenges, because educational outcomes serve private as well as public interests – and in many ways these outcomes are inextricably linked through gains in the productivity and civic efficacy of the individual learner, which in turn contribute to firms, societies and states. Thus the notion of the public good (and the role of the private in achieving this) ‘will probably always be, and should be, a contested subject’ (Mansbridge 1998, p.4).
Most current classifications of public and private are informed by the discipline of economics, which contrasts the ‘market’ to the ‘state’. To methodologically and analytically determine what constitutes a public or private good, Paul Samuelson’s theory of public goods delineates those goods which are not adequately provided by the market, basing this distinction on the notions of non-rivalrousness and non-excludability. The normative implication in the field of economics is that the public sector should only take on issues or services where there is market failure.

However, scholars in other disciplines take a less fixed view of private-public distinctions, seeing both the state and the market, and therefore the public and the private, as historical and cultural constructs. The distinction between the public vs. private is therefore understood as something that has evolved based on specific types of exchange relations in human society, and the development of different social and political orders. From this more culturalist viewpoint, the construction of public-private distinctions deserves careful interrogation. For example, as both Fraser and Waring have argued, crystallization of notions of the public and private spheres have shaped the social and economic roles of women (Waring 1999).

Looking beyond conceptualizing the public from the private, the notion that there is a clearly defined group of private actors who share similar interests that can be characterized in opposition to the state seems far too simplistic. Inside the category of the private in education, for example, actors may include households and students (paying fees, demanding quality), not-for-profit organizations, citizen groups, religious bodies and other organizations dependent on public funding; as well as for profit businesses, each with different motives and relationships to the state and to the market. Important distinctions exist among these different categories of actors and the PPP mechanisms they sponsor. Yet definitions of PPPs have typically described private actors as any group that is ‘not’ the State – conflating for-profit and not-for-profit actors. For many economists, the distinction between for-profit institutions and nonprofit institutions is not salient, because either type of provider can have a contractual relationship that makes it more directly responsive to users than government providers of those services. For others, for-profit provision suggests a conflict of interest with the public good.

In the context of globalization, the debate about public vs. private roles in education becomes even more complex. For example, education can be considered a ‘global public good’, where cross-border and intergenerational impacts of education are taken into account (Kaul et al. 1999; Menashy 2009; 2011). On the other hand, within an emerging global knowledge economy, education is also portrayed as essential to individual competitiveness (a private good accruing to the individual) and to the economic competitiveness of nations,
regions and cities (a public good accruing at the national and subnational rather than the global scale).

In discussions about PPPs, one constant appears to be the addition of roles or weight for the ‘private’. Each of the chapters in this book describes a dimension of this ‘additionality’. And while the authors tackle definitional and normative debates about the public vs. private sphere in education in different ways, all raise two key governance questions: In new partnerships arrangements, who wins and who loses? And who has the power to decide?

THE RISE OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN EDUCATION

Given the discussion above, it should not be surprising to find that the term ‘public private partnerships’ has a diverse range of meanings and is portrayed as including many different policy tools and mechanisms of governance. This has led Hodge and Greve (2010) to suggest we should view PPPs as both a ‘language game’ and a ‘governance arrangement’.

Defined as a shift in ‘governance arrangements’, the rise of the term PPPs can be traced to the late 1980s, when its usage began to invoke new or additional roles for private actors in putatively public spheres of action (Bexell and Morth 2010; Bull and McNeill 2007; Rosenau 2000; Wettenhall 2003). This is not to suggest that the private sector has historically played a minor role in education. Far from it! Around the world, education systems have often included ‘durable relationships’ between the public and the private sector. From faith-based organizations and small proprietary schools, to local community organizations and philanthropies, and to textbook manufacturers, testing bodies and construction firms – all have been vigorously engaged in a range of educational activities. Yet as documented by a multitude of educational researchers and practitioners, and by authors in this book, the term PPPs has been associated with a sharp resurgence of interest in, and participation of, new kinds of private actors in educational governance.

In this volume, chapters by Robertson and Verger, Ginsburg, as well as by Ron-Balsera and Marphatia, explain this rising interest in private participation in educational systems by reference to shifts in the global political economy. They suggest that neoliberal globalization, as captured in pressure to downsize the state and open public services to greater competition from the domestic and international private sector (alongside structural adjustment and the growth of international private sector education service providers), have shaped the global resurgence of interest in public private partnerships in education. Draxler takes a somewhat different tack. She argues that the rising influence of transnational corporations in the global political economy has increased
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pressure on international organizations to expand PPPs. Yet these partnership mechanisms, as argued by Draxler, Srivastava and Oh, Bhanji, and van Fleet in this volume, often develop without a clear understanding of the driving force of business interests in such relationships.

The term PPPs can also be understood as a ‘language game’ that is used by different policy actors to convey their position on the appropriate roles for, and the comparative advantages of, state vs. private sector roles in education. Many chapters in this book document the emergence of specific networks or partnerships among global policy actors who have acted as advocates for (or critics of) the expansion of privately provided educational services. As argued in this volume, the term ‘public private partnerships’ is a semantic umbrella that can cover quite heterogeneous phenomena, ranging from straight-out private service provision, to contractually-based service arrangements, to less formal types of collaboration and partnership between the private sector, private philanthropic organizations and governments, based on trust and joint commitment to the common good. While different actors and networks of actors have found common ground in the term PPPs, when their usage of the term is unpacked, sharp differences in expectations about lead actors, basic mechanisms and motivations often emerge.

For example, economists working within international organizations have typically preferred a more precise and narrow definition of PPPs – one that is focused on a contract made by a government with a private service provider to acquire services ‘of a defined quantity and quality at an agreed price for a specified period’ (Patrinos et al. 2009, p.31; see also the definition employed by the IFC in Chapter 5 p.85–86). This type of PPP definition is utilized by the World Bank and in Chapter 10 of this volume composed by two economists from the World Bank. While the educational services in this definition of PPPs may include (i) management, maintenance and support services; (ii) operation services (such as pure management); and (iii) infrastructure; the focus is primarily on those PPPs where the government guides policy and provides financing while the private sector delivers education services to students. Such a definition shares similarities with the one utilized by the OECD, which defines PPPs as an ‘…agreement between government and a private partner(s) (that may include the operators and financiers) according to which the private partner(s) deliver the service in such a manner that the service delivery objectives of government are aligned with the profit objectives of the private partner(s) and where the effectiveness of alignment depends on a sufficient transfer of risk to the private partner(s)’ (OECD 2008, p.17).

In contrast to the language of direct contracts between national governments and private sector service providers, a softer and more encompassing notion of PPPs sees them as joint initiatives between private, philanthropic and public sector actors aimed at achieving the public good. Here we come closer to the
term ‘multistakeholder partnerships’ utilized by the United Nations and by Draxler in this volume. In this definition, PPPs are characterized by ‘…the pooling and managing of resources, as well as the mobilization of competences and commitments by public business and civil society partners to contribute to the expansion and quality of education’ (2008, p. 16).

Such a conception of PPPs is much closer to that of Rosenau (2000), where the idea of partnership is less driven by a formal contract for specific services, and more by the view that the pooling of different resources and competencies can contribute to better quality outcomes in education. In this looser definition of public private partnerships, arrangements can vary tremendously based on a number of factors. For instance, who are the actors involved? Is there a ‘lead’ actor, or coordination between actors? What are the motivations behind the partnerships? At what scale does the partnership operate?

GLOBAL PPP INITIATIVES AND MECHANISMS IN EDUCATION

Generally, on a global scale, PPPs have been framed using the softer and more encompassing definition above, focusing on shared objectives in achieving the public good. Yet as argued by many authors in this volume it is important that such a ‘rose-tinted’ take on partnerships does not obscure the surprising variety of PPP mechanisms emerging globally and important questions of power, motivation, sovereignty, citizenship and social justice that are raised by them.

In this volume several chapters look at how multilateral (intergovernmental) organizations act as advocates or critics of policies encouraging a more robust role for the private sector in education. Organizations within the United Nations have tended to take a positive, though cautious, approach to PPPs; one that aims to leverage the strengths and resources available from corporations, whilst privileging public sector delivery of services. For example, UNESCO – the UN body with an educational mandate – has advocated publicly-provided educational services, while also promoting special initiatives to improve schooling that utilize funding and technical or business know-how from the private sector. Another example, described by Bhanji, is the UN Global Compact, which brings together corporate leaders around a set of corporate social responsibility initiatives (Bhanji 2008). In education, the Education Fast Track Initiative is a partnership that includes governance roles for corporate actors (represented by the World Economic Forum) as well as governments, intergovernmental organizations and civil society actors committed to accelerating access to basic education.

International financial institutions are a special instance of public private partnerships. In one sense, they are PPPs in their own right, because they utilize
publicly collected funds from member governments to raise private finance that is in turn loaned out to low- and middle-income country governments for educational reform. In critical international political economy approaches, the IMF and the World Bank are described as setting in place interlocking policy conditionalities that force governments to enhance the role of the private sector in the delivery of public services (see chapters by Robertson and Verger and Ron-Balsera and Marphatia in this volume; see also Alexander 2002; Mehrotra and Delamonica 2005). According to Ginsburg, bilateral aid agencies, including USAID and DfID, have also used funding, technical assistance and research to advocate for increased private participation in the form of subsidies and vouchers (DfID 1999; USAID 2006; 2011). However, other scholars view the advocacy of public private partnerships by IFIs and other official donors as a warranted response to state failure and to the greater efficiencies achievable through such mechanisms (see, for example, Heyneman 2003; Heyneman 2011; Patrinos et al. 2009).

In this volume, Mundy and Menashy’s chapter adds to the debate about IFIs and PPPs by providing the first published research on the International Financial Corporation (IFC) and education. The IFC is the private sector arm of the World Bank Group, which uses capital from the World Bank’s members to invest in private education businesses. The IFC also supports the expansion of educational markets by providing technical assistance, research and advisory services. While Mundy and Menashy question the distributional and poverty impacts of IFC investments, showing how the IFC diverges from the World Bank Group’s overarching poverty mandate, they also suggest that the notion of the IFC and the World Bank strategically combining forces to achieve an expansion of private provision may be exaggerated.

Verger and Robertson explore another important multilateral actor in education PPPs: the World Trade Organization (WTO). Their chapter shows how the WTO’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (the GATS) and the associated intergovernmental trade negotiations have created global regulatory frameworks that are highly conducive to private sector development in education, gradually opening up national education systems to competition and potential claims from national and international for-profit providers. They raise several questions concerning the legal and political implications of GATS, including the possible impacts of the agreement on public education and educational global governance. The chapter argues that the most critical implications for education may arise from the replication of the GATS rules, principles and procedures in many other trade agreements of a bilateral and regional scope.
GLOBAL PPP INITIATIVES LED BY CORPORATE ACTORS

This book also highlights a growing variety of global PPPs led and initiated by private sector (corporate) actors. At the global level, private-led PPP mechanisms include direct corporate contributions to educational institutions; arms-length corporate philanthropies; as well as for-profit firms that provide technical, research and testing services, and educational materials.

Over the past two decades, corporations have become steadily more involved in sponsoring international educational programmes (see Chapters 2, 3, 4 in this volume). As Zahra Bhanji has documented, the mechanisms used by corporations and the motivations that drive their engagement in education ranges from business sustainability to philanthropy (Bhanji 2008; this volume). In Chapter 7, she provides a case study of Microsoft’s Partners in Learning programme (PiL). PiL blends philanthropy and business sustainability objectives, with the business/marketing division of a corporation providing finance, products, technical service and training to the public education system. In examining the PiL programme in two countries, Bhanji shows how two different models of PPPs are utilized. In South Africa, where there is strong national support for open-source software and scepticism about the role of private corporations in public spaces, Microsoft provided free computers and software and utilized nongovernmental intermediaries to deliver training to educators and students. In Jordan, where Microsoft faced less public sector resistance, it provided more limited access to free products. It also chose to work primarily through subcontracted private technology firms who provided training and services.

Chapters by Srivastava and Oh and van Fleet in this volume also explore the role of foundations and corporate philanthropy as a form of public private partnership in education. Srivastava and Oh (Chapter 7) look broadly at the evolution of foundation-giving in education, noting in particular the growth of ‘venture philanthropy’ as a new modality for giving and also citing the recent rise of Southern corporate foundations in the BRIC economies. They note that while foundations are often used to illustrate the softer, more locally consultative end of the PPP spectrum, very little recent research in fact exists on the motivations and impact of their educational activities. Van Fleet (Chapter 8) studies the growing involvement of US-based corporations in education. He shows that these companies generally support nonprofit initiatives that are uncoordinated with public sector services and that are focused both geographically and thematically on direct and indirect business interests. Most international corporate educational philanthropy dollars are thus concentrated in the strongest emerging economies and in communities where businesses have operations. He thus sees little chance that corporate philanthropy will do the heavy lifting in meeting global EFA challenges.
Additional chapters in this volume provide insights into several other leading private sector PPP actors: Bhanji discusses the Global Education Initiative of the World Economic Forum, which has a mandate to support PPPs in order to improve public sector education, while Draxler shows that investment banks, specifically in Europe, have invested in PPP initiatives. Robertson and Verger and Ginsburg document the rise of educational consulting organizations, either for-profit or nonprofit. Some consultancies have emerged as strong advocates of PPPs globally (for example, the Council for British Teachers [CfBT] and Academy for Educational Development [AED]); while others, such as Deloitte and Touche, and McKinsey and Company, are noteworthy for the extent to which their services are subcontracted to perform research and financial analysis functions formerly the purview of national bureaucracies or international organizations (see, for example, McKinsey 2010). There is also mention of international for-profit education service providers that offer distance education, tutoring, and school franchises, which are growing rapidly, sometimes with public funding and support from intergovernmental bodies. However, very limited research exists on them and their impact (Heyneman 2001; Knight 2007).

Overall, global PPP initiatives led by the private sector appear to operate in many different ways, ranging from arms-length support for public education systems to direct delivery of private services; from for-profit initiatives to philanthropic partnerships. No matter what the PPP type, chapters in this book suggest that the corporate actors play an increasingly important role in shaping national educational systems and opportunities.

INTERNATIONAL NONGOVERNMENTAL AND CIVIL SOCIETY-BASED PPPS

Nonprofit, secular nongovernmental organizations have for decades promoted international education programmes, with roots extending even further back to the growth of internationally focused faith-based charities over many centuries. On the one hand, the work of these organizations has had controversial implications for public provision of education: their activities have sometimes not been ‘linked up’ with government planning and services; and have been accused of substituting for governmental effort. On the other hand, much research has shown how international nongovernmental organizations have partnered with communities to provide locally relevant schooling in less developed and conflict-affected countries (Destefano and Schuch Moore 2010).

In this volume, Ron-Balsa and Marphatia’s chapter details the work of ActionAid, a major international nongovernmental organization working in education, which historically provided grants to nonprofit schools in order
to fill gaps in public sector services (see also Archer 2010). Their chapter explains how this organization shifted its approach to educational development from providing direct assistance for non-state service providers, to working with citizens to improve their ability to demand better public services. It also describes a common (but not universal) stance among international NGOs that oppose the expansion of for-profit schooling and see the future in improved public sector provision.

Ron-Balsera and Marphatia also briefly explore the development of global level civil society advocacy for expanded access and better quality public education. Here they pick up on another growing mechanism for public private partnerships, aimed at aggregating private voices to demand national governments and intergovernmental organizations to take action to ensure that basic rights, like the right to education, are universal. A small critical literature on this phenomenon has grown over the last decade (cf. Mundy and Murphy 2001; Mundy et al. 2010; Verger and Novelli 2012). It represents a very different interface between private citizens and the public sphere than most other PPP mechanisms described in this book.

**PPPs AT THE COUNTRY LEVEL**

One of the most hotly debated issues in international educational policy today is the expansion of private sector service provision and PPPs. As seen in chapters by Robertson and Verger, Ron-Balsera and Marphatia and Barrera-Osorio et al., among others, assessments of the value of expanded PPPs diverge sharply. In one camp are those who believe that private providers increase accountability, quality and diversity in educational systems, offsetting major weaknesses in state-administered services, and sometimes releasing public resources for targeted services to the poorest populations (Chakrabarti and Peterson 2008; Fielden and LaRocque 2008; Patrinos et al. 2009). On the other side of this debate are those who point out the neutral or even negative effects of PPPs (for example, school choice and competition between schools) in dimensions such as students’ achievement (see McEwan and Carnoy 2000; Rouse and Barrow 2009), efficiency (Levin 2000) and, especially, equity (Alegre and Ferrer 2010; Fiske and Ladd 2005; Quezada et al. 2008; Reay 2004; Waslander 2010). Scholars that are critical or sceptical of PPPs believe that only comprehensive public systems of education are likely to reach out to remote and disadvantaged populations (cf. Lewin 2007). In this camp are also those who are deeply suspicious of the profit motive in the delivery of public services.

On the surface, there does seem to have been a substantial expansion in private education service provision in many OECD and non-OECD countries. Barrera-Osorio et al., for example, present evidence that ‘private participation
in education has increased dramatically over the last two decades across the world’ (this volume, p. 204). It is important, however, to note that such trends are not uniform. Indeed, in recent OECD data on both OECD and non-OECD countries, a substantial number of countries show declines in private sector provision, while the share of public support for private providers has remained stable for a large number of others. In the developing world, key countries have seen a reversal in private provision, including Indonesia, Colombia and, most significantly, Brazil, while for many others (South Africa, for instance) growth in private sector provision has occurred over a very small initial starting point: from 1 per cent to 2 per cent of enrolment totals (OECD 2008; 2010).

Furthermore, despite recent arguments about the benefits of enhanced private provision (cf. Hanushek and Woessman 2010; Woessman 2005), top country performers in international standardized tests continue to include those with both significant private participation (the Netherlands) and those with very little (Finland). Research on the impact of expanding participation in privately operated schools, through vouchers and other forms of contracting to private providers, show highly varied results (Waslander et al. 2010). Thus, as Barrera-Osorio, Guaqueta and Patrinos (this volume, p. 212) tell us, although there is ‘some positive evidence on the educational outcomes associated with public provision of private services, including measures of student achievement, but is not extensive enough to justify either ignoring PPPs or expanding them on a large scale’.

Part III of this book, entitled ‘The Impact of PPPs in Education: Evidence from the Field’ presents a range of case studies and reviews of the PPP experience in less developed countries. It begins with two broadly-based selections arguing for and against the expansion of PPPs. Chapter 10, by Barrera-Osorio, Guaqueta and Patrinos, leads the section with an overview of research on private provision of schooling, its advantages, and mechanisms for expanding it. The chapter combines data from a number of countries on voucher programmes, subsidies, private management contracts and private financing initiatives, and argues that private delivery can improve access to disadvantaged groups and encourage specialization and quality. In Chapter 11, Ron-Balsera and Marphatia present a strongly opposing view of the value of PPPs, based on research evidence and the experiences of ActionAid. The tensions between human rights approaches to educational development and PPPs as a policy solution for reaching the poor are amply illustrated in these two contributions.

Three subsequent chapters explore the PPP experience in specific countries. Härmä and Rose (Chapter 12) provide an overview of low-fee private schools (LFPS), reviewing evidence on affordability in India, Kenya, Ghana, Nigeria and Malawi. As well, they discuss the limitations of vouchers in the contexts of, for instance, Chile and Pakistan. But the main focus of their chapter is
the costs to families of low-fee private schools. They demonstrate that such schools cannot reach students from the bottom income quintiles, and document parental preference for reform to the public system (over the expansion of LFPS) because of long-term challenges to sustainability of individual LFPS. Also highlighted are the challenges that governments might face in administering voucher schemes, where household level cash transfers might be required to cover fees. They conclude that it may be preferable to fund the improvement of the government system, rather than the expansion of LFPS.

Fennell’s chapter on girls’ education in Pakistan raises the issue of PPP in education decontextualized from a ‘gendered reality’. Her chapter focuses on community perceptions of PPP in the province of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, and presents evidence that while parents are keen for both their sons and daughters to benefit from private schools, students are more keen on teaching quality and regularity within schools, independent of whether they are public or private. She also finds that the gendered perspective in the way international organizations conceive PPP programmes is too narrow (usually focused on girls’ school access). Thus, there is a need to embed gender data and evidence within community contexts, in order to better understand how the provision of education by private providers can ensure gender equality.

Jaimovich’s chapter focuses on the Fe y Alegria schools, all funded by country governments but managed by a nonprofit religious body. Such schools can be found across Latin America, Spain and – the country of focus for Jaimovich – Peru. This is a case of a ‘franchised’ school model. Jaimovich’s study suggests that the secret to its success within this model is the provision (and enthusiastic reception) of intermediate level technical support to schools focused on helping them align internal processes with improved outcomes. While the chapter demonstrates the value of PPP that incorporate school franchise or network type structures, it raises some key issues and challenges. As Jaimovich suggests, building capacity within private schools can be quite varied depending on the organizational culture of the individual schools. Private schools in well managed and technically advanced franchise networks have differential abilities to utilize network-level supports. This is a problem that characterizes most public systems, suggesting an opportunity for mutual learning across public and private initiatives.

Combined, the country studies in this volume show that assessing the impact of private sector engagement in education is clearly quite complex. Any evaluation of PPP is dependent on a wide range of contextual factors, such as families’ education preferences, local social norms concerning education and the role and structure of the private education sector in the territories in question. Consequently, these case studies suggest that purely quantitative research cannot capture the multiple dimensions of PPP impact, and that qualitative approaches need to be taken more seriously into account.
CONCLUSION

This volume is intended to offer readers a fresh look at the public private partnership debate in education, by exploring the complexity and nuances of diverse types of PPP mechanisms, and their impacts in varied contexts. Chapters in this volume seek to review the evolution of global policy discourses on PPPs; unpack the roles of new intergovernmental proponents of PPPs (like the WTO and the IFC); trace the motivation for, and shape of, new forms of corporate philanthropy; and bring to light intriguing questions about non-state organizations who increasingly provide educational services in less developed countries. Each chapter offers a distinctive answer to the question: In new partnerships arrangements who wins and who loses? And who has the power to decide?

While a wider literature suggests that there are benefits to PPPs – they can be pro-poor, harness new forms of innovation, tap into community preferences and needs, and (especially when structured as philanthropies) offer new source of financial support for education – the majority of authors in this volume are rather sceptical of the equity impacts of private sector participation, citing the associated erosion of citizens’ voice as a contributor to change, and the potential ways in which PPPs can detract from the status of education as a public good and a human right.

PPPs are clearly shifting the structures through which educational life chances are organized and governed. Because of this, there is an urgent need for both more empirical research, and more open-ended debate engaging advocates and opponents of PPPs as a new arena of educational governance. At every scale, public private partnership arrangements need greater scrutiny and understanding, because they are certainly with us to stay.

NOTES

1 The symposium, titled ‘Public-Private Partnerships in Education: New Actors and Modes of Education Governance in a Globalized World’, was organized in the context of the IS Academie ‘Education and Development’ programme. See: http://educationanddevelopment.wordpress.com/

2 If non-rival, a good’s consumption by one individual cannot be diminished by another individual’s use. Therefore, an equal quantity is available to all. When non-excludable, no person can be excluded from the use of the good or service. A common example of a public good is a lighthouse, for it is helpful to any number of boats and no boat can be excluded from the use of a lighthouse (Gazier and Touffet 2006; Kaul, Grunberg and Stern 1999; Stiglitz 2000).
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