

## Public Private Partnerships in Education: Perspectives and Challenges in Education Policies

Sangkyu Kim

*Sookmyung Women's University*

### A B S T R A C T

The paper is to give an overview public private partnerships (hereinafter referred to as “PPPs”) – notably PPPs in education (hereinafter referred to as “EPPPs”) focusing on the Republic of Korea and Japan to seek perspectives and challenges of PPPs. The PPPs will serve significant roles to educational changes not only in the present but also in the future. Over the last two to three decades, globalization, neoliberalism, new public management (hereinafter referred to as “NPM”), and PPPs have generated considerable debates on their purposes, notions, and outcomes. However, Korean academic fields have scant attention on PPPs. In this paper, first, examines the global definitions and notions of PPPs. Thereafter, the following cases of EPPPs have been analyzed: private schools as education providers, school vouchers, quasi-market in education, operation services, professional services, facility availabilities, and so forth. Finally, this paper concludes with an examination of the perspectives and challenges of EPPPs, with implications for improving educational performances.

*Keywords: Public Private Partnerships, PPPs, PPPs in Education, EPPPs, 3Ps*

## I. Introduction

The right to receive an education is a fundamental human right, and education is recognized as primary responsibility for the government even though there are sources of private education. Over the last two to three decades, globalization, neoliberalism, NPM, and PPPs have generated considerable debates around government responsibility. Because of the widely-held view concerning education as a complex and political activity to be, if not wholly, in the public sector for public interests

(Robertson and Verger, 2012), these debates are particularly heated in the education sectors. In advanced Western countries, EPPPs are also criticized as a process of marketization or/and privatization, because supporters of the educational status quo, although state and local governments have introduced EPPPs broadly, believe that public education equates to 100 percent government subsidized education or government-run schools. While the critics are concentrated on the polarization of educational performance by school choice rather than criticizing EPPPs directly.

Nevertheless, interest in PPPs has clearly gained momentum through the 1990s and in the 2000s (Greve and Hodge, 2011), and the participation of the private sectors in the delivery of public education has grown internationally. According to the World Bank's documents, the rate of enrollment in private primary schools grew by 58 percent

\* Corresponding Author: Sangkyu Kim  
Sookmyung Women's University  
#503, 96, Sajik-ro, Jongno-gu, Seoul, 03169, Republic of Korea.  
Tel: +82-10-7197-9420  
E-mail: [ksk9420@hotmail.com](mailto:ksk9420@hotmail.com)

between 1991 and 2004 across the world, while the rate of enrollment in public primary schools grew by only 10 percent (Patrinos et al., 2009). The three most common reasons for government's engagement in PPPs are: budgetary limits, improvement of quality of education, and innovation in management (Education International, 2009). As stated above, PPPs have become a defining characteristic of modern governance,

This study gives a general overview and analysis of the EPPPs focusing on Korea and Japan. In order to clarify the purpose of this study, the critical comment on the debates and discussions on the definition and the notion of the PPPs and EPPPs issues will be examined. Moreover, the cases of EPPPs at the international level will be explored as well. In conclusion, the paper will suggest perspectives and challenges of EPPPs, which may serve significant roles in educational changes as well as positive elements as an innovative approach to provide education for all.

## **II. Research Methodology**

Although most of the countries provided from early times for participation of the private sector in delivering public education, the current PPPs terminology refers mostly to new tendencies dating from the early 1990's (Education International, 2009). The extraordinary success of many Asian countries in expanding access and improving education quality is strong evidence of success caused by EPPPs. However, there are insufficient researches around PPPs or/and EPPPs. This paper aims to provide a particular insight into the PPPs and EPPPs in a specific context through "content analysis". Content analysis is a useful qualitative research methodology in which is a technique that enables researchers to study human behavior in an indirect way, through an analysis of their communications (Fraenkel et al. 2012). Therefore, it allows the research to explore "text", for example, historical documents, essays, newspapers, political speeches. Whereas document analysis has served mostly as a complement to other methods, it has also been used as a stand-alone method (Bowen, 2009). Furthermore, document analysis is particularly applicable to qualitative case studies—intensive studies producing rich descriptions

of a single phenomenon, event, organisation, or program (Stake, 1995), and non-technical literature, such as reports and internal correspondence, is a potential source of empirical data for case studies. That is, documents of all types can help the uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem (Merriam 1988). Moreover, documents may be the most effective means of gathering data when events can no longer be observed or when informants have forgotten the details (Bowen, 2009).

To clarify research questions, this paper has required documentary and testimonial information. Methods approach the keywords such as "public private partnerships," or "education AND public private partnerships," will be used to search for information in the National Assembly Library database in Korea, in the CiNii, which can be searched with academic information of articles, books, journals and dissertations in Japan, in documents of international institutions, and in international studies including specialized online forums. All these elements have been organized by the discursive perspective supplemented with a combination of argumentative and conceptual analysis.

## **III. Reviewing the Literature**

PPPs have been adopted by many Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. However, there has been no careful meta-analysis or statistical overview summarizing multiple quantitative PPP performance results to date. Contrary to other public services—social service, health care, public housing, and public transportation, educational sectors do not have sufficient experiences to PPPs because many people consider education as the domain where public nature must be secured strongly. The unique features incorporating government-authorized educational institutions may provide mainly education, while these education providers receive both government subsidies and government controls under the laws and regulations such as "the Private School Act" (hereinafter referred to as "PSA"). In previous works, there exist various articles in terms of PPPs, but they do not have common ideas of definition and notion. This charter aims to explore these topics around international

literature that has been examined previously.

### A. The Notions and Definitions of PPPs

Basically, there exist two arguments in PPPs. One is that PPPs have been an extension of the NPM agenda, which is itself based deeply on notions of marketization and efficient private sector delivery methods. The other is that PPPs are a whole new phenomenon (Greve and Hodge, 2011). Ball and Youdell (2007) also argue participations of private sectors to public education can be understood as being of two key types: “endogenous” privatization, and “exogenous” privatization. Private sectors in each country have provided education for a long time, while, in recent days, the developing countries began to have an interest in increasing opportunities for a low-income group. In Pakistan and India, 60 percent of private schools charges “low tuition” to be less than 7 USD per month (Jamil et. al. 2012).

Although the exact history of PPPs is debatable, EPPPs are receiving widespread attention (Patrinos and Sosale, 2007). The term is a sort of “umbrella notion” covering a broad range of agreements between public institutions and private sectors, aimed at operating public infrastructures or delivering public services (Education International, 2009; Hall, 2015). Based on the preceding discussion, PPPs may be depicted on a spectrum that represents all possible combinations and levels of public and private sector involvement in the various modes of service delivery, classified according to the risk allocation among the parties. The modes of delivery range from traditional public procurement, where the government procures the assets and services of the private sector, to full private delivery where the government is not involved at all. PPPs are situated in the middle of the spectrum. However, the borders among the various modes of delivery are not always rigid, and there can be overlaps depending on the amount of risk shared (OECD, 2008). As OECD defines PPPs following, the notion of partnership is considered more broadly.

a public-private partnership as an agreement between the government and one or more private partners (which may include the operators and the financiers) according to which the private partners deliver the service in such a manner that the service

delivery objectives of the government are aligned with the profit objectives of the private partners and where the effectiveness of the alignment depends on a sufficient transfer of risk to the private partners (OECD, 2008).

International agencies such as OECD, International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank mainly emphasize relationships within economic activities, and thus they accept EPPPs as a natural phenomenon of the existing circumstance. Meanwhile, Education International also states broadly about the scope of EPPPs as follows.

A great majority of respondent-organisations (78.5%) claim familiarity though unions’ understanding of the term PPP varies quite widely, confirming in a way the perception of the term as being both generic and confusing. There are various levels too of engagement between the public and private sectors, i.e. national, federal, state, municipal, etc. The private sector involved in PPPs comprised of business companies/consortiums, banks, religious institutions and charity foundations, NGOs and parents in the private actor (Education International, 2009).

To sum up, PPPs proponents expect the state to modify its organizational culture such as bureaucratic weakness by learning from the private sectors at the managerial level, while most of equalitarian criticize the participation of the private sectors as the expansion of inequality in education.

Concerning the notions of PPPs, there are two ideas: consisting of NPM elements and privatization. Greve and Hodge (2011) argue PPPs may seem to hold both NPM elements and belonging to the post-NPM agenda that emphasizes the new governance elements associated with networks, collaboration, and innovation towards a broader conceptualization of public value creation. Whereas Luthra and Mahajan (2013) ascribe PPPs as a private investment where two parties comprising government as well as a private sector undertaking form a partnership. These ideas are similar to the notion of NPM which promotes an efficiency of public services through public providing.

On the other hand, Ball and Youdell (2007) introduced “endogenous privatization” and “exogenous privatization” to describe hidden privatization of PPPs. The former is a form of privatization including the importing of ideas,

techniques, and practices from the private sector in order to make the public sector more like a business and more business-like. The latter is a form of privatization including the opening up of public education services to private sector participation on a for-profit basis and to use the private sector to design, manage, or deliver aspects of public education. To some observers, EPPPs are simply a newer, friendlier, and longer-standing privatization of education agenda (Hatcher, 2006). Two ideas on PPPs above, however, are not substantially different and related to each other. These can be described with the seven doctrines of NPM by Hood.

Hood (1991) summarized discussions of NPM as seven doctrines. i.e., “hands-on professional management” in the public sector, explicit standards and measures of performance, greater emphasis on output controls, shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector, shift to greater competition in public sector, stress on private-sector styles of management practice, and stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use. Clarke et al. (2000) state the feature to NPM as follows: “attention to outputs and performance rather than inputs, organizations being viewed as chains of low-trust relationships…… breaking down large scale organizations and using competition to enable ‘exit’ or ‘choice’ by service users, and decentralization of budgetary and personal authority to line managers. Above all, Whitfield (2000) ascribes the ways of privatization—outsourcing support services, inspections, training and related services, private finance for school buildings, private management of schools and LEAs, privately led information and communications technology projects, vouchers and personal accounts, and zones and partnerships. The ideas of Whitfield are not different from the understanding of the World Bank clearly promoting PPPs in education: management services, professional services, support services, facility availability, operational services, education services, and both facility availability and education services (Patrinos et al., 2009). Therefore, PPPs can be the element of the privatization, and the privatization can be the element of PPPs, too.

## B. The Effects and Expectations of PPPs

Discussing the potential benefits and disadvantages of EPPPs is not an easy endeavor. Many different forms of public-private relationships are generally labeled as

PPPs. Furthermore, market and pro-school choice solutions (such as vouchers and charter schools) are often seen as the ultimate PPP model in education, although in essence PPPs do not necessarily need to be adopted as a way to promote market competition (Vergier and Moschetti, 2017; Chubb and Moe, 1990).

PPPs has both positive and negative impacts according to the content. For example, two international agencies, the World Bank and Education International, have different notions. The World Bank as proponent is clearly promoting PPPs by only naming advantages, while Education International is far more skeptical towards PPPs and uses an anti-private education metaphor (Brans, 2010). The followings clarify the above:

“it is a way to bring the private sector’s skills and resources into the education sector” and to increase efficiency and innovation in the delivery of education. Contracting can do all of this while allowing governments to keep schools accountable (Patrinos et al., 2009).

Is education about giving each child, each young person, the opportunity to develop his or her full potential as a person and as a member of society? Or is education to be a service sold to clients, who are considered from a young age to be consumers and target for marketing? (Educational International, 2009).

Concerning expectations on EPPPs, Patrinos et al. (2009) expect that public and private sectors can join together to complement strength on each side to reinforce education services and to help developing countries to meet Millennium Development Goals for education and learning outcomes. The World Bank definitely believes the roles of PPPs to improve educational performance and to expand educational opportunity to the developing countries, while the others criticize considerably against the effects of PPPs (Table 1). In addition, in Senegal for example, one positive result was that PPPs gave small civil society providers access to decent financing to conduct literacy activities (Nordtveit, 2005). Whereas they are anxious about negative effects—leading to privatization, increasing socioeconomic segregation, and leading to poorer students being left behind.

**Table 1.** Expected effects of different EPPPs on four main education objectives

Contract	Effect on increasing enrollment	Effect on improving education outcomes	Effect on reducing education inequality	Effect on reducing costs
Vouchers	Strong: number of students who receive the voucher	Strong: school choice	Strong when targeted	Strong when private sector is more efficient
Subsidies	Strong: use of already built private infrastructure	Moderate: limited by available places and quality of service delivered in the private sector	Strong when targeted	Moderate
Private Management and operations	Moderate: limited by the supply of private school operators	Moderate: limited by available places in the private sector	Strong when targeted	Moderate
Private finance Initiatives	Moderate: limited by financial constraints	Low	Strong when targeted	Strong

Source: Patrinos et al. (2009)

## IV. The PPPs in Education

### A. The Private Schools as Education Provider

The main forms of EPPPs are private sector philanthropic initiatives (e.g. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation), private management of public schools, government purchase of education services from private schools, voucher and voucher-like programs, adoption of a school program, capacity-building initiatives, and school infrastructure partnership (Moummé & Saudemont, 2015). However, the traditional form of EPPPs is a delivery of education by private sectors. Private sectors, incorporated educational institutions (school juristic persons of PSA in Korea) and individuals (managers of PSA in Korea) to be authorized by the government, have contributed greatly to the achievement of universalized education. The dominant arguments for private schooling are that it is of higher quality, increases the number of school places, is more efficient, and encourages additional private funds to support education (Chapman, 2002).

Most of the countries have private schools as authorized institutions to provide education generally or alternatively. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) statistics, participations to public education by private schools are also increasing internationally. From 2000 to 2015, on a global level, the enrollment ratio in private schools grew 7.5 percent in primary education and 6.9 percent in secondary education. The enrollment ratio of private schools in

**Table 2.** Percentage of enrollment in education by private institutions (2000 to 2015)

Region	Primary education (%)		Secondary education (%)	
	2000	2015	2000	2015
Africa	9.0	12.7	11.9	16.5
Asia	9.7	20.7	11.9	16.5
Europe	7.9	9.4	8.6	17.8
North America	12.1	12.6	12.5	12.0
South America	14.0	21.1	17.2	20.4
Oceania	21.5	16.1	23.5	29.5
World	10.0	17.5	19.0	25.9

Source: The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), Education: Distribution of enrolment by type of institution, <http://data.uis.unesco.org/#> Accessed 10 October 2017.

Africa, which includes some of the least-developed countries, also rose from 9.0 to 12.7 percent in primary education and from 11.9 to 16.7 percent in secondary education within the same period (Table 2).

Compared to many other countries, Korea maintains a high rate of private school participation. In particular, the ratio of both private upper secondary schools and higher education in Korea is relatively higher than that of other developed countries. This demonstrates that private sectors have provided another education other than compulsory education, while public sectors have invested intensively focusing on compulsory education. Participations in education by private sectors in Korea had relation to governmental finances. In other words, private sectors participated in education actively when

the government could not invest in school facilities and other educational conditions sufficiently. Meanwhile, the Korean government enacted the PSA in 1963 under the purpose to promote the sound development of private schools by respecting their autonomy as well as enhancing their publicness. However, nevertheless these purposes, many criticisms are focusing on that the PSA is functioning for restricting the autonomous operation of education by private sectors.

Prior to Korea, Japan enacted the PSA in 1949. Unlike Korea, Japan has the following characteristics—establishment of the Private Schools Council in governments, and the Board of Councilors in incorporated educational institutions. That is, by planning for the harmony of the autonomy and publicness, private sectors have taken part in providing education, and consequently, Japan could achieve the quantitative expansion of secondary education. In Japan, private sectors mainly also support secondary education and higher education, whereas public sectors intensively put finances into compulsory education. Therefore, participations in education by private sectors are similar to those in Korea. Recently, however, the number of private primary and junior high schools have increased in response to governmental deregulation policy since 1998. The Regulation Reform Committee, which was

set up by Japanese Government in 1999, submitted the 2001 “First Recommendation,” which raised various reform issues to the Prime Minister, and the 2002 “Three Regulation Reform Age Plan,” which promoted the establishment of private schools. This plan has led to an increase in the number of private schools, while public primary and junior high schools covering compulsory education are on the decrease steadily due to demographic shifts.

Compared to Japan, Korea has the big features in the organization of compulsory education. In Japan, the private schools have the right to choose students and to collect tuition autonomously as well. In Korea, on the contrary, private junior high schools offer free and compulsory education, and so they cannot choose students and collect tuition. Moreover, most of the private high schools in cities prescribed by the municipal ordinance also do not have the right to choose students by leveling policy, and their school tuitions are set equal to the tuitions of public high schools. Therefore, students who enter private schools are allocated within school districts by the local government.

**Table 3.** The private school policies in Korea and Japan

Division	Korea	Japan
Competent Authorities	Superintendent of the office of education of the metropolitan city	Prefecture governor
Free/ Compulsory Education	9-year compulsory education. Not free for primary and upper secondary schools but free for lower secondary ones	9-year compulsory education. Not free for either primary or secondary schools
School District	Not applicable to primary schools but applicable to secondary ones	Not applicable to either primary or secondary schools
Assessment in Private Schools	Province implements educational curriculum assessment	Self-assessment and results reported to establisher
Academic Tests	Same as public schools, national academic tests implemented annually	National academic tests exist. Private schools less involved.
Teacher Training	Teachers in private schools should be trained by regulation as teachers in public schools.	Group training quite often but no legal obligation to attend. However, the residence of teachers' certification is valid every 10 years.
Educational Grants	No tuition fees for private secondary schools. Tuition fees in upper secondary schools are the same as in public ones. Educational grants exist for the families of poor students.	In many cases, Private primary and junior upper secondary school students cannot receive educational grants of municipality. But, upper secondary school students can get “High School Tuition Support Fund” from government.

Source: Author

\* In this table, the private school policies are limited to primary and secondary education.

## B. Charter Schools and School Vouchers

In the United States, school vouchers proposed by the national government in 1991 were the focus of debates regarding the privatization in education. Although vouchers aimed to assist families and students from disadvantaged backgrounds, many criticisms suggested that the vouchers would increase levels of inequality. There is some evidence to suggest that vouchers assigned via lotteries may have positive effects on those who receive them (Fleming, 2014; Egalite, 2014). The conceptualism of school vouchers to have an effect on economist Milton Friedman, who recommended state-funded scholarships to pay for students to attend private rather than public schools.

Governments could require a minimum level of education which they could finance by giving parents vouchers redeemable for a specified maximum sum per child per year if spent on "approved" educational services. Parents would then be free to spend this sum and any additional sum on purchasing educational services from an "approved" institution of their own choice. The educational services could be rendered by private enterprises operated for profit, or by non-profit institutions of various kinds. The role of the government would be limited to assuring that the schools met certain minimum standards such as the inclusion of a minimum common content in their programs, much as it now inspects restaurants to assure that they maintain minimum sanitary standards (Friedman, 1955).

This perspective assumes that vouchers will spur competition among private and public schools, thereby increasing student achievement and decreasing education costs. The Wisconsin legislature passed the nation's first modern school voucher program targeting students from low-income households in the Milwaukee School District in 1989, followed by the Florida legislature in 2001 (the John M. McKay Scholarships Program for Students with Disabilities). Moreover, a voucher program was been funded and administered for the first time by the federal government was enacted by the Congress in Washington D. C., and other states (the Utah in 2007, Indiana in 2001) created school voucher as well. Currently, 14 states and the District of Columbia offer school vouchers according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

In the United States, the selection by a private school

may be described as three followings. Firstly, school voucher is a state-funded scholarship for qualifying students to attend private schools. Secondly, a personal tax credit is to subsidize a tax credit for private school expenses incurred. Thirdly, a tax credit scholarship is subsidized individuals/businesses a tax credit for donations to non-government scholarship-granting organizations. In 2017, 17 states maintained tax credit scholarship program, and majority of states have considered legislation on vouchers or a tax credit.

Meanwhile, the Charter School policy for a private operation of public schools can be described as the leading policy of PPPs. The Charter Schools rose to prominence in the 1990s with the backing of two powerful reform movements in education. Minnesota was the first state to pass a charter school law in 1991, and a few charters were established in Minnesota in 1992. Today, there are more than 160 operating charter schools in Minnesota with over 50,800 students enrolled in the 2015/2016 school year, according to the Minnesota State Legislature. Nationally, there are more than 6,800 charter schools with nearly 3 million children in the 2015-16 school year according to the Center for Education Reform. With the recent adoption of a charter school law in the state of Washington, 43 states and the District of Columbia now allow charter schools. Many states with charter laws already on the books are strengthening their laws or expanding the scope of charter authorizations (CREDO, 2013). Both school voucher and quasi-market in education to issue later involve neoliberal ideology \_ i.e., there is nothing distinctive or special about education. Around the academic fields of Korea and Japan, neoliberal ideology is also a target of attack.

On the contrary, controversies around school vouchers were ever heated in Japanese academics. The critiques of education reforms have concentrated on increasing individuality, choice, and flexibility since the National Council on Education Reform in 1984. With respect to the educational ideology of the National Council on Education Reform, American observers estimated "the current reform movement in Japan is that it is tending to move in the opposite direction from that in the United States." The core of estimation was "American reformers are now seeking a greater measure of commonality in the curriculum and higher academic standards for all". However, "education reformers in Japan are seeking some decentralization of control, greater diversification of

institutions, less uniformity and standardization of curriculum, more flexibility in teaching, and more individualization of instruction” (U.S Department of Education, 1987). Korean academic fields also started these controversies from “5.31 Education Reform” of 1995.

### C. Quasi-Market in Education

The U.K. has been well known as the pioneering country of neoliberal reform under the heading of “The Next Move Forward” by the Conservative Manifesto 1987 since Ms. Thatcher took the office in 1979 (Edwards, 1989). “The Next Move Forward” was set to have four agenda: establishing the National Core Curriculum, school control by school governing bodies, increasing parental choice, and allowing state schools to opt out LEA control., Conservative governments between 1979-1997 established the quasi-market in education with open enrollment, local management of schools, opt-outs from direct public control, competitive contracts for support services and a performance management regime consisting of standards, performance league tables, inspection, and the centralization of funding (Whitfield, 2000). Freire, criticizing neoliberalism, stated that every country on the planet is “suffocated” by the ethics of the market (Freire, 1998). Whereas, the critiques of neoliberalism argue that neoliberals are dominant among the fatalistic voices of our age, leading many to believe that imbalances in the comparative wealth of nations, along with mass unemployment, widespread hunger, exploitation, discrimination, poverty, and misery are acceptable and inevitable (Robarts, 2003).

On the other hand, the quasi-market facilitates the participation of private sectors in educational services, and it regards the value for money (VFM). In addition, choice and competition are an integral part of quasi-market. Therefore, academic fields criticize “high-income children can be educated to a high level education” under the quasi-market of education (Brighouse, 2010; Allen et al. 2014). Neoliberal educational policies in the U.K. have continued education action zones, a form as the quasi-market despite the critics considerably. Education action zones were first established by the Secretary of State for Education and Employment in 1998-99 under the School Standards and Framework Act of 1998 and comprised clusters of schools within a specific geographical area together with local communities of interest or partnerships

(Whitehead and Clough, 2004; National Audit Office).

### D. Operation Services

Private Finance Initiative (hereinafter referred to as “PFI”) in education as a part of PPPs is generalized in Korea and Japan, although the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO) overviews that the Japanese PFI market is characterized by small project primarily across the social infrastructure sector (e.g. government buildings, schools, and hospitals) that have been delivered mainly on a BTO basis (JETRO, 2010). The Japanese government has promoted PFI through the Act on Promotion of Private Finance Initiative (hereinafter referred to as “PFI Act”) in 1999 with additional guidelines and amendment in 2001. In the PFI Act (Article 1), EPPPs have the purposes to improve the social infrastructure efficiently and effectively through utilization of private finance, management abilities, and technical capabilities, thereby contributing a healthy development of the national economy. Under the influence of PFI Act, 17 municipalities across Japan have completed the PFI in educational services (as of April 2009). The Korean government had enacted the Act on Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure (hereinafter referred to as “PPPs Act”) almost simultaneously in 1999. The purpose of PPPs Act is to contribute to the development of the national economy by encouraging the creative and efficient expansion and operation of infrastructure.

School construction, which falls under the infrastructure project provision of the PPPs Act, typically follows two steps: first, the private sector organization is contracted to build school facilities, and second, provides cleaning, maintenance, security, safety, utility, and related services for the building for twenty years and receive performance-related monthly payments from the competent authority during the operational phase of the project. Since PPPs were expanded to school facilities from 2005, the Build-Transfer-Lease (hereinafter referred to as “BTL”) has been adopted broadly. Although EPPPs have been adopted that public finances didn’t provide sufficiently to expand public demands, nevertheless, there are 1,205 school facilities to have been built around urban regions in Korea through BTL. With regard to PPPs in education, mainly, academic levels have criticized the points at issue; the responsibility of maintenance, operating fee, etc. (Cha, 2014).

## E. Professional Services in Education

While the Korea Government has more caution on an involvement of private sectors for professional services of education, Japan introduced the national scholastic ability for a survey (hereinafter referred to as “National Testing”) in 2007. The National Testing is performed for sixth graders in elementary school and ninth graders in middle school. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) in Japan implemented bidding, eight companies bid for the contract which involved the printing, delivery, marking, statistical analysis of the tests and provision of results to local authorities. MEXT contracted two companies: NTT Data and Benesse (Japan’s largest private provider of after-school and child care services). Japan also continues to implement by the private sector, and the MEXT contracted out Benesse and JP Media Direct for providing professional services to education recently. Meanwhile, in the U.S., non-profit organizations like Teach for America, and KIPP implement the following professional education services: hiring teachers in low-income communities, coaching, school-wide training, and conferences. In sum, professional services in education by private sectors can be observed across the OECD countries.

## F. Facility Availability and Other Services

The Government of India is implementing the model school scheme to set up 6,000 model schools at every block of the country as a benchmark of excellence for providing quality education to talented rural children. Under the state sector component of the scheme, 3,500 model schools have been set up in Educationally Backward Blocks (EBBs) through State/UT Governments since 2008 (the Ministry of Human Resource Development). In India, the priority of PPPs is not merely to use the private party as an executor or a source of funds though these may be parts of the role in specific cases. Rather it needs to seek a collaborative engagement that builds on the strengths of different players and creates a whole greater than the sum of the parts (Luthra and Mahajan, 2013). Whereas the New South Wales Government had carried out the “NEW Schools Project” between 2002 and 2005. The New Schools Project consisted of two main components:

the private financed and constructed nine new schools, and the private sectors provide cleaning, maintenance, repair, security, etc. (2004 opened 5 schools and 2005 opened 4 schools). Moreover, New South Wales launched the “New Schools Project 2” which aimed to construct 10 schools, consequently, 11 schools: 3 schools in 2007, 4 schools in 2008, 3 schools in 2009 and final school in the first term of 2010, opened according to the New South Wales Government.

In Japan, local governments have had affluent experiences on PPPs since the 1950s, while EPPPs could be pursued truly from 1980s through deregulation and decentralization. Nowadays, EPPPs, although professional services such as teaching, curriculum, and collective administrative services as education action zones of the UK are resisted, are general in Korea and Japan. For instance, entrusting school meal services (School Meals Act Article 15, in Korea), designated administrator system (Local Autonomy Act Article 244, in Japan), school security service, school cleaning service, and facility management service are organized in education currently. On the other hand, there are interesting cases in Asian countries like Korea, Japan, and Taiwan. Private provisions in these countries are an adjunct or complement to the public sector as in the case the cramming schools, while the UK and the US have personal tutoring. The 67.8 percent of the students from elementary school to high school in Korea take part in cramming schools and personal tutoring in 2016, and especially higher income families and students with higher academic achievement are passionate about it (Korean Statistics Information Service).

The Korean government enacted the “Act on the Establishment, Operation of Private Teaching Institutes and Extracurricular Lessons” to contribute to the promotion of lifelong education and to stipulate matters pertaining to extracurricular lessons by providing for matters on the establishment and administration of private teaching institutes to encourage the sound development of private teaching institutes. On the other hand, Japan entrusts cramming schools and personal tutoring to free market. Moreover, the Korean Government continues on various efforts greatly to reduce demands for cramming school. Among them, In June 2009, Ministry of Education announced “Plans for Quality Improvement of Public Education” which was to reduce spending for private tutoring (Ministry of Education, 2013). Under the efforts by the Korean Government, although demands for cramming

and private tutoring tend to decline slightly, it is required to be more careful about whether participations of cramming affect on academic achievement greatly or not. Thereafter, the representative effort of reducing demands to enter cramming schools is the “after school programs.” The after-school programs were first introduced in March 2005 but were first outlined in the 5.31 Education Reform of 1995. The after-school programs allow for tailored instruction to meet individual student needs. Although this policy seeks to discourage private tutoring and cram schools, it may further encourage their use (Kim, 2017).

## **V. Conclusion**

Despite the arguments, increases in EPPPs are the trend of the modern world. They have two sides. The one side has positive effects in terms of efficiency and effectiveness around educational finances. These provide reliable reasons for those who ascribe PPPs as NPM elements. On the other hand, the other side produces a negative effect toward polarization of educational results by almost egalitarians. This idea, although there are various criticisms, provides the reasons to those who assert educational equality. As recent tendency, Japan facilitates ongoing EPPPs through enactment of the Act on Special Districts for Structural Reform and Provision in 2002 and the Act on Special Districts for Development of National Strategy in 2013, while Korea has narrow participation of private sectors in education by the Act on Special Cases Concerning the Regulation of the Special Economic Zones for Specialized Regional Development. Furthermore, the Japanese Government considers of introducing the school voucher among great criticism around academic fields because of a negative impact on educational equality and social justice by marketization or/and privatization of education. However, in order to gain positive impacts by successful EPPPs, the following elements need to be considered thoroughly.

First, the analysis of the evidence on the impact of EPPPs is significant. EPPPs will be increased more and more in the future because the administration conditions are not just complex but also requiring the introduction of private methods in operating educational policy nowadays. Therefore, among ongoing the controversies

concerning new ideologies: globalization, neoliberalism, and NPM, most of the countries have adapted these ideologies in many different ways on education reform. However, Korea and Japan have insufficient evidence because of lack of studies on PPPs until now, and they have even scant attention within academic fields. EPPPs, definitely, have both the positive effects and negative effects from previous studies. Nevertheless, the explicit evidence such as reduction of repetition and dropouts, higher academic achievements, higher student performance, and increasing political tolerance and civic engagement, have been discovered by researches held internationally.

Second, the exploration of factors for success in EPPPs is crucial work. In the past, education was largely paid for and almost entirely administered by government bodies or non-profit institutions (Friedman, 1955). However, since the 1980s, the cooperation between public and private sector is expanding largely. Furthermore, participation in education by for-profit institutions, even if limited, is being promoted. For example, In October 2016, the People’s Congress adopted an important amendment to the law regulating private education: for-profit private schools are no longer allowed within compulsory education. From 2017 onwards, educational entrepreneurs outside compulsory education are free to decide whether they want to establish non-profit or for-profit schools (Schulte, 2017). The ultimate success of EPPPs must be measured by the degree the PPPs importing teaching and learning, providing improved facilities and introduced improved means of management and enabled the wider community to participate in the process of education and training (Latham, 2009). Currently, EPPPs are increasing by neoliberal educational reform and de-regulation, there exist arguments in favor of and against them. Therefore, the “selective focus” such as the introduction of the ways of good practice will be important elements.

Finally, recognition of prerequisites of successful EPPPs is a significant measure. There are two measures – good partnership between public and private sectors, and then accountability by PPPs partners. Forrer et al. (2000) proposed six dimensions of the framework to assess PPP accountability: understanding and allocating risk among partners, cost-benefit analysis, assessing social equity effects, expertise, partnership collaboration, and performance measurement. Accountability can be one of the cornerstones of good partnerships, however, recently there has been a growing discussion focusing on the proper role of

government in education. Supporters of the educational status quo believe that public education equates to 100 percent government financed, government owned, and government operated schools. Therefore, they tend to understand strong government control toward private sectors in education is equal to “publicness.” In particular, arguments concerning publicness in Korea and Japan have negative thinking toward school choice. However, publicness in education is neither clear concept nor a meaning of government control or government owned. It will be the openness of education or/and guarantee the rights to receive an education. On the other hand, school choice will become innovative and bring improvements on the learning process rather than on privatization and less public control of education. This means that equality of educational opportunity should convert securing quantitative educational conditions into qualitative ones. In other words, educational equality should be evaluated not for quantitative policies such as the size of educational finances, a quantity of educational materials, and modernized school facilities but for qualitative policies such as a concept of textbooks, teacher’s expertise, teaching methods, quality of learning, and feasibility of catchment areas. Because final goal of schools is not to give school experience for pupils but to lead students to equip academic ability to compete in society, this means that accountability should be evaluated by academic performance.

## References

- Allen, R., Burgess, S., & Mckenna, L. (2014). School performance and parental choice of school: secondary data analysis, Department for Education in the UK, [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/275938/RR310\\_-\\_School\\_performance\\_and\\_parental\\_choice\\_of\\_school.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/275938/RR310_-_School_performance_and_parental_choice_of_school.pdf) Accessed 20 September 2017.
- Ball, S. J., & Youdell, D. (2007). Hidden privatisation in public education. Education Internationally 5<sup>th</sup> World Congress. [http://pages.ei-ie.org/quadrennialreport/2007/upload/content\\_trsl\\_images/630/Hidden\\_privatisation-EN.pdf](http://pages.ei-ie.org/quadrennialreport/2007/upload/content_trsl_images/630/Hidden_privatisation-EN.pdf). Accessed 15 September 2017.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Brans, B. (2010). Public private partnerships in education: analyzing PPPs as a policy tool for universal secondary education in Uganda. *Forum for Education NGO’s demonstration in Kampala Uganda*. <https://educationnddevelopment.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/ppps-in-uganda-bo-joe-brans.pdf>. Accessed 15 August 2016.
- Brighthouse, H. (2010). Educational equality and school reform. In Haydon, G. (Ed.), *Educational Equality* (pp. 15-70). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Center for Education Reform. <https://www.edreform.com/issues/choice-charter-schools/facts/>. Accessed 16 August 2016.
- Cabinet Office, Government of Japan. <http://www.cao.go.jp/>. Accessed 16 August 2016.
- Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2013). *National charter school study 2013*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Cha, Y. J. (2014). Issues and improvement schemes of BTL educational facility operation—centered in the facility after A/S term. Master Thesis of Chung-Ang University the graduate School of Construction Engineering.
- Chapman, D. (2002). Management and efficiency in education: goals and strategies. Asian Development Bank. [http://ce.rc.edu.hku.hk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Vol2\\_chapman\\_booklet4.pdf](http://ce.rc.edu.hku.hk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Vol2_chapman_booklet4.pdf). Accessed 16 October 2016.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America’s schools*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S., & Mclanghlin, E. (2000). Reinventing the welfare state. In Clarke, J. et al. (Eds.), *New managerialism, new welfare?* (pp. 1-26). London: Thousand Oaks.
- Education International. (2009). Public-private partnerships in education. <http://download.ei-ie.org/Docs/WebDepot/PUBLIC%20PRIVATE%20PARTNERSHIP.PDF>. Accessed 18 August 2016.
- Edwards, R. (1989). Margaret Thatcher, Thatcherism and education. *McGill Journal of Education*, 24(2), 203-214.
- Egalite, A. J. (2014). Competitive impacts of means-tested vouchers on public school performance: Evidence from Louisiana and Indiana. [http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/PDF/Papers/PEPG14\\_05\\_Egalite.pdf](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/PDF/Papers/PEPG14_05_Egalite.pdf). Accessed 1 October 2017.
- Fleming, D. (2014). Learning from schools: school choice, political learning, and policy feedback. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(1), 55-78.
- Forrer, J., Kee, J. E., Newcomer, K. E., & Boyer, E. (2010). Public-private partnerships and the public accountability question. *Public Administration Review*,

- 70(3), 475-484.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, E. W., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (international edition 2013). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Friedman, M. (1955). The role of government in education. In Solo, R.A (Ed.), *Economics and the Public Interest* (pp. 123-144). NJ, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Greve, C. and Hodge, G. (2011). A transformative perspective on public-private partnerships. In Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P (Eds.), *The ashgate research companion to new public management* (pp. 265-277). Burlington: Ashgate.
- Hall, D. (2015). Why public-private partnerships don't work: the many advantages of the public alternative. Public Service International. [http://www.world-psi.org/sites/default/files/rapport\\_eng\\_56pages\\_a4\\_lr.pdf](http://www.world-psi.org/sites/default/files/rapport_eng_56pages_a4_lr.pdf). Accessed 18 October 2017.
- Hatcher, R. (2006). Privatization and sponsorship: the re-agenting of the school system in England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(5), 519-619.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19.
- Japan External Trade Organization. (2010). Public private partnerships in Australia and Japan. [https://www.jetro.go.jp/en/reports/survey/pdf/2010\\_01\\_other.pdf](https://www.jetro.go.jp/en/reports/survey/pdf/2010_01_other.pdf). Accessed 1 August 2016.
- Jamil, B. R., Javaid, K., & Rangaraju, B. (2012). Investigating dimensions of the privatisation of public education in South Asia: case studies from Pakistan and India. *Education Support Programme Working Paper Series*, 43, Open Society Foundation, New York.
- Kim, S. K. (2017). *Education dialogue*. Seoul: Humanogue.
- Schulte, B. (2017). Private Schools in the People's Republic of China: development, modalities and contradictions. In Koinzer, T., Nikolai, R., & Waldow, F. (Eds.), *Private schools and school choice in compulsory education* (pp. 115-131). Springer VS.
- Korean Educational Statistical Service. <http://kess.kedi.kr>. Accessed 30 August 2016.
- Latham, M. (2009). Public-private partnerships in education. EP-Nuffic. <https://www.nuffic.nl/en/library/public-private-partnerships-in-education.pdf>. Accessed 15 August 2016.
- Ledd, H. F. (2002). School vouchers: a critical view. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(4), 3-24.
- Luthra, M., & Mahajan, S. (2013). Role of public private partnership in school education in India. *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 3(7), 801-810.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: a qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Minnesota State Legislature. <https://www.leg.state.mn.us/leg/elists/>. Accessed 30 August 2016.
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Education in Korea*. Ministry of Education in S. Korea.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology of Japan, School Basic Survey. [http://www.mext.go.jp/b\\_menu/toukei/chousa01/kihon/1267995.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/toukei/chousa01/kihon/1267995.htm). Accessed 2 September 2016.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD). <http://mhrd.gov.in/>. Accessed 5 September 2016.
- Moumné, R., & Saudemont, C. (2015). Overview of the role of private providers in education in light of the existing international legal framework, investments in private education: undermining or contributing to the full development of the human right to education? *UNESCO Working Papers on Education Policy*.
- National Audit Office. <http://www.nao.org.uk/report/education-action-zones-meeting-the-challenge-the-lessons-identified-from-auditing-the-first-25-zones>. Accessed 2 September 2016.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. <http://www.ncsl.org/>. Accessed 2 September 2016.
- New South Wales Government. Public private partnership project summary of contracts. [http://nwt-funnelback01.squiz.net/s/search.html?query=public+private+partnership&collection=nsw\\_treasury&form=simple](http://nwt-funnelback01.squiz.net/s/search.html?query=public+private+partnership&collection=nsw_treasury&form=simple). Accessed 2 September 2016.
- Nordtveit, B. H. (2005). Use of public-private partnerships to deliver social services: advantages and drawbacks. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED453359.pdf#page=161>. Accessed 7 September 2016.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2008). *Public-private partnerships: in pursuit of risk sharing and value for money*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Patrinos, H. A., Barrera-Osorio., & Guáqueta, J. (2009). *The role and impact of public-private partnerships in education*. Washington, D.C.: the World Bank.
- Patrinos, H. A. (2009). Private education provision and public finance: the Netherlands, prepared for school choice and school improvement: research in State. *District and Community Contexts Vanderbilt University*, October 25-27, 2009.
- Pesch, U. (2008). The publicness of public administration. *Administration & Society*, 40(2), 170-193.
- Roberts, P. (2003). Pedagogy, neoliberalism and postmodernity:

- reflections on Freire's later work. *Educational Philosophy and theory*, 35(4), 451-465.
- Robertson, S. L., & Verger, A. (2012). Governing education through public private partnerships. In Robertson, S.L., Mundy, K., Verger, A., & Menashy, F. (Eds.), *Public private partnerships in education: new actors and modes of governance in a globalizing world* (pp. 21-42). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*, Thousand Oaks. C.A: Sage.
- Statutes of the Republic of Korea. <http://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng>. Accessed 20 September 2017.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. <http://uis.unesco.org/> Accessed 20 September 2017.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1987). *Japanese education today*. U.S Department of Education.
- Yun, C. I., & Yun, H. J. (1999). The possibilities and limitations of privatization of education. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 17(1), 249-282.
- Verger, A., & Moschetti, M. (2017). Public-private partnerships as an education policy approach: multiple meanings, risks and challenges. *Education Research and Foresight Working Papers*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002473/247327e.pdf>. Accessed 30 September 2017.
- Whitehead, J., & Clough, N. (2004). Pupils, the forgotten partners in education action zones. *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(2), 215-227.
- Whitfield, D. (2000). The third way for education: privatisation and marketization. *FORUM*, 42(2), 82-85.