

Keynote Address, 29 June 2015

Exacerbating or Reducing Disparities?

The Global Expansion of Shadow Education and Implications for the Teaching Profession

Mark Bray
UNESCO Chair Professor in Comparative Education
The University of Hong Kong
mbray@hku.hk

Much has changed in education since ICET was founded in 1953. Some things have not changed, of course. Schools remain the dominant formal vehicle for delivering formal education for children and youth aged approximately six to 18; individuals designated as teachers remain the most visible people responsible for delivering instruction and promoting students' learning; and disparities in education remain a major concern, especially for policy-makers and managers of education systems and also for many people at school and classroom levels. Among the changes have been massive expansion of educational provision as populations have grown and enrolment rates have risen; new methods of teaching and learning facilitated by information technologies; and improved data availability on disparities and other domains as a result of expanded research and improved instruments for monitoring and evaluation. Other domains of change, of particular relevance to this paper, have included shifts in the balance between the roles of the state and the private sector, and expansion of forms of 'shadow education' which operate in parallel to regular school systems.

Concerning parallel provision of education, for a conference held in Japan a place to commence is with *juku* – a word that has entered the English language and that has been defined as “private, profit-making tutorial, enrichment, remedial and preparatory schools” (Wray 1999: 154). The nature of these private institutions in Japan has greatly evolved over the decades and centuries (see e.g. Mehl 2003; Sato 2012), but in contemporary times they are mainly bodies operating alongside schools to provide instruction in both academic and non-academic matters (see e.g. McLean 2009; Dierkes 2010; Watanabe 2013), among which the academic domain is of most interest to this paper. For readers able to read English but unable to read Japanese, Roesgaard (2006) provides helpful insights and classifications of types of *juku*, which have greatly increased in number during since the 1960s. According to the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry [METI] (2013, p.92), in 2009 the country had 51,726 *juku* with 332,541 employees; and in 2010 the market value of *juku* was 925.4 billion JPY (approximately US\$8 billion).

Yet *juku* and their equivalents are not found only in Japan. They have become a global phenomenon, albeit with variations in different cultures and locations. Further, such institutions of supplementary education,

together with tutoring provided informally by university students, teachers and others, have become a substantial industry with backwash implications for regular schools. In some cases they may help to reduce disparities but, as noted by Tsuneyoshi's presentation for this Assembly (2015: 9-10) with reference to Japan and by many other researchers around the world, they are much more likely to exacerbate disparities.

To set the scene, this paper first explains the metaphor of the shadow and outlines features of the shadow education around the world. Then the paper considers ways in which shadow education may affect the lives and work of teachers. Taking two contrasting situations, the paper indicates some reactions of teachers in Hong Kong and Cambodia. The former is a prosperous society in which most shadow education takes place outside the schools with little direct involvement of regular teachers, while the latter is a low-income society in which much shadow education is provided by regular teachers as a way to supplement their salaries. Patterns may be interpreted through the lenses of ecology and of marketisation of education. The next section returns to issues of balance between public and private sectors in a changing world. Finally, the paper summarises some implications of the expansion of shadow education for ICET itself, for educational disparities, and for the work of teachers around the world.

The Scale and Nature of Shadow Education

Early users of the term shadow education to describe private supplementary tutoring included Marimuthu et al. (1991) referring to Malaysia, and Stevenson and Baker (1992) referring to Japan. The metaphor was given wider exposure in a global context by the present author (Bray 1999). The basic notion is that much of the parallel sector mimics regular schooling: as the curriculum in the schools change, so it changes in the shadow; and as the mainstream system grows, so does the shadow. The metaphor is not perfect, since some activities in the shadow sector complement and expand on those of schools rather than just copying. Also, while the implication of the shadow metaphor is that subjects are taught first in schools and then in the shadow, in reality the sequence may be reversed. Nevertheless, the metaphor is adequate for many purposes and is widely used in the literature.

A related component in many analyses, and certainly pertinent to this paper, is that shadow education is fee-charging. Thus the focus here excludes supplementary help given free of charge by relatives, community bodies, schools, or other individuals and organisations. Further the principal focus of this paper, in line with the dominant literature, is on academic subjects – i.e. excluding soccer, ballet, religious instruction and other subjects primarily learned for personal development rather than academic achievement. Shadow education may be found at all levels, from kindergarten to university. However, the chief focus of this paper is on the primary and secondary levels of education.

Table 1 presents some statistics on the shadow education around the world. The numbers should be interpreted with caution, especially when making comparisons, because they were collected on different types of samples and with varying degrees of methodological rigour. Nevertheless, they show that shadow education is a significant phenomenon not only in East Asia but also in parts of Africa, Australasia, the

Americas, South Asia and Western Europe. Moreover, the sample shows high rates in both rich countries such as Canada and Cyprus and poor countries such as Pakistan and Ghana.

Table 1: Cross-national Indicators of Shadow Education

<i>Location</i>	<i>Patterns</i>
Argentina	Cámara and Gertel (2014) surveyed 360 students who had gained admission to the University of Cordoba. The researchers chose different programmes to identify variations in the demand for tutoring to gain entrance. Rates were 17%, 31%, 39% and 92% respectively of admitted candidates in Law, Dentistry, Economics and Medicine.
Australia	Dillon (2011) reported that parents were spending up to Aus\$6 billion a year on private tutoring, with the industry having grown by almost 40% over the previous five years.
Canada	Aurini and Davies (2013: 157) reported that 33% of parents had purchased supplementary education and that 21% of nine-year-old children had received some kind of private tutoring. Eckler (2015) described tutoring as the “new normal”.
Cambodia	Dawson (2011: 18) surveyed eight primary schools in three locations, and found that about half of the students had received tutoring. Brehm & Silova (2012: 167) echoed with data from Grade 9 students in six schools.
China	The 2004 Urban Household Education and Employment Survey of 4,772 households indicated that 73.8% of primary students were receiving supplementary lessons, including in non-academic subjects. Proportions in lower and upper secondary were 65.6% and 53.5% (Xue & Ding 2009).
Cyprus	Data analysed by Lamprianou & Lamprianou (2013: 4) indicated that 80.5% of households with school-aged children were paying for private tutoring.
England & Wales	A 2014 survey of 2,700 young people asked whether they had ever received private or home tutoring. In London, 37% of respondents replied affirmatively, and 20% in the rest of the country did so (Sutton Trust 2014: 2).
Egypt	Household survey data reported by Sobhy (2012: 49) indicated that 81% had children who had received tutoring in the secondary stage, and that 50% had received tutoring at the primary stage.
Ghana	A 2008 survey of 1,020 households found that 48% were paying additional fees for tutoring in primary education (Antonowicz et al. 2010: 21).
Hong Kong	A 2011/12 survey of 1,646 students in 16 schools found that 53.8% of Grade 9 students and 71.8% of Grade 12 students were receiving tutoring (Bray 2013: 21).
India	Sen (2010: 315) stated that at the primary level in West Bengal, 57% of students were receiving private tutoring. Data from a nationwide rural survey showed rates among children aged 6-14 ranging from 2.8% in Chhattisgarh to 73.0% in West Bengal (Pratham 2013: 55).
Japan	A 2007 survey found that <i>juku</i> served 15.9% of Primary 1 children, that this proportion rose steadily in later grades, and that it reached 65.2% in Junior Secondary 3. In addition, 6.8% of Junior Secondary 3 pupils received tutoring at home, and 15.0% followed correspondence courses (MEXT 2008: 13).
Korea, Republic of	In 2014, 81.1% of elementary school pupils were estimated to be receiving private tutoring. In middle school the proportion was 69.1%; and in general high school it was 56.2% (KOSIS 2015).
Malta	Statistics cited by Buhagiar and Chetcuti (2013: 136-137) indicated that up to 51.9% of primary students and up to 82.9% of secondary students were receiving private tutoring.
Pakistan	A 2012 survey of six cities and 136 rural districts found that 34.0% of urban children and 11.3% of rural children attending school received private supplementary tutoring. In Karachi the proportion reached 60.2% (ASER-Pakistan 2013: 118, 143).
Sri Lanka	Pallegedara (2012: 380) examined 2006/07 survey data of 10,677 households with students aged 6 to 21. Among these households, 64.0% had spent money on private tutoring. This compared with just 23.3% in a comparable survey in 1995/96. Suraweera (2011: 20) reported that 92.4% of 2,578 students in a Grade 10 survey and 98.0% of 884 Grade 12 students were receiving tutoring.
Trinidad & Tobago	A sample of 801 children in primary schools found that 5.7% in Standard 1 received extra lessons. Proportions rose in subsequent grades to 7.4%, 25.4%, 68.4% and then 88.2% in Standard 5 (Barrow & Lochan 2012: 411).

Important differences arise between tutoring supplied by commercial companies and by other providers such as university students on an informal basis. Even among the companies are wide differences. At one end are multinational enterprises such as Kumon which operate on a franchise basis, and at the other end are small companies serving only their immediate neighbourhoods (Bray & Kwo 2014: 21-24). Some companies operate large classes in lecture theatres, while others serve individuals and/or small groups. Informal providers are more likely to provide tutoring in the homes of either the tutors or the students, and again usually focus on individuals and/or small groups (see e.g. Oller 2011; Viel 2012).

In some countries, teachers are another important group of shadow education providers. Teachers may work part-time for tutorial companies (see e.g. Zhang 2014: 447), or they may work independently. In the latter case, they may provide tutoring in their own homes, in the homes of students, or in other locations (see e.g. Mariya 2012; Hartmann 2013). In some countries, teachers commonly provide private supplementary tutoring on school premises.

These observations on scale and nature lead easily to observations about disparities. Private supplementary tutoring could reduce disparities, e.g. by encouraging slow learners to catch up with their peers. However, if left to market forces it is much more likely to increase disparities because richer families can afford more and better tutoring than middle-income and poor families. In many countries shadow education has become so widespread that families consider it a necessity for investment; but those who really cannot afford it are then left behind. Amartya Sen devoted part of his Nobel Prize resources to the Pratichi Trust working in low-income parts of West Bengal, India. The Trust surveyed primary education in 2001/02 and again seven years later. Sen highlighted (2009: 13)

a real regression, as opposed to progress, on the dependence on private tuition [tutoring]. The proportion of children relying on private tuition has gone up quite a bit (64 per cent from 57 per cent for the students of standard primary schools...). Underlying this rise is not only some increase in incomes and the affordability of having private tuition, but also an intensification of the general conviction among the parents that private tuition is “unavoidable” if it can be at all afforded (78 per cent of the parents now believe it is indeed “unavoidable” – up from 62 per cent). For those who do not have arrangements for private tuition, 54 per cent indicate that they do not go for it mainly – or only – because they cannot afford the costs.

Sen noted that most of the content in the private tutorial classes could and should have been taught in the regular classes of the primary schools, and added that private tutoring divided the student population into haves and have-nots. Of even more pertinence to this paper, Sen observed (pp.14-15) that shadow education “makes teachers less responsible and ... diminishes their central role in education”.

Two Case Studies

To elaborate on such matters, and particularly to identify the impact of shadow education on the attitudes and work of teachers, this section takes a pair of case studies. The first is of Hong Kong, a prosperous society in which shadow education is mainly supplied by companies and informal providers, and in which teachers do not commonly provide fee-based supplementary tutoring. The second is of Cambodia, a low-income country in which the commercial sector is less developed and most tutoring is provided by teachers, often to their own regular students.

Hong Kong

Forty years ago, private supplementary tutoring was almost unheard of in Hong Kong. Twenty years ago it was known about but limited in scale; and now it seems ubiquitous. As recorded in Table 1, a 2011/12 survey found that 53.8% of Grade 9 students and 71.8% of Grade 12 students were receiving tutoring (Bray 2013: 21). Proportions are also high at the primary level. For example, a 2009 telephone survey of 521 students reported that 72.5% of upper primary students received tutoring (Ngai & Cheung 2010).

The commercial marketplace for tutoring in Hong Kong is diverse. At one extreme are large companies, one of which is quoted on the stock exchange (Hong Kong Education [Intl] Investments Limited 2014). These large companies target senior secondary students, and particularly offer drilling and tips for external public examinations. Several companies advertise their tutors as “kings and queens”, with advertisements in newspapers, on streets, and on the exterior of double-decker buses (Kwo & Bray 2011). Their tutors dress fashionably and attract clients with teenage vocabulary of a sort that would be frowned upon in schools. The companies also advertise their tutees’ examination results, selling “the educational dream of success in Hong-Kong’s exam-oriented culture” (Koh 2014: 817). By government regulation, classrooms have maximum capacity of 45 students, but some have glass walls with internal TV monitors so that over 100 students can simultaneously learn from one tutor (Lee 2010; Yung 2011). As an alternative to live classes, students can join video-recorded lessons at a slightly lower cost.

Alongside are smaller companies which particularly serve primary and lower secondary students and are localised in their immediate neighbourhoods. In November 2013, the website of the government’s Education Bureau listed 1,185 registered academic-oriented tutorial centres, including the very large ones with multiple branches but mostly comprising small operations. By comparison, Hong Kong had 1,083 secondary and primary schools (Education Bureau 2014, p.7).

The 2011/12 survey mentioned above (Bray 2013) had quantitative and qualitative components and solicited the views of teachers as well as students. In their attitudes towards shadow education, and particularly the roles of the commercial sector, three main groups of teachers were identified. Some teachers had not thought much about the matter, evidently considering the shadow sector beyond their remit. A second group was offended by the shadow sector, seeing it as unnecessary and even parasitic. Teachers in this group felt that their own provision was adequate, and that the activities of the shadow sector were to some extent

intrusive and damaging. Teachers in the third group welcomed the shadow sector, encouraging students to learn from all sources, both in-school and out-of-school.

Elaborating on the last of these, the positive teachers recognised the constraints faced by the students. In the words of one teacher:

Public exams are important. Teachers hope students perform well. We really don't mind them asking other ways for improvement. But of course the best way is that teachers can spend more time on teaching and helping more students.

Some teachers noted the dimensions which the students found attractive in the parallel sector and sought to improve their own lessons. For example, some teachers borrowed notes from the commercial sector to improve their classes.

By contrast, one complaint of the teachers who were antagonistic to the shadow sector concerned students' attitudes. Students had little or no choice of teachers within their schools, and perhaps did not value services which were free and compulsory. They did, however, have choices in the marketplace and gave tutors particular attention because they were paying fees. Some tutorial companies encouraged the students to view their teachers as inadequate so that the students would remain clients. Tutoring commonly took place in the evenings, with the result that students were tired during the day. One teacher expressed her complaint sharply. The students, she said:

think that schoolteachers are useless.... They take out the tutoring materials in your lessons. They don't care what you are teaching. They are so disrespectful. In some extreme cases, students no longer complete homework we assign to them.... Tutoring used to be a supplement to learning, not a major learning place. But now school becomes a place to play and sleep. I think some students have reversed the order.

Other complaints were about the content of the tutoring, much of which focused on drilling rather than on what the teachers considered to be real education. Also, some teachers felt that the tutors upset the sequencing of school lessons by covering materials in advance or with different pedagogic approaches.

In these examples, using the analogy of ecosystems the tutoring sector could be viewed as an invasive species which had upset previous balances and to some extent competed with the authority that the teachers had previously enjoyed (Bray & Kobakhidze 2015). While the teachers in the antagonistic group were most obviously concerned about that, even the work of the neutral teachers had changed. When an average of 71.8% of students are receiving supplementary help – and higher proportions in some schools – then teachers tend to assume that their students have access to such help and therefore that less effort is needed by the schools. This pattern echoes that in West Bengal observed by Sen. In such circumstances, the ecological balances have shifted not only for the students who do receive shadow education but also for the ones who do not.

Cambodia

Cambodia contrasts with Hong Kong not only in being a low-income society that is much less commercialised but also in being mostly rural. Whereas in Hong Kong almost all students can gain physical access to providers of shadow education through excellent private transport, rural students in Cambodia cannot do so. However, teachers are available throughout Cambodia. Where there are schools, there are also teachers; and many Cambodian teachers offer private lessons in addition to their public ones.

Table 1 recorded Dawson's (2011: 18) observation that about half of the primary school students that he surveyed were receiving private tutoring, and that similar proportions were found by Brehm and Silova (2014: 167) among Grade 9 students. Their samples were small, but were consistent with other studies (e.g. Bray & Bunly 2005: 40-42; UNDP 2014: 5). The issues associated with this form of shadow education, particularly the impact on social disparities, have been highlighted at least since the mid-1990s (see e.g. Asian Development Bank 1996: 107), but have proven intractable.

One part of the context for shadow education in Cambodia is that teachers' salaries are low; and increases have been rapidly eroded by inflation (Benveniste et al. 2008: 52; Tandon & Fukao 2015: 24). Many teachers therefore supplement their incomes through extra lessons. Commonly these lessons are for the same students that the teachers have taught during regular lessons, and in the same classrooms.

Another part of the context for shadow education relates to a perceived mismatch between the official curriculum and the available time for delivery. Tensions are particularly significant in double-shift schools, i.e. ones in which one group attends in the mornings and another group attends in the afternoons. Coverage of the curriculum with attention to the needs of individual students may be especially challenging in large classes. As noted by Brehm and Silova (2014: 164):

many parents and teachers believe that there is simply not enough time in the school day to cover the entire curriculum. The perceived lack of time leads to a perceived need for more instructional time simply to provide requisite coverage of the national curriculum.

However, inadequacies in available time can also be ensured. Dawson (2009) referred to "the tricks of the teacher", including withholding content important for examinations in order to persuade students to pay for supplementary classes. This has also been noted by the UNDP (2014: 6):

The field study ... detected apparent abuses of power: students were pressured to attend tutoring sessions, and private tutoring was used as a conduit for teachers to leak examination questions in advance.

In addition to the obvious questions about lack of access for children who were too poor to pay the tutoring fees, the UNDP highlighted "an additional concern about the ethos of children learning at an early age to bribe educators in exchange for access".

The phenomenon, it must be recognised, has many complexities and nuances. Variations arise according to the subjects and grades, the genders of the teachers, the communities served by specific schools,

and the policies of individual principals and local governments. Much also depends on the attitudes and decisions of individual teachers, students and families. Brehm and Silova “routinely heard that students who cannot pay the fees for tutoring are sometimes allowed to attend for free” (2014: 170), but also noted that children in high-income families were much more likely to attend tutoring classes than their low-income counterparts.

Brehm and Silova (2014) also made instructive comparisons between the structure and content of public and private lessons. In many respects, they reported, the government classes and private-tutoring lessons were similar, and the lines between public and private provision were often blurred. However, regular lessons and private tutoring had some differences even when the two to some extent had the same actors in the same locations (p.168):

Not only were there fewer students in the private-tutoring classes and teachers were able to offer examples outside the national curriculum, but teachers were also able to employ pedagogies tailored to individual students. In private-tutoring classes, we often observed teachers circling the room to help students complete individual practice examples, whereas in mainstream school students often worked on problems in groups.

The opportunities to offer private classes also shaped teachers’ decision-making on postings, subjects and grades to be taught. Urban areas may have higher living costs than rural ones, but they also have more opportunities to solicit tutoring. Teachers also choose the subjects for which demand is high, such as languages and mathematics, leading to neglect of other subjects such as history and geography; and teachers compete to teach the upper classes in which the examination pressures are stronger, thereby leading to neglect of lower classes.

Patterns in Cambodia would not easily be interpreted through an ecological metaphor along the lines of the Hong Kong commentary. The Cambodian ecosystem, except perhaps in parts of the large towns, has not experienced the arrival of a new actor in the form of commercialised tutorial centres. Therefore a more productive lens might be literature on marketisation in which teachers in the public sector are nevertheless able to offer their services in private arrangements (see e.g. Silova et al. 2006; Burch 2009; Felouzis & Fouquet-Chauprade 2011; Macpherson et al. 2014). The Cambodian example shows ways in which public and private may be intertwined within the same institutions and persons.

Changing Visions for Changing Times

Among major shifts in the education sector during recent times have been perceptions about the balance of government and private-sector roles. During the initial decades following the Second World War, a dominant view, enshrined for example in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations 1948, Article 26), was that education was a human right and should be provided free of charge and provided by governments. This view is still held strongly by some people (e.g. Singh 2015). However, others have become more tolerant

of the possibility of the private sector as an alternative to the public sector and/or of cost-sharing and public-private partnerships (see e.g. Draxler 2008; LaRocque 2011; Robertson et al. 2012).

Most of the discourse has focused on schooling, with private institutions operating alongside public ones, but parts could also apply to shadow education. UNESCO (2015: 72) has pointed out that:

In re-visioning education in a new global context, we need to reconsider not only the purposes of education, but also how learning is *organized*. In light of the diversification of partnerships and the blurring of boundaries between public and private, we need to rethink the principles that guide educational governance and, in particular, the *normative* principle of education as a public good and how this should be understood in the changing context of society, state and market.

The report noted the privatisation trend at all levels of education across the world, including the expansion of private tutoring (p.74):

Often a symptom of badly functioning school systems, private tutoring, much like other manifestations of private education, can have both positive and negative effects for learners and their teachers. On one hand, teaching can be tailored to the needs of slower learners and teachers can supplement their salaries. On the other hand, fees for private tutoring may represent a sizeable share of household income, particularly among the poor, and can therefore create inequalities in learning opportunities.

Yet although private tutoring is “often a symptom of badly functioning school systems”, this cannot be the only characterisation. Hong Kong’s education system has been judged very positively, at least by inference, in rankings of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD 2014) and the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (e.g. Mullis et al. 2012); and similar remarks may be made about Japan, the Republic of Korea and other countries in which much shadow education exists. Thus, a more nuanced interpretation would take account of the forces of competition that indeed are exacerbated by PISA and TIMSS rankings among other factors. Parents see education as a powerful instrument for advancement in a world that has become increasingly competitive because of the forces of globalisation. Education is a positional good (Hollis 1982), in which families and students see the need to secure and maintain an edge over their competitors. Whether in Hong Kong or in Canada, Egypt or India, first elite, then middle-class, and finally even significant numbers of low-income families see a need to supplement to provision of schooling in the competitive environment. Governments may provide the basics, but the real sorting of high-status occupations and lifestyles comes through the extras of out-of-school education. This pattern is likely to become increasingly intense rather than to diminish.

Conclusions

The vision of ICET, as declared on its website (www.icet4u.org), is:

that all learners will have *access to a high quality education* in which educators are *appropriately qualified* and recognized as *motivated and committed* professionals and practitioners. (emphasis added)

The authors of that statement probably had in mind educational processes within the boundaries of formal schooling rather than a wider vision that encompassed private supplementary tutoring. In terms of *access* (or non-access, and therefore disparities), it is obvious that some families have much greater possibilities to receive high quality tutoring than others. Much depends not only on income levels but also on locations. Concerning *qualifications*, while governments and teacher-training institutions insist that teachers should be trained, many families are very willing to employ untrained tutors, some of whom are company employees and others of whom are just university students or others in the informal economy. Concerning *motivation*, it is possible that tutors whose incomes depend on performance in a marketplace pay more attention to client perspectives; but whether they can all be described as “committed professionals and practitioners” may be open to doubt.

Beyond the vision statement, the ICET website has a mission statement:

to improve the educational experiences and outcomes of learners in all parts of the world by providing opportunities for those involved in their education to share knowledge, practice, resources, and expertise and establish active *partnerships* that are designed to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and improve life opportunities for young people. (emphasis added)

The statement about active partnerships raises a question about how school-based educators and the tutoring industry view each other. Vocabulary about public-private partnerships may sound positive, but in practice may hide multiple forms of competition and dissonance. Taking the Hong Kong case, interview data indicate that some schools and tutors do view each other as partners, or at least as performers of complementary roles. However, another perspective is that parts of the tutoring industry undermine the schools and upset the ecosystem balances. In Cambodia, partnership does not seem to be applicable vocabulary since the public actors are also the private actors, i.e. publicly-employed teachers who provide private tutoring after school hours.

Lest the Hong Kong situation be seen as unusual, it must be repeated that tutorial centres of various kinds have mushroomed around the world. They have become highly visible not just in Asia but also in Western Europe (Bray 2011; Koinzer 2013), North America (Burch 2009; Aurini & Davies 2013), Australasia (Dhall 2014), and elsewhere. Compared with schools, these centres are in most cases loosely regulated. Their quality may not be assured even when their prices are high, and thus major issues of disparity exist among and within the tutorial centres. Further, when tutoring becomes very widespread, teachers may be inclined to assume that students have external support and thus to reduce the efforts that they might otherwise have devoted to their work.

And lest the Cambodian situation be seen as unusual, it must be noted that teachers provide tutoring in contexts ranging from China (Zhang 2014) to Georgia (Kobakhidze 2014) and Rwanda (Williams et al. 2015). In all these settings, issues arise not only about disparities but also about ethics and corruption. Jayachandran

(2014) has pointedly highlighted the “incentives to teach badly” when teachers are tempted to neglect their regular classes in order to devote energies to their private lessons.

Thus, finally, this paper has three major exhortations for ICET and its members:

1. *Recognise the scale and impact of the shadow education sector.* It has been widely ignored by Ministries of Education and by university Faculties of Education which see their missions as serving mainstream education systems. Organisations and individuals that view education for school-aged children and youths only within the boundaries of regular schooling are missing a major component of the picture. The shadow sector has now grown to a huge scale. While it used to be seen as particularly an East Asian phenomenon, it is now global.
2. *Consider the impact on disparities.* This matter is the core of the 2015 Assembly. The shadow education sector has its own internal disparities; and if left to market forces, it generally increases the disparities in schools and the wider society. These disparities, indeed, may be regional and partly explain why East Asian countries have performed well in PISA and TIMSS. But even strong performance on these assessments may be brought into question by the pressures that shadow education brings to young people. And at the level of specific companies and informal providers of tutoring major queries should be raised about the quality of provision. Some shadow education providers achieve outcomes that cannot be achieved by schools, but others are weak or even damaging without adequate monitoring and evaluation by parents and external bodies.
3. *Consider the roles of teachers.* ICET may wish to look more closely at the ways that teachers interact with and are part of the shadow education sector. Some teachers are themselves tutors. Supplementary work should not necessarily be prohibited, but it should at least be assessed and monitored. Other teachers are respondents rather than protagonists in the rise of shadow education in changing ecosystems. They respond in diverse ways, which again should be assessed and monitored.

As ICET and its members address these matters, they will find many complexities and undercurrents. Modes of operation and relationships between actors vary widely within and across families, schools, districts, provinces, countries, and regions. The research literature on this theme is still in its infancy, and ICET can help by expanding the evidence base and then facilitating discussions with policy makers and practitioners.

References

- Antonowicz, Laetitia; Lesné, Frédéric; Stassen, Stéphane & Wood, John (2010): *Africa Education Watch: Good Governance Lessons for Primary Education*. Berlin: Transparency International.
- ASER-Pakistan (2013): *Annual Status of Education Report 2012: National*. Islamabad: South Asian Forum for Education Development (SAFED).
<http://www.aserpakistan.org/document/aser/2012/reports/national/National2012.pdf>.
- Asian Development Bank (1996): *Cambodia: Education Sector Strategy*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.

- Aurini, Janice & Davies, Scott (2013): 'Supplementary Education in a Changing Organizational Field: The Canadian Case', in Aurini, Janice; Davies, Scott & Dierkes, Julian (eds.), *Out of the Shadows: The Global Intensification of Supplementary Education*. Bingley: Emerald, pp.155-170.
- Barrow, Dorian A. & Lochan, Samuel N. (2012): 'Supplementary Tutoring in Trinidad and Tobago: Some Implications for Policy Making'. *International Review of Education*, 58 (3): 405-422.
- Benveniste, Luis; Marshall, Jeffery & Araujo, M. Caridad (2008): *Teaching in Cambodia*. Washington DC: Human Development Sector, East Asia and Pacific Region, The World Bank.
- Bray, Mark (1999). *The Shadow Education System: Private Tutoring and its Implications for Planners*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001802/180205e.pdf> . [Japanese transition with introduction by Suzuki, Shin'ichi 2014, Tokyo: Toshindo. <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Juku-juken-shido-kokusai-hikaku/dp/4798912514>]
- Bray, Mark (2011): *The Challenge of Shadow Education: Private Tutoring and its Implications for Policy Makers in the European Union*. Brussels: European Commission.
<http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports/the-challenge-of-shadow-education-1>
- Bray, Mark (2013): 'Benefits and Tensions of Shadow Education: Comparative Perspectives on the Roles and Impact of Private Supplementary Tutoring in the Lives of Hong Kong Students'. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 2 (1): 18-30.
- Bray, Mark & Bunly, Seng (2005): *Balancing the Books: Household Financing of Basic Education in Cambodia*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong, and Washington DC: The World Bank. <http://cerc.edu.hku.hk/publications/cerc-monograph-series/balancing-the-books>
- Bray, Mark & Kobakhidze, Magda Nutsa (2015): 'Evolving Ecosystems in Education: The Nature and Implications of Private Supplementary Tutoring in Hong Kong'. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, in press.
- Bray, Mark & Kwo (2014): *Regulating Private Tutoring for Public Good: Policy Options for Supplementary Education in Asia*. Bangkok: UNESCO and Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong. <http://cerc.edu.hku.hk/publications/cerc-monograph-series/regulating-private-tutoring-public-good-policy-options-supplementary-education-asia>
- Brehm, William & Silova, Iveta (2014): 'Ethical Dilemmas in the Education Marketplace: Shadow Education, Political Philosophy and Social (In)justice in Cambodia', in Macpherson, Ian; Robertson, Susan & Walford, Geoffrey (eds.), *Education, Privatisation and Social Justice: Case Studies from Africa, South Asia and South East Asia*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp.159-178.
- Buhagiar, Michael & Chetcuti, Deborah A. (2013): 'The Private Tuition Phenomenon in Malta: Moving Toward a Fairer Education System', in Bray, Mark; Mazawi, André E. & Sultana, Ronald G. (eds.), *Private Tutoring Across the Mediterranean: Power Dynamics and Implications for Learning and Equity*. Rotterdam: Sense, pp.129-149.
- Burch, Patricia (2009): *Hidden Markets: The New Education Privatization*. New York: Routledge.
- Cámara, Florencia & Gertel, Héctor R. (2014): 'Private Tutoring: A Necessary Supplement to Admission in Higher Education?'. Paper presented to the annual conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, Toronto, 10-15 March.
- Dawson, Walter (2009): 'The Tricks of the Teacher: Shadow Education and Corruption in Cambodia', in Heyneman, Stephen P. (ed.), *Buying Your Way into Heaven: Education and Corruption in International Perspective*. Rotterdam: Sense, pp.51-74.
- Dawson, Walter (2011): 'Supplementary Education in Cambodia'. *IIAS Newsletter* (University of Leiden, International Institute for Asian Studies), 56: 18-19.
http://www.iias.nl/sites/default/files/IIAS_NL56_1819_0.pdf
- Dhall, Mohan (2014): '2013 A Retrospective'. *Within Tuition* [Australian Tutoring Association], 9 (1): 1.

<http://ata.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/ATA-Newsletter-Jan-2014-2.pdf>

- Dierkes, Julian (2010): 'Teaching in the Shadow: Operators of Small Shadow Institutions in Japan'. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11 (1), pp.25-35.
- Dillon, Jenny (2011): '\$200 an Hour buys a Better Education with Private Tutoring'. *The Daily Telegraph* [Sydney], 22 August.
- Draxler, Alexandra (2008): *New Partnerships for EFA: Building on Experience*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).
- Eckler, Rebecca (2015): 'The New Tutor Dynasty'. *Macleans*, 12 April.
<http://www.macleans.ca/education/the-new-tutor-dynasty>
- Education Bureau (2014): *Student Enrolment Statistics 2013/14*. Hong Kong: Education Statistics Section, Education Bureau.
- Felouzis, Georges & Fouquet-Chauprade, Barbara (eds.) (2011): *Penser les Marchés Scolaires*. Special issue of *Éducation Comparée*, Vol.6.
- Hartmann, Sarah (2013): 'Education "Home Delivery" in Egypt: Private Tutoring and Social Stratification'. in Bray, Mark; Mazawi, André E. & Sultana, Ronald G. (eds.), *Private Tutoring Across the Mediterranean: Power Dynamics and Implications for Learning and Equity*. Rotterdam: Sense, pp.57-75.
- Hollis, Martin (1982): 'Education as a Positional Good'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 16 (2): 235-244.
- Hong Kong Education (Intl) Investments Limited (2014): *Annual Report 2014*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Education (Intl) Investments Limited. http://www.irasia.com/listco/hk/hkeduui/annual/ar131938-ew_01082ar_21102014.pdf
- Jayachandran, Seema (2014): 'Incentives to Teach Badly: After-School Tutoring in Developing Countries'. *Journal of Development Economics*, 108: 190-205.
- Kobakhidze, Magda Nutsa (2014): 'Corruption Risks of Private Tutoring: Case of Georgia'. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 34 (4): 455-475.
- Koh, Aaron (2014). 'The "Magic" of Tutorial Centres in Hong Kong: An Analysis of Media Marketing and Pedagogy in a Tutorial Centre'. *International Review of Education*, 60 (6): 803-819.
- Koinzer, Thomas (2013): 'Supplementary Education in Germany: History and Present Developments', in Aurini, Janice; Davies, Scott & Dierkes, Julian (eds.), *Out of the Shadows: The Global Intensification of Supplementary Education*. Bingley: Emerald, pp.209-220.
- KOSIS [Korean Statistical Information Service] (2015): 'Private Education Participation Rate by School Level'.
http://kosis.kr/eng/statisticsList/statisticsList_01List.jsp?vwcd=MT_ETITLE&parentId=C#SubCont, accessed 30 May 2015.
- Kwo, Ora & Bray, Mark (2011): 'Facing the Shadow Education system in Hong Kong'. *IIAS Newsletter* (University of Leiden, International Institute for Asian Studies), 56: 20. <http://www.ias.nl/the-newsletter/article/facing-shadow-education-system-hong-kong>
- LaRocque, Norman (2011): *Non-State Providers and Public-Private Partnerships in Education for the Poor*. Bangkok: UNICEF and Mandaluyong City: Asian Development Bank.
http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Final_NSP_lowres.pdf
- Lamprianou, Iasonas & Lamprianou, Thekla Afantiti (2013): 'Charting Private Tutoring in Cyprus: A Socio-Demographic Perspective', in Bray, Mark; Mazawi, André E. & Sultana, Ronald G. (eds.), *Private Tutoring Across the Mediterranean: Power Dynamics and Implications for Learning and Equity*. Rotterdam: Sense, pp.29-56.
- Lee, Chung-Wah (2010): *Shadow Education: A Comparative Study of Two Tutorial Schools in Hong Kong*. MEd dissertation, The University of Hong Kong.

- Macpherson, Ian; Robertson, Susan & Walford, Geoffrey (eds.) (2014): *Education, Privatisation and Social Justice: Case Studies from Africa, South Asia and South East Asia*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Marimuthu, T., Singh, J.S., Ahmad, K., Lim, H.K., Mukherjee, H., Osman, S., Chelliah, T., Sharma, J.R., Salleh, N.M., Yong, L., Lim, T.L., Sukumaran, S., Thong, L.K. & Jamaluddin, W. (1991). *Extra-school instruction, social equity and educational quality* [in Malaysia]. Singapore: International Development Research Centre.
- Mariya, Maryam (2012): *I don't Learn at School, so I take Tuition: An Ethnographic Study of Classroom Practices and Private Tuition Settings in the Maldives*. PhD thesis, Massey University.
- McLean, John (2009): 'Japan's Academic Juku (1): Teachers, Pupils, Focus on Courses, Class Sizes, Fees and Admission Criteria'. *Journal of Yasuda Women's University*, 37, pp.153-167.
- Mehl, Margaret (2003): *Private Academies of Chinese Learning in Meiji Japan: The Decline and Transformation of the Kangaku Juku*. Copenhagen: NIAS [Nordic Institute of Asian Studies] Press.
- METI [Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry] (2013). *Report on the Trend in the Industry of Specialized Services in 2011: Data Collected for the Purpose of Improving the Empirical Studies*. Tokyo: METI. http://www.meti.go.jp/meti_lib/report/2013fy/E002924.pdf. [in Japanese]
- MEXT [Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology] (2008): *Report on the Situation of Academic Learning Activities of Children*. Tokyo: Monbukagakusho Hokokusho. [in Japanese]
- Mullis, Ina V.S.; Martin, Michael O.; Foy, Pierre & Arora, Alka (2012): *TIMSS 2011 International Results in Mathematics*. Boston: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College. <http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2011/international-results-mathematics.html>
- Ngai, Angela & Cheung, Sharon (2010): *Students' Participation in Private Tuition*. Youth Poll Series No. 188. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups.
- OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] (2014): *PISA 2012 Results in Focus: What 15-year-olds know and what they can do with what they know*. Paris: OECD. <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf>
- Oller, Claudine (2011): 'Le Coaching Scolaire en France : Émergence d'un Nouveau Marché Éducatif'. *Education Comparée*, 6 : 181-201.
- Pallegedara, Asankha (2012): 'Demand for Private Tutoring in a Free Education Country: The Case of Sri Lanka'. *International Journal of Education Economics and Development*, 3 (4): 375-393.
- Pratham (2013): *Annual Status of Education Report 2012*. Mumbai: Pratham. <http://pratham.org/file/ASER-2012report.pdf>.
- Robertson, Susan; Mundy, Karen; Verger, Antoni & Menashy, Francine (eds.) (2012): *Public Private Partnerships in Education: New Actors and Modes of Governance in a Globalizing World*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Roesgaard, Marie H. (2006): *Japanese Education and the Cram School Business: Functions, Challenges and Perspectives of the Juku*. Copenhagen: NIAS [Nordic Institute of Asian Studies] Press.
- Sato, Yuji (ed.) (2012): *100 Years of Juku and 50 Years of Juku Associations*. Tokyo: Private Tutoring Federation. [in Japanese]
- Sen, Amartya (2009): 'Introduction: Primary Schooling in West Bengal', in Rana, Kumar (Coordinator), *The Pratiche Education Report II: Primary Education in West Bengal – Changes and Challenges*. New Delhi: Pratiche (India) Trust. http://pratiche.org/sites/default/files/Pratiche_Education-Report_II.pdf.
- Sen, Amartya (2010): 'Primary Schooling in West Bengal'. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, 40 (3): 311-320.
- Silova, Iveta; Būdienė, Virginija & Bray, Mark (eds.) (2006): *Education in a Hidden Marketplace: Monitoring of Private Tutoring*. New York: Open Society Institute.
- Singh, Kishore (2015): 'Education is a Basic Human Right – Which is why Private Schools must be Resisted'.

The Guardian, 23 April. <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/apr/23/education-is-a-basic-human-right-why-private-schools-must-be-resisted>, accessed 2 June 2015.

- Sobhy, Hania (2012): 'The De-facto Privatization of Secondary Education in Egypt: A Study of Private Tutoring in Technical and General Schools'. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43 (1): 47-67.
- Stevenson, David L. & Baker, David P. (1992): 'Shadow Education and Allocation in Formal Schooling: Transition to University in Japan'. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97 (6): 1639-1657.
- Suraweera, A.V. (2011): *Dr. Kannangara's Free Education Proposals in Relation to the Subsequent Expansion of the Tuition Industry*. Dr. C.W.W. Kannangara Memorial Lecture 22, Mahargama, Sri Lanka: Department of Research and Development, National Institute of Education.
- Sutton Trust (2014): *Research Brief: Extra-curricular Inequality*. London: The Sutton Trust. <http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Extracurricular-inequality.pdf>.
- Tandon, Prateek & Fukao, Tsuyoshi (2015): *Educating the Next Generation: Improving Teacher Quality in Cambodia*. Directions in Development, Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Tsuneyoshi, Ryoko (2015): 'Confronting Inequity in Japanese School Education', Keynote address, ICET 59th World Assembly, Naruto Kyoiku Daigaku.
- UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] (2015): *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?*. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002326/232652E.pdf>
- UNDP [United Nations Development Programme] (2014): *Curbing Private Tutoring and Informal Fees in Cambodia's Basic Education: Background Paper for Cambodia Human Development Report 2015*. Phnom Penh: UNDP.
- United Nations (1948): *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations. http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf
- Viel, Patricia (2012): *Gestión de la Tutoría Escolar: Proyectos y Recursos Para la Escuela Secundaria*. Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- Watanabe, Manabu (2013): *Juku: The Stealth Force of Education and the Deterioration of Schools in Japan*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Williams, Timothy P.; Abbott, Pamela & Mupenzi, Alfred (2015): "'Education at our School is not Free": The Hidden Costs of Fee-free Schooling in Rwanda'. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 45. DOI 10.1080/03057925.2014.938611
- Wray, Harry (1999): *Japanese and American Education: Attitudes and Practices*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.
- Xue, Hai-ping & Ding Xiao-hao (2009): 'A Study on Additional Instruction for Students in Cities and Towns in China'. *Educational Research*, 30 (1): 39-46. [in Chinese]
- Yung, Kevin Wai-Ho (2011): *Shadow Education in Hong Kong: The Experience of Learners of English*. MA in Applied Linguistics dissertation, The University of Hong Kong.
- Zhang, Wei (2014): 'The Demand for Shadow Education in China: Mainstream Teachers and Power Relations'. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 34 (4): 436-454.

Note on the Author: Mark Bray is UNESCO Chair Professor in Comparative Education at the University of Hong Kong. He began his career as a secondary school teacher in Kenya and then Nigeria, before taking posts at the Universities of Edinburgh, Papua New Guinea and London. He moved to Hong Kong in 1986, but from 2006 to 2010 took leave to work in Paris as Director of UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning. He has written several books on shadow education, including [The Shadow Education System](#):

[Private Tutoring and its Implications for Planners](#) (1999), [Confronting the Shadow Education System: What Government Policies for What Private Tutoring?](#) (2009), and, with Chad Lykins, [Shadow Education: Private Supplementary Tutoring and its Implications for Policy Makers in Asia](#) (2012).

Address: Comparative Education Research Centre, Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. mbray@hku.hk.