

Tooley, James

Low-cost private schools: Controversy and implications concerning EFA-debate

ZEP : Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik 38 (2015) 2, S. 22-26



Empfohlene Zitierung/ Suggested Citation:

Tooley, James: Low-cost private schools: Controversy and implications concerning EFA-debate - In: ZEP : Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik 38 (2015) 2, S. 22-26 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-140169

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:

ZEP Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung
und Entwicklungspädagogik

"Gesellschaft für interkulturelle Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik e.V."

<http://www.uni-bamberg.de/allgpaed/zep-zeitschrift-fuer-internationale-bildungsforschung-und-entwicklungspaedagogik/profil>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung (DIPF)
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Mitglied der


Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

1'15 ZEP

Für das internationale Projekt Education for All (EFA) ist 2015 gewissermaßen ein Schicksalsjahr. Die UN-Generalversammlung in New York und der UN-Bildungskongress in Dakar hatten 2000 das zentrale Ziel, einen Zugang zu Bildung für alle Kinder der Welt bis zum Jahr 2015 durchzusetzen und lebenslange Bildungsoptionen auch für Jugendliche und Erwachsene zu schaffen. Bereits auf dem Weg dorthin wurde der visionäre Charakter der Zielperspektive deutlich. Obgleich z.B. die Zahl der nicht eingeschulten Kinder von 108 Mio. (1999) auf 58 (2012) Mio. gefallen ist, wird das Gesamtziel weit verfehlt. 29 % der Länder mit verfügbaren Daten sind weit und 9 % sehr weit davon entfernt das Ziel der Grundbildung für alle zu erreichen (EFA-Monitoring Report 2015). Aber auch die Einschulungsrate sagt wenig über den Lernerfolg und über die Qualität des Unterrichts aus. Nach wie vor unterrichten in vielen Ländern eine große Zahl von Personen ohne professionelle Ausbildung und viele Schüler/-innen können auch nach Durchlaufen der Grundschulzeit weder lesen noch schreiben. Insgesamt ist der Erfolg des EFA-Projekts sehr unterschiedlich verlaufen. Da in diesem Jahr (2015) die Post-Millenniumsziele bis 2030 bei der UN-Generalversammlung im September verabschiedet werden, ist es an der Zeit, Bilanz zu ziehen und Perspektiven zu überprüfen. Dabei sollen vor allem Kolleg/inn/en aus dem globalen Süden zu Wort kommen.

Mit dem vorliegenden Heft soll den interessierten Lesenden eine Zusammenschau zur gegenwärtigen weltweiten Bildungssituation geliefert werden. *Asit Datta*, *Gregor Lang-Wojtasik* und *Sarah Lange* bieten zusammenfassend Rückblick, Bestandsaufnahme und Ausblick der thematischen Felder an.

Vor diesem Hintergrund fasst *Aaron Benavot* – der Direktor des Global Monitoring Report (GRM) – zusammen mit seinem Team die wichtigen Ergebnisse des soeben erschienenen GMR zusammen und beschreibt neben den Kernergebnissen auch deren Bedeutung für die weiteren Finanzierungspläne von EFA. Im Anschluss werden weitere inhaltliche Schwerpunkte vertieft. Zunächst wird der geografische Fokus auf Ostafrika gelegt. *John Kabutha Mugo*, *John Kiruru Nderitu* und *Sara Jerop Ruto* beschreiben verfehlt Ziele und Chancen neuer Initiativen am Beispiel Kenias.

James Tooley widmet sich dem Thema der Schulen mit geringfügigem Schulgeld, indem er die umstrittene These ausführt, dass ‚low cost private schools‘ Alternativstrategien sein können, um die EFA-Ziele zu erreichen. Im Anschluss beschreiben *Claudia Richter* und *Ricardo Morales Ulloa* ihre Bestandsaufnahme mit einem Fokus auf Honduras, also einem jener Länder, das Teil der Fast-Track-Initiative des EFA-Projekts war.

Bangladesh ist ein Land, das in jüngster Vergangenheit häufig auf Grund der vielen Entwicklungen im Bildungsbereich genannt wird. Es steht im Zentrum des Beitrags von

Rasheda Chowdhury und *Mostafizur Rahaman*, die für das Netzwerk CAMPE (Campaign for Popular Education, Bangladesh) tätig sind und einen Überblick über Fakten, Erreichtes und Herausforderungen im südasiatischen Kontext berichten.

Die Bilder in dieser Ausgabe wurden von Kindern aus Süddeutschland in einem informellen Malwettbewerb zum Thema Schule für alle gestaltet und ermöglichen einen bodengeerderten Blick auf das Thema.

Darüber hinaus wird auch diese Ausgabe der ZEP durch einen Bericht zum deutschen Launch des GMR im April 2015 in Bonn, Rezensionen und Informationen des Globalen Lernens und der internationalen Bildungsforschung bereichert.

Neue Erkenntnisse und Anregungen für eine Weiterbeschäftigung mit dem Thema wünschen

*Asit Datta, Gregor Lang-Wojtasik
und Sarah Lange
Hannover, Weingarten, Bamberg, Mai 2015*

Impressum

ZEP – Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik
ISSN 1434-4688

Herausgeber:

Gesellschaft für interkulturelle Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik e.V. und KommEnt

Schriftleitung: Annette Scheunpflug/
Claudia Bergmüller

Redaktionsanschrift:

ZEP-Redaktion, Lehrstuhl Allgemeine Pädagogik, Markusplatz 3, 96047 Bamberg

Verlag:

Waxmann Verlag GmbH, Steinfurter Straße 555,
48159 Münster, Tel.: 0251/26 50 40
E-Mail: info@waxmann.com

Redaktion:

Barbara Asbrand, Claudia Bergmüller, Hans Bühler, Asit Datta, Julia Franz, Norbert Frieters-Reermann, Heidi Grobbauer (Österreich), Helmuth Hartmeyer (Österreich), Susanne Höck, Karola Hoffmann, Ulrich Klemm, Gregor Lang-Wojtasik, Sarah Lange, Volker Lenhart, Claudia Lohrenscheit, Bernd Overwien, Marco Rieckmann, Annette Scheunpflug, Birgit Schößwender, Klaus Seitz, Rudolf Tippelt, Susanne Timm

Technische Redaktion:

Sabine Lang (verantwortlich) 0951/863-1832, Sarah Lange (Rezensionen), Markus Ziebarth (Infos)

Anzeigenverwaltung: Waxmann Verlag GmbH, Martina Kaluza: kaluza@waxmann.com

Abbildungen: (Falls nicht bezeichnet) Privatfotos oder Illustrationen der Herausgebenden

Titelbild: „Schule für alle“ aus der Sicht von Josua (10 Jahre) © Gregor Lang-Wojtasik

Erscheinungsweise und Bezugsbedingungen: erscheint vierteljährlich; Jahresabonnement EUR 20,-, Einzelheft EUR 6,50; alle Preise verstehen sich zuzüglich Versandkosten; zu beziehen durch alle Buchhandlungen oder direkt vom Verlag. Abbestellungen spätestens acht Wochen vor Ablauf des Jahres. Das Heft ist auf umweltfreundlichem chlorfreien Papier gedruckt. Diese Publikation ist gefördert von Brot für die Welt – Evangelischen Entwicklungsdienst, Referat für Inlandsförderung, Berlin.

ZEP

Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung
und Entwicklungspädagogik

Mit: Mitteilungen der DGfE-Kommission
Vergleichende und Internationale
Erziehungswissenschaft

2'15

- Themen 4 **Asit Datta/Gregor Lang-Wojtasik/Sarah Lange**
Education for All – bleibende Vision als Auftrag zum Handeln!
- 10 **Aaron Benavot et al.**
Education for All 2000–2015: Review and Perspectives
- 16 **John Kabutha Mugo/John Kiruru Nderitu/Sara Jerop Ruto**
The 2015 Promise of Education for All in Kenya:
Missed Target or New Start?
- 22 **James Tooley**
Low-cost Private Schools: Controversy and Implications
Concerning EFA-debate
- 27 **Claudia Richter/Ricardo Morales Ulloa**
Education for All in Honduras – 15 Jahre nach Dakar
- 33 **Rasheda Chowdhury/Mostafizur Rahaman**
Education for All. Realities, Achievements and Challenges
The Story of Bangladesh
- VIE 38 Neues aus der Kommission/Deutscher Launch des
UNESCO-Weltbildungsberichts 2015
- 40 Rezensionen
- 43 Informationen

James Tooley

Low-cost Private Schools: Controversy and Implications Concerning EFA-debate

Abstract

Malala Yousafzai went to a low-cost private school. This type of school is ubiquitous in the developing world. There is no controversy about the superior quality of these schools over the government alternative. Controversy focuses on equity implications. This paper argues low-cost private schools are affordable to families on the poverty line; they also enhance opportunities for girls. They are compatible with “Education for All”, provided that targeted assistance is provided for those currently unable to avail themselves of private education.

Keywords: *Private education, development, entrepreneurship, low-cost*

Zusammenfassung

Kostengünstige Privatschulen sind allgegenwärtig in Entwicklungsländern. Es besteht Einigkeit zur überragenden Qualität dieser Schulen im Vergleich zur staatlichen Alternative. In der Debatte werden Konsequenzen für Gerechtigkeit diskutiert. In diesem Aufsatz wird argumentiert, dass kostengünstige Privatschulen für Familien an der Armutsgrenze bezahlbar sind und auch die Möglichkeiten für Mädchen verbessern. Diese Schulen sind vereinbar mit den Zielen von „Education For All“ – vorausgesetzt, dass denjenigen, die derzeit keinen Nutzen aus von privaten Bildungsangeboten ziehen können, gezielt Unterstützung gewährt wird.

Schlüsselworte: *Privatbildung, Entwicklung, Unternehmertum, Kostengünstigkeit*

Introduction

Malala Yousafzai, the girl the Taliban tried to murder, is the youngest person ever to win the Nobel Peace Prize. Curiously, however, when her work is discussed an important detail is usually omitted: summarising her 16th birthday talk to the UN, e.g., the BBC highlighted “her campaign to ensure free, compulsory education for every child” (BBC News 2013). “Free” and “compulsory” echo the Dakar Framework for Action (“Education for all”) which sought by 2015 that all children should have access to “free and compulsory primary education of good quality.” (World Education Forum 2000, p. 8). “Free” and “compulsory” are also of course words commonly

associated with government schooling. But it wasn't to government schooling that Malala and her family turned to get an education. The school she attended, on her way to which she was famously shot by the Taliban, was in fact a low-cost private school set up by her father (cf. Yousafzai 2013, p. 34). Indeed, her father became president of an association of 400 low-cost private schools (p. 41).

Malala's story is far from unusual. It highlights the presence of a global grassroots' movement of which her father is just one player.

Ubiquity

I began writing about low-cost private schools in 2000 (cf. Tooley 2000a, b), and directed two major research programmes, between 2003 and 2005 and 2011 to 2013, funded by the John Templeton Foundation. When I began writing about this phenomenon, it was hard getting anyone to take it seriously. Influential development expert Kevin Watkins, erstwhile director of UNESCO's Education for All Global Monitoring Report, wrote that I and my colleagues were “ploughing a lonely furrow. Nobody, it seems, is listening to them. Long may it stay that way” (Watkins 2004, p. 11). Today the furrow is much less lonely as many other sources now corroborate the existence of these schools and explore their impact for development, although of course more research is needed to fully understand the extent of their potential role. My initial research showed that, far from only serving the middle classes and above, private schools were serving poor communities across sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Although in some countries (Kenya for instance), these schools were described by the ministry of education as ‘non-formal’, it was clear that they satisfied all the conditions of formal schooling – they had formal buildings, formal timetables, formal curriculum, etc. – and perhaps the label ‘non-formal’ was designed to marginalize their significance. (Indeed, pointing out these facts to members, I was instrumental in getting the association of low-cost private schools in Kenya to change its name from Kenya Non-Formal Schools Association to Kenya Independent Schools Association).

The first research programme explored slums, shanty towns and peri-urban communities in India (Delhi and Hyderabad), Kenya (Nairobi), Ghana (Ga, near Accra) and Nige-

ria (Lagos State), as well as rural India (Mahbubnagar) and China (Gansu province). Typically the research found that the majority of schoolchildren in urban and peri-urban communities was attending low-cost private schools – usually between 64 to 75 % – while a significant minority in rural communities similarly attended private schools (see e.g., Tooley/Dixon 2006; Tooley 2009).

We tested 24,000 children in mathematics, English and one other subjects and found typically that children in low-cost private schools outperformed those in government schools, even after controlling for family background variables and possible selectivity biases (cf. Tooley et al. 2010, 2011; Dixon et al. 2013).

The second major study extended the focus to conflict and post-conflict countries in sub-Saharan Africa. In Liberia (cf. Tooley/Longfield 2013a), we conducted a school survey in seven major slums in Monrovia, followed by a household survey in one of these slums. The survey found 432 schools serving a total of 102,205 pupils in the seven slums. Of these schools, only two were government. Private proprietors provided 57.2 % of all schools found, with 60.7 % of all pupils. A household survey showed that, for children aged five to 14, only 8.2 % was in government schools while 71.0 % were in private schools and 20.9 % was out of school.

In Sierra Leone (cf. Tooley and Longfield 2013b) we set out to find all schools serving primary children in Western Area, (Rural and Urban). This was followed by testing over 3,000 primary 4 students in English and mathematics in a random sample of schools, stratified by management categories and creating multi-level models to analyse the data.

The government was found to manage ten percent of all schools, with 90 % managed in the private sector. Private proprietors provided the largest proportion of schools (33 % of all schools), followed by established churches (17 %). Moreover, 17 % of children were in government managed schools, compared to 83 % in private schools. Regarding achievement, analysed by using multi-level modelling, we found that an average child was predicted to perform better in private than in government schools. For English (reading), in a government school an average boy was predicted to achieve 15.5 %, while a girl would achieve 10.8 %. In a low-cost private school, the boy's result would nearly double, while the girl's result would nearly triple, to 30.2 % in for profit or 29.0 % in non-profit.

In South Sudan (cf. Longfield/Tooley 2013) we carried out a school survey to locate all schools in the urban and peri-urban areas of Juba. We found 199 schools serving a total of 88,820 pupils at nursery, primary and high school levels. The private sector accounted for 73.9 % of the schools and 62.6 % of the pupils. The largest number of schools were private proprietor schools (28.1 %) followed by government schools (26.1 %).

The research summarised here suggests a considerable success story: educational entrepreneurs and other socially-minded groups have created low-cost private schools, which are generally serving the majority of children in urban areas. In *The Beautiful Tree* (Tooley 2009) I celebrate the existence of these schools and suggest that they have a crucial contribution to make towards “education for all”.

However, this position is controversial: the literature reveals a hugely polarised debate about the significance of low-

cost private schools. Why the controversy? Earlier I used the phrase ‘de facto privatisation’ to describe the low-cost private school movement (cf. Tooley/Dixon 2006); this phrase is now in wide circulation (e.g., CEDAW 2014; Rolleston/Adefeso-Olateju 2014). But this term carries huge significance: privatisation, the assigning of businesses or services to private rather than state ownership, is normally considered a top-down approach (governments ‘denationalize’ particular industries, e.g., railways or steel). ‘De facto’ privatisation, on the other hand, is ‘bottom-up’, where the people themselves, not the state – indeed, often against the wishes of the state – are engaged in reassigning education to private rather than state control and ownership. So controversy seems engendered by the realisation that the people themselves are embracing an alternative solution to educational delivery to that which has been the accepted wisdom since around 1948 (with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights). There is a lot at stake if the people themselves appear to be rejecting 65 years of development consensus.

Controversy¹

No controversy about ubiquity of private schools or superior quality

Let us be clear where the controversy does and does not lie. First, there is no controversy now about the extent of private schools. For instance, the literature surveyed in the recent DFID-commissioned “rigorous literature review” of the sector (Day Ashley et al. 2014) reported (low cost) private schools in urban and rural India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Ghana, South Africa, Malawi and Jamaica. Concurring with our findings above, research reports a large majority of urban children using low-cost private schools. In Lagos, Nigeria, 70 % of pre- and primary children are in private schools (cf. Härmä/Adefisayo, 2013 p. 129), while across India it is reported that 28 % of rural children nationally are in private school, rising above 50 % in certain states, “denoting a furious rate of growth of private school enrolment in rural north India” (Day Ashley et al. 2014 p. 23 and footnote 12). In terms of absolute numbers, there are reportedly between 300,000 to 400,000 low-cost private schools in India (cf. Garg 2011), while Härmä/Adefisayo (2013) report over 12,000 private schools in Lagos State alone (p. 133), with around three quarters (the unapproved schools) likely to be low-cost. Nishimura/Yamano (2013) report a dramatic growth to around 8,000 private schools by 2007, while Aslam (2009) reports over 24,000 private schools in Punjab alone, even as far back as 2001 (p. 333).

Second, there is also widespread agreement that quality is higher in private than public provision, although there are not a huge number of good studies that illustrate this (a problem of lack of research, not quality of private provision). For instance, Day Ashley et al. (2014) argue that the assumption “pupils attending private schools achieve better learning outcomes than state school pupils” is well-supported by the literature. Excellent studies from India include Desai et al. (2008) and French/Kingdon (2010), which show “positive private school achievement advantage based on standardised test scores” even after controlling for observable and unobservable household factors (Day Ashley et al. 2014, p. 15). Other rigo-

rous studies find similar effects from other settings, including in Africa (p. 16). Evidence also strongly supports the assumption that “teaching in private schools is better than in state schools” (p. 14). Teaching is better “in terms of more teacher presence and teaching activity, and teaching approaches that are more likely to lead to improved outcomes” (p. 19).

Affordability and Accessibility

The controversy is not around the ubiquity of low-cost private schools or their superior quality to government schools. Instead it concerns ‘equity’ issues, and in particular affordability and access to the poorest, and gender.

Regarding affordability/access, here we part company with Day Ashley et al. (2014), although focusing on the same literature (see Tooley/Longfield 2015). For instance, they cite Härmä (2011) as showing “that despite a vast majority of parents indicating a preference for private schools over poor quality government alternatives, only 41 percent of the children in the sample were actually attending private schools” (Day Ashley et al. 2014, p. 28).

Someone determined to find the glass half-empty might take that as negative evidence against private education. I suggest that more than two out of five children using private schools in poor, remote villages in one of India’s poorest states is instead evidence suggesting private school affordability and accessibility.

But are the children the poorest? Härmä/Rose (2012) is reported as finding “that only 10 percent of children from the poorest quintile were accessing private schools in their study area in India (compared to 70 percent of the richest quintile)” (Day Ashley et al. 2014, p. 28). However, Härmä created bespoke wealth and income quintiles for the villages researched. In very poor villages in remote Uttar Pradesh, itself a poor Indian state, one might assume that everyone or nearly everyone is poor. Investigating income quintiles for India as a whole shows that all but one, the richest of Härmä’s quintiles, is either poor or very poor by Indian standards. Her bottom two quintiles are very poor by Indian standards, while her third and fourth relatively wealthy quintiles are in fact poor by Indian standards (cf. Tooley/Longfield 2015). So it is true that in these very poor villages, only 10 % of the lowest quintile accesses private schools. But we should not ignore the 30 % of the second lowest, nearly 50 % of the middle quintile, and nearly 60 % of the fourth quintile are also using private schools (cf. Härmä/Rose 2012, Figure 12.1, p. 251). These are all poor by Indian standards, and the first two categories are the poorest; large proportions of each are currently able to afford low-cost private schools.

We take these ideas further in our recent research in conflict and post-conflict affected states in Africa, where we’ve attempted to define “low-cost” in a more scientific fashion (cf. Tooley 2013a; Tooley/Longfield 2013; Tooley/Longfield 2015). This works backwards from poor families’ income or expenditure, to estimate what they could afford to spend on private schooling: Using the internationally accepted \$1.25 and \$2 per person per day poverty lines (at 2005 exchange rates and purchasing power parity), we first calculate, for a specific country/region, the total annual income for an average sized family. We then take some percentage of that total annual in-

come, and specify that this is the maximum amount that can be spent on schooling. (We used 10 %, inspired by discussions in Lewin, 2007). Finally, we divide that ‘maximum amount’ by the average number of school-aged children in a family. This gives us the maximum annual schooling costs per child, in other words, maximum fees affordable in private schools. For the \$1.25 poverty line calculation we specify this as ‘lowest cost’, while the \$2 poverty line gives ‘low cost’ private schools.

What were the findings using this method? From our school survey in slums of Monrovia, Liberia, the vast majority (73.7 %) of private schools found is lowest cost, that is, affordable to families on the internationally-accepted poverty line. Regarding private for profit schools, 77.6 % is lowest cost, similar to private independent church schools (76.4 % lowest cost), but rather different from the established church schools (51.8 % lowest cost). Looking at all areas of Sierra Leone (Western Area), i.e. not just the poorest areas, we found 66 % of for profit private schools were lowest cost and 15 % low cost, (cf. Tooley/Longfield 2013a, b).

In South Sudan, we were also able to use an additional poverty category, the average consumption of those living below the poverty line, to define an “ultra-low-cost” fee category. The vast majority (81.5 %) of schools found is ultra-low or very low cost. Fully three fifths (61.1 %) of private proprietor schools are ultra-low or very low cost, with nearly one in five ultra-low cost, affordable to the poorest of the poor (cf. Longfield/Tooley 2013).

Not only did we find many private schools affordable to the poorest, it is also illuminating to realize that the cost of sending a child to a government school is often not that different from the cost of sending to a private school. The figures from Monrovia, Liberia, illustrate this: Although total fees per annum are three times higher in private than government schools, total other costs are more or less the same in both types of schools. Overall, the average cost for a parent of sending a child to government school is 75 % of the cost of sending a child to private school. That is, while mean fees at government schools come to \$29.98 per annum, only a third of the \$90.51 at private schools, the other costs total \$126.46 in government, compared to \$124.27 in private. Overall, the cost of sending to a government school comes to \$159.07 per annum, not far short of the \$214.25 of sending to private (cf. Tooley/Longfield, 2013a).

Gender

Another area of controversy concerns gender. Again we part company with Day Ashley et al. (2014). Our review of the evidence (cf. Tooley/Longfield, 2015) suggests that low-cost private schools do not discriminate against girls. In places where there are cultural or socio-economic barriers to girls using low-cost private schools, they attend them in significant proportions. Moreover, where these cultural or socio-economic barriers are lower, then low-cost private schools already arrive at or even exceed gender parity. Finally, low-cost private schools seem to have a positive impact on narrowing gender achievement gaps.

Some of the disagreement here appears based on simple misreading of the evidence by Day Ashley et al. (2014). For instance, Hartwig’s (2013) study from rural Tanzania compar-

ing public and private secondary schools is used as negative evidence against private schools. In fact, in private schools 77 % of the pupils are girls (see Hartwig 2013, Table 2), certainly not evidence of gender bias against girls. Similarly, Maitra et al. (2011) is not used as positive evidence even though in nine out of the 14 states researched, none of the gender variable measures are statistically significant: That is, there is no evidence of gender inequality in private schools in states as diverse as Orissa, Jammu and Kashmir, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Kerala (Table 9, p. 36). For these states, “there is no evidence that girls are less likely to be enrolled in private schools relative to boys” (p. 17).

In our latest studies from conflict and post-conflict states, we have also found evidence of gender parity in private schools in West Africa. In Western Area, Sierra Leone, for instance, 51.9 % of children in schools are girls. Girls make up the majority of pupils in all three categories of schools – government, non-profit and for profit private – and at each level of primary school. In the slums of Monrovia, Liberia, there are more girls than boys in school overall, with enrolment being 51.6 % girls and 48.4 % boys. Moreover, private proprietor (for profit) schools have either more girls or equal numbers of girls and boys, at nursery, elementary and junior high school. In the household survey, in each of the three categories (private, government and out of school), there are more girls than boys, but no significant differences between the sexes: 6.8 % of boys and 7.0 % of girls are in government school, while 66.2 % of boys and 64.8 % of girls are in private school (cf. Tooley/Longfield 2013a, b).

Conclusion: Linking Private Schools and ‘Education for All’

Nobel peace-prize winner Malala went to a low-cost private school. Her experience is far from unusual. Low-cost private schools are commonplace across developing countries. They are ubiquitous and of higher quality than government schools; this appears to be widely accepted. Our evidence also suggests that low-cost private schools are affordable to the poor and do not offend gender equity. But perhaps the discussion may seem beside the point in an essay on ‘education for all’, exploring ideas for the international community to put forward for future educational goals: irrespective of whether or not low-cost private schools are affordable to the poor or fair to girls, does not the definition of “education for all” (EFA) override these considerations? For the Dakar Framework for Action it commits signatories to ensure “that by 2015 all children ... have access to and complete, free and compulsory primary education of good quality.” (World Education Forum 2000, p. 8, emphasis added). Clearly low-cost private schools are not free, so cannot be part of this solution.

However, there are three reasons to suggest that low-cost private schools should play a role. First, trivially, if governments commit to give all children access to free primary education, this does not mean to say that all children have to use this government provision. Indeed, this is often the position in countries described – in India, for instance, there are typically free government schools available, genuinely much cheaper options for parents; nonetheless, even in the presence of these free alternatives, parents prefer to opt for low-cost private schools.

Second, the EFA goal does not specify that there should be government provision of schools only that the schools provided should be free. So it is consistent with EFA that parents attend private schools, with fees paid through a universal voucher system. That is, government funds pupils, but this funding is directed to whichever school parents or pupils choose to attend, whether private or government. Indeed, under a universal voucher system there need not be any government schools at all (see Tooley 2014).

Third, most importantly, there is another rights-based commitment to education adopted by the international community in 2000: The second Millennium Development Goal (MDG) commits governments to “ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere ... will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.” (UNDP 2003, p. 1). UNESCO claims that the education MDG is only “different in detail, but not in intent” from its own EFA goals (UNESCO 2002, p. 29). But there is an important difference. Under MDG, governments were only committed to ensuring that all children have access to primary schooling; it says nothing about whether it should be free. The MDG goal doesn’t rule out that the human right of education could be met, in full or in part, by fee-paying private schools, if everyone could obtain access to them – perhaps by providing targeted vouchers to those who could not afford fees. So the MDG version would not be an objection to private education playing an important role in providing “education for all.”

Indeed, if we look at the motivations behind the Dakar Framework, we can see that, in intent, if not precise wording, it too is not incompatible with private fee-paying education. In an expanded commentary on the framework, it is noted that “user charges continue to be a major deterrent to poor children attending school”, so “Every government has the responsibility to provide free, quality basic education, so that no child will be denied access because of an inability to pay.” (UNESCO 2000, p. 14, emphases added). But this clarification shows the intention that poverty should not lead to any child being “denied access.” This is entirely different, of course, from requiring no one to pay fees. It could be perfectly compatible with this formulation to have fees at primary school, with the very poorest being allocated targeted vouchers so that they are not excluded by poverty. (Targeted vouchers are different from universal vouchers in that they assume that many are able to pay for private schooling; only those who cannot or who are seen as particularly deprived groups are targeted to receive the vouchers).

Given the extent of low-cost private schools, their superior performance to government schools, their affordability to the poor and their accessibility to girls, we suggest here that they must be a key part of any future discussions of how best to ensure education for all, possibly supplemented with targeted vouchers to ensure universal access.

Note

¹ These sections are based on Tooley/Longfield 2015.

References

BBC News (2013): Malala Yousafzai speech in full. Available online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-23291897>, accessed on 01/05/2015.

- CEDAW (United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women) (2014):** Privatization and its Impact on the Right to Education of Women and Girls. Written Submission.
- Day Ashley, L./McCloughlin, C./Aslam, M./Engel, J./Wales, J./Rawal, S./Batley, R./Kingdon, G./Nicolai, S./Rose, P. (2014):** The role and impact of private schools in developing countries: a rigorous review of the evidence. Final report. Education Rigorous Literature Review. Department for International Development.
- Desai, S./Dubey, A./Vanneman, R./Banerji, R. (2008):** Private schooling in India: a new educational landscape. Maryland.
- Dixon, P./Tooley J./Schagen, I. (2012):** The relative quality of private and public schools for low income families living in slums of Nairobi, Kenya. In: Srivastava, P. (Ed.): *Low-Fee Private Schooling: Aggravating Equity or Mediating Disadvantage?* Oxford Studies in Comparative Education, Symposium Books, Oxford.
- French, R./Kingdon, G. (2010):** The relative effectiveness of private and government schools in rural India: evidence from ASER data. London.
- Garg, N. (2011):** Low cost private education in India: Challenges and way forward. MIT Sloan School of Management.
- Härmä, J. (2011):** Low cost private schooling in India: is it pro poor and equitable? *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 31, I. 4, pp. 350–356.
- Härmä, J./Adefisayo, F. (2013):** Scaling up: challenges facing low-fee private schools in the slums of Lagos, Nigeria. In: Srivastava, P. (Ed): *Low-fee private schooling: aggravating equity or mitigating disadvantage?* Oxford.
- Härmä, J./Rose, P. (2012):** Is low-fee private primary schooling affordable for the poor? Evidence from rural India. In: Robertson, R./Mundy, K. (Eds.) *Public-private partnerships in education: new actors and modes of governance in a globalizing world*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hartwig, K. (2013):** Using a social justice framework to assess educational quality in Tanzanian schools. In: *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 33, I. 5, pp. 487–496.
- Lewin, K. (2007):** The Limits to Growth of Non-Government Private Schooling in Sub Saharan Africa, *Create Pathways to Access*, Research Monograph No 5, June. Falmer: University of Sussex, Centre for International Education.
- Longfield, D./Tooley, J. (2014):** A Survey of Schools in Juba, South Sudan. Newcastle: EG West Centre and Nile Institute Juba, South Sudan.
- Maitra, P./Pal, S./Shärmä, A. (2011):** Reforms, growth and persistence of gender gap: recent evidence from private school enrolment in India. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Nishimura, M./Yamano, T. (2013):** Emerging private education in Africa: determinants of school choice in rural Kenya. *World Development*, Vol. 43, pp. 266–275.
- Rolleston, C./Adefeso-Olateju, M. (2014):** De Facto Privatization of Basic Education in Africa: a market response to government failure? A Comparative Study of the Cases of Ghana and Nigeria. In: Macpherson, I./Robertson, S./Walford, G. (Eds.): *Education, Privatization and Social Justice: Case studies from Africa, South Asia and South East Asia*. Oxford, p. 25–44.
- Tooley, J. (2000a):** Private education: the poor's best chance? *UNESCO Courier*, November.
- Tooley, J. (2000b):** Private schools for the poor. *Economic Affairs*, June.
- Tooley, J. (2009):** *The Beautiful Tree: A personal journey into how the world's poorest people are educating themselves*. New Delhi.
- Tooley, J. (2014):** The Role of Government in Education Revisited: The theory and practice of vouchers, with pointers to another solution for American education. In: *Social Philosophy and Policy*, Vol. 31, I. 1, pp. 204–228.
- Tooley, J./Dixon, P. (2006):** 'De Facto' Privatisation of Education and the Poor: Implications of a Study from sub-Saharan Africa and India. In: *Compare*, Vol. 36, I. 4, pp. 443–462.
- Tooley, J./Longfield, D. (2013a):** Private primary education in Western Area, Sierra Leone. Newcastle: E G West Centre and People's Educational Association.
- Tooley, J./Longfield, D. (2013b):** Private Education in Low-income Areas of Monrovia: School and household surveys. Newcastle: EG West Centre and Development Initiatives Liberia, Inc.
- Tooley, J./Longfield, D. (2015):** The role and impact of private education in developing countries: A response to the DFID-commissioned "rigorous literature review" London.
- Tooley, J./Dixon, P./Merrifield, J./Yong, B. (2011):** School Choice and Academic Performance: Some evidence from developing countries. In: *Journal of School Choice*, Vol. 5, I. 1, pp. 1–39.
- Tooley, J./Dixon, P./Shamsan, Y./Schagen, I. (2010):** The relative quality and cost-effectiveness of private and public schools for low-income families: a case study in a developing country. In: *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 21, I. 2, pp. 117–144.
- Watkins, K. (2004):** Private education and education for all – or how not to construct an evidence based argument: a reply to Tooley. *Economic Affairs*, Vol. 24, I. 4.
- World Education Forum (2000):** The Dakar Framework for Action, Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments, Paris.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) (2000):** Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments. Expanded Commentary on the Dakar Framework for Action. Paris, 23 May.
- UNESCO (2002):** Education for All: Is the world on track? EFA Global Monitoring Report, Paris.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Program) (2003):** Human Development Report 2003. New York.
- Yousafzai, M. (2013):** *I am Malala: the girl who stood up for education and was shot by the Taliban*. London.

James Tooley

is professor of education policy at Newcastle University. He is the author of *The Beautiful Tree* (Penguin), winner of the 2010 Sir Antony Fisher Memorial Prize, based on his prize-winning research on low-cost private education in India, China and Africa. Building on his research, Tooley has dedicated himself to creating working models of innovative practice in low-cost private education to help explore its potential to extend access to, and improve educational opportunities for, the poor. He is cofounder and chairman, Omega Schools (Ghana); patron, Association of Formidable Educational Development, (Nigeria) and chief mentor, National Independent Schools Alliance (India).