

---

## 24. Everyday geographies of shadow education: placements, spatialities and temporalities of tutoring provisions

*Achala Gupta*

---

### INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers everyday geographies of shadow education (also known as tutoring provisions, private tutoring and supplementary education) as an emerging topic of inquiry within contemporary investigations into the geographies of education. Shadow education refers to a set of privatised, outside-school educational provisions that offer students targeted teaching and learning services and support with the aim of helping them to excel in the formal assessment system (Gupta, 2022a). Shadow education exists in many forms, including but not limited to one-to-one tuition and tutoring centres that cater to small and large groups of students, with services delivered online or in-person synchronously or asynchronously. This increasingly popular education industry operates alongside the formal schooling system and schooling practices and influences a variety of processes such as educational inequalities, educational work and the organisation of schooling itself to varying extents and capacities across societies globally. This chapter offers a critical overview of research in this field, focusing particularly on highlighting the specific ways in which shadow education establishes itself within the contemporary geographies of education.

The discussion provided in this chapter speaks directly to the authoritative piece entitled ‘Geographies of Education and Learning’ in which Holloway and Jöns (2012) establish the domain of exploring education geographically. In this paper, the authors recognise the value of exploring *the spatial turn* in educational provisions to fully understand the processes underlying, and the impact of, the restructuring of such provisions across learning spaces such as schools and universities, encompassing areas such as teaching skills, employability and careers alongside practices such as educational mobilities and networks, all operating simultaneously and in complex ways within and across countries. Many of these aspects have been discussed in the literature in relation to the formal education system, but these appraisals are seldom extended to informal spaces such as shadow education, which this chapter focuses on. Anticipating the prospective changes to educational processes and practices and recognising the value of studying them, Holloway and Jöns (2012) insisted on exploring what they labelled as ‘new geographies of education and learning’ where they considered creative ways to diversify the field itself, specifically, by exploring ‘historical comparisons; further explorations of the relative importance of diverse axes

of social difference; and examinations of different educational sectors and types of institutions' (p. 486).

More than a decade later, the field of geographies of education has expanded substantially, with some, but insufficient, literature concerning the geographies of shadow education. For example, Holloway and Kirby, in their 2020 paper, recognise new geographies of private tuition and their relationship to class privilege and educational practices among minority ethnic groups. Although based empirically in Britain, this paper helps to understand the connection between shadow education and socio-economic inequalities across societies. More recently, Bray (2023) articulated the idea of geographies of shadow education, focusing particularly on the patterns and forces involving the spatial distributions of private supplementary tutoring globally. In his paper, Bray discusses the physical, political, economic, cultural and pedagogical attributes of shadow education, often in comparison to formal schooling. Both papers and others discussed in this chapter allude to the value of looking into non-formal educational spaces to fully comprehend spatial inequalities operating within and across education systems in contemporary societies (for discussion, see Kučerová, Holloway & Jahnke, 2020).

This chapter considers shadow education as a significant and substantial educational territory that is pervasive, vital and integral to mainstream schooling, which not just shapes the industry but is also shaped by it. It unpacks the complexity of this educational territory under the conceptual themes of placements, spatialities and temporalities of everyday geographies of shadow education. Theme 1 on placements concerns the place shadow education occupies in relation to the formal education system. Theme 2 on spatialities examines the spaces shadow education creates in its work with wider societal processes. Finally, Theme 3 on temporalities explicates the dynamic nature of shadow education, thus demonstrating specific ways in which it changes its structure and practices over time whilst simultaneously circumventing the mainstream formal education across societies. Discussions across each of these themes provide useful insights into the specific ways in which shadow education, despite being a non-formal education system, gains social legitimacy, interacts with formal schooling processes and adopts specific mechanisms that further intensify the problematic structures and practices in everyday geographies of education.

## PLACEMENTS: HETEROGENEITY IN SHADOW EDUCATION ACROSS CULTURES GLOBALLY

This section explores how shadow education takes a subtly different form around the world, and how these diverse forms of provision purposively shadow as well as strategically deviate from formal schooling norms, thus outlining the implications of tutoring provisions for the social contract between education and society.

Shadowing as a process illustrates the ways in which private supplementary tutoring mimics mainstream education (see Gupta, 2021a, for discussion and empirical justification). This mimicry often takes different forms in the organisational arrangement

of tutoring across countries. In India, for example, shadow education often operates through tutorial centres which shadow formal schooling by typically adopting a three-layered differentiation, that is, dividing their services for students who study in schools run by different boards (which cater to different socio-economic groups), across educational levels (typically offering services for grades ending in high-stakes exams) and specific subjects (often privileging maths and science) (Gupta, 2021a). In comparison, one-to-one tuition or enrichment sessions are more common in the UK. These provisions operate on a case-by-case basis (rather than through the organisation of classes like large tutorial centres do) to shadow what children should learn at school to improve their academic performance (see for discussion Holloway & Kirby, 2020). Shadow education also exists in the form of learning centres – such as Kumon, Kip McGrath and Sylvan Learning – which operate transnationally to ‘sell’ their educational products or packages that are based on their own curriculum and pedagogies and are designed to aid children in excelling in the school assessments (see Aurini, 2006, for discussion; also see Bray, 2023). Importantly, though, multiple types of shadow education provision can co-exist simultaneously, thus catering to a wide array of educational needs in any given empirical context.

Shadow education exists in diverse formats with varying modes of operation, which is made possible, as alluded to earlier, due to the diversity in the process of shadowing itself. The outcome of this dynamic process produces heterogeneity in tutoring provisions both across and within countries. Indeed, the aim and focus of tutoring provisions are shaped by the kind of formal education system they aim to replicate and the political-economic context in which this replication occurs. This replication further bolsters the socio-economic disparity on which the formal education system operates across cultures. For example, large tutorial centres often target middle classes, whereas one-to-one tuition caters to more economically exclusive social groups in countries where tutoring is a norm (e.g., India). Nonetheless, most tutorial centres cater primarily to the needs of privileged social groups to reproduce their social status by means of scholastic achievements in contemporary society (Gupta, 2022a; 2022b; 2023a; 2023b). Thus, many shadow education institutions thrive on mapping the hierarchies of educational advantage produced by the formal schooling system onto their own organisational framework. Although tutoring processes largely increase inequalities between the wealthy and historically marginalised groups, shadow education can be instrumental in realising social mobility if it is strategically placed alongside formal schooling *for* the students who are systemically disadvantaged in accessing and using educational resources offered by schools (see, e.g., Cullinane & Montacute, 2023).

Indeed, the need for shadow education emerges in the context where it is socially viewed as a valuable source for gaining socio-educational advantages. Both formal educational institutions and shadow edu-businesses have become embedded in the everyday schooling culture across societies in the larger context where scholastic achievements not only determine future educational pathways but also shape the life trajectories of individuals and their families (see Baker, 2014, for discussion). This perception fuels the practices of meritocracy-induced competition, societal and peer

pressure, and parents' desire to either attain or retain social status through education, all of which contribute to producing a place for shadow education alongside formal schools worldwide, but especially in countries such as South Korea, Japan and India where this competition is experienced much more fiercely (see for discussion, Kim, 2016; Samuell, 2023; Gupta, 2020). In comparison, in Nordic countries, where scholastic competition is often resisted in formal schooling, shadow education does not operate with the same intensity; yet it emerges in new forms. For example, in Sweden, supplementary tutoring is located *within* – and not outside – the mainstream schools to help students who struggle with their academic tasks, thus aiming to reduce rather than contribute to educational inequality (see Hallsén, 2021 – more on this is discussed later in the chapter).

Notably, the placements of shadow education are informed not only by shadowing but also by strategic ways in which these edu-businesses deviate from specific formal education practices. This deviation is necessary for shadow education to dissociate itself from formal schools in ways that their clients – parents and students – may want. Indeed, shadow education responds positively to market pressures by carefully removing practices from formal educational settings that are socially deemed problematic. The new set of practices that shadow education creates, as per the clients' explicit needs and perceived demands, helps shadow education organisations to curate spaces for themselves within the broader education market that are sufficiently distant and are different from formal schools.

Examples of the specific ways in which shadow education differs from formal schooling include (but are not limited to): teacher credentials, pedagogical approaches and the teacher–student relationship (see discussion in Gupta, 2022a). While schoolteachers often consider their qualifications as an indicator of their credentials, tutors often foreground their students' academic results (a proxy for students' learning outcomes) in India (see Gupta, 2022a) and their physical appearances as 'star' tutors with flashy lifestyles in Hong Kong (see Koh, 2016) as a source of their credibility. Notably, schoolteachers who also tutor (which is common across many cultures and could be due to low income or entrepreneurial desire or a combination of both – see Kobakhidze, 2020 and Gupta, 2021b for discussion) operate as per the institutional logic of the organisations where they work and therefore, they *perform* the role of an educator differently in school as compared to how they function in tutorial settings. Moreover, pedagogically, tutoring centres often occupy different spaces from those that schools do. For example, whilst schools may rely on textbook-driven pedagogical approaches, tutorial centres are predominantly student-centric, which is also reflected in the slightly less hierarchical relationship between students and educators in shadow education environments as compared to in schools (see Gupta, 2022a, for a case of India; Brehm, 2021, for a case of Cambodia). Importantly, the schools' pedagogical approaches mentioned above are often socially critiqued by parents and students, and so deviating from these is a strategic approach, thus allowing shadow education to occupy a favourable space within the educational context alongside formal schools.

Hence, the nature of shadow education differs within and across countries because the extent to which it shadows and deviates from the formal education system varies. Although it finds places and spaces for itself in each nation, shadow education is often situated in tension with mainstream schools. Moreover, purposive shadowing and strategic deviation as processes, however, are never complete, as schooling itself shifts in relation to the shadow, and this cyclical transformation, therefore, continues.

## SPATIALITIES: SITUATING DYNAMIC SHADOW EDUCATION WITHIN EVOLVING EDUCATIONAL LANDSCAPES

This section focuses on how shadow education in its dynamic form exists within ever-evolving educational landscapes, through understanding broader global and local processes – namely, neoliberalism, education policies and digitalisation – that constantly shape the shadow education sector. In doing so, it unpacks the spatialities of shadow education provisions, that is, the intrinsically dynamic and fluctuating ‘spaces’ of shadow education which respond to ever-changing social processes.

The shadow education spatialities are informed, driven and shaped by the political economy of the country where they are operating. Neoliberalism, notably, actively promotes educational entrepreneurialism and, as such, produces avenues for educational entrepreneurs or edu-preneurs to start their businesses and flourish in the economy run by local, regional, national and transnational market forces (see Gupta, 2021b for discussion). Indeed, we find the tuition sector operating across all these levels simultaneously (see examples in Bray, 2023). In England, research shows that tutors have become integral to the ever-expanding educational workforce, and the skills these educators are expected to possess are shaped primarily by socio-economic forces and are fundamentally market-oriented (see Holloway & Kirby, 2020). The literature also signifies how neoliberalism promotes different kinds of entrepreneurial subjectivities, that is, alongside large-scale tutoring businesses, many suppliers of these services are solo entrepreneurs who often find themselves in a security–precarity continuum (Holloway & Pimlott-Wilson, 2021). This phenomenon can be argued to be a case of the contemporary disruptive, disparate yet pervasive ‘gig economy’ – another example of an emergent spatiality of shadow education. Entrepreneurial subjectivity is not just limited to educators operating outside of formal schooling, but also within it. In India, neoliberal mindsets have curated spaces for teacher-entrepreneurs, who capitalise on their expertise as they straddle the worlds of formal and shadow education systems and work not only as schoolteachers but also as tutors after school hours (Gupta, 2021b). These studies explain the ways in which neoliberalism has fuelled the supply, and the nature of this supply, that is, who offers these services and their implications, of shadow education, thus increasing privatised and commodified educational spaces.

Neoliberalism is often discussed as an ideology that shapes policy. Beyond the broader formulations discussed above, the spaces shadow education occupies within educational landscapes are often produced, curtailed, created, regulated

and granted by specific empirically rooted education policies as well. Examples of state policies directly aiding the rise and popularity of private tuition can be seen in examples from Sweden and the UK. Shadow education grew in Sweden because the government's tax-deduction scheme provided space for the rise of commercial edubusinesses. The government recognised the implications of this scheme and replaced it with providing schools with extra resources so that they could offer students additional tutoring support. As such, tutoring provisions in Sweden are now embedded within the formal education system as a direct result of government policies (see Hallsén, 2021). Similarly, tutoring provisions were offered through the state schooling system in countries such as the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic to compensate for the loss of learning in schools during lockdown (see Cullinane & Montacute, 2023).

Education policies can also disrupt the continuity of shadow education. For example, the Korean government has devised various policy reforms to reduce the number of shadow education institutions since the 1960s, including banning these services in 1980, which, in turn, was heavily resisted by the parents who still wanted their children to receive extra-school educational support (see Kim, 2016). The government's imperative since then has been to regulate the quality of shadow education provisions, thus ensuring that tutors have appropriate qualifications and that tutorial centres have facilities that are conducive to a healthy learning environment for students (see Piao & Hwang, 2021). China's 2021 Double Burden Reduction Policy is yet another example of how government policies can impact the functioning of a highly commercialised shadow education industry (see for discussion Gupta & Zhao, 2023). Notably, these regulations do not always result in the intended outcomes. Often, instead, they produce spaces for the rise of different forms of tutoring provisions; these are realised through a dynamic temporal disposition of shadow education businesses (see Gupta, 2022c, for a framework of a shadow education timescape).

This dynamism of shadow education is aided by another social process: technology, which pervades the contemporary social life of which education is a key part. Indeed, the digitisation of education is a crucial element in understanding the spatial scope of everyday geographies of shadow education. Alongside physical places where shadow education is delivered, the internet is yet another avenue for seeking and supplying tutoring support. Ventura and Jang (2010) show how the practices of 'outsourcing' and 'offshoring' education are mediated by globalisation forces that have resulted in an exponential increase in tutoring businesses through the World Wide Web. The authors note that the technological innovations (in the form of software, electronic boards, image processors, video cameras and broadband internet connections) enable tutors to offer online shadow education services both synchronously and asynchronously, thus expanding the spatial scope of tutoring provisions themselves. The authors also highlight the processes of offshoring where tutors, often based in India, offer services to students in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, England, Malaysia and Singapore, thus producing a new form of transnational educational economy. In the last decade, and especially during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, shadow education in online spaces has grown substantially.

Not only did existing institutions go online, but new kinds of services were also created to be delivered solely online. This format co-exists with traditional place-based tutoring, and together, both generate new ways of understanding the socio-educational and transnational spatialities of shadow education.

Hence, the spatialities of shadow education are complex and multifaceted, making them challenging to identify and subsequently unpack. This section has provided a glimpse into the range of spaces shadow education businesses occupy through their interaction with policies that produce or curb the demand, existence and supply of tutoring services. It acknowledges and appreciates the technological interventions in tutoring provisions, thus expanding the spaces that shadow education occupies globally.

## TEMPORALITIES: RESPONSIVENESS OF SHADOW EDUCATION ACROSS TIMES AND SPACES

The everyday geographical situatedness of shadow education is shaped largely by how it responds to empirical realities across times and spaces. Timescapes – the collective temporal and spatial facets of a phenomenon or concept – work at different intersecting levels, such as time management in educational institutions, time in a person's life, and time in society in a sense of history. This section unpacks distinctive ways of thinking about time conceptually to fully comprehend the complexities underlying the everyday geographies of shadow education.

The temporalities of shadow education are determined by how institutions in the shadow education system manage time in relation to formal schooling. As market-driven businesses, shadow education institutions are highly competitive and contribute to the competitiveness of the educational market as a whole. However, they do not appear to attempt to replace the formal education system primarily because the former exists only in the shadow of the latter. Put differently, the illusion that tutoring is needed is sustained within the larger logic of a 'schooled society' (see Baker, 2014), where formal education is considered a critical route to attaining success in life. In order to sustain this illusion, tutorial centres tend to circumvent the timescape that is often occupied by the formal education system. The process of circumvention makes the shadow education system more responsive and flexible to adapt to small changes and large transformations in the educational landscape more broadly. Shadow education operates across multiple, parallel timescapes which are dense, inherently resilient and dynamic. Four key elements that contribute to the construction of shadow education timescapes are mapping, advantage, diversity and adaptability (see Gupta, 2022c for discussion), which I will now discuss in turn.

Shadow education institutions often *map* their services as per the schedule of formal schooling, meaning that services are offered as per the assessment schedule of formal educational institutions. In this way, tutoring services appear to supplement what is being taught at the school level (see the explanation of the definition of shadow education and the role of supplementation in this in Bray, 2023). The

second element of these timescapes is the *advantage*, both temporally and spatially, that shadow education institutions have over schools, as they typically offer services around school timings throughout an academic year. This facilitates not only students' participation in tutoring (although Bray, 2023, reports on student absenteeism being linked to attending tutoring sessions during school time in Egypt) but also facilitates schoolteachers in offering after-school tutoring services (see discussion in Kobakhidze, 2020).

Another feature of tutoring centres is how they provide students with a multitude of *diverse* services at the right time, so these services speak directly to market demands. For example, in India and elsewhere, tutoring services include reviewing classroom activities, preparing for exams and completing the syllabus, as well as various combinations of each of these services at different points in time throughout an academic year (Gupta, 2022c). To provide these diverse sets of services effectively, shadow education remains *adaptable*, flexible and overall resilient, thus functioning effectively in alignment with the schedule of teaching and assessment of formal schools. These attributes make tutoring provisions appear to be more time-efficient than schools. For example, writing in the context of post-Soviet countries in Central and Eastern Europe and Mongolia, Silova and Bray (2006) argue that private tutoring is often valued by children and young adults in these countries because of its ability to respond 'to students' needs in a more efficient, flexible and prompt manner' as compared to the often-perceived as 'rigid mainstream education system, which has been slow to embrace change' (p. 19). Furthermore, tutorial centres adapt their structure and practices according to the changes adopted by the formal institutions of education, which can be seen in the form of changes in the appraisal system of high-stakes exams (see Gupta, 2022c), changing policy regulations (Kim, 2016) or societal transformation due to a global crisis such as COVID-19 (see Pimlott-Wilson & Holloway, 2021).

How tutoring centres circumvent the formal education system can vary across and within countries, and indeed changes over time itself. Although it may seem that shadow education is a new concept, which is likely because it has received scholarly attention relatively recently, the practice itself has existed throughout history. For example, shadow education or private tuition was considered an 'alternative' to schooling by wealthy families in Britain; this changed with the massification of education – instead of being seen as an alternative, shadow education is now perceived as 'supplementary' to formal schooling in British society (Holloway & Kirby, 2020; see Kim, 2016 for the case of South Korea). Delving deeper into these histories can not only show how shadow education has evolved through time and space across and within countries, but such an investigation has the potential to illustrate the nature and impact of privilege on shaping socio-educational processes and practices. Future explorations of this nature can also help unpack how social class privileges are realised at the intersection of other social identities such as caste, gender and ethnicity, and how these intersectional situatednesses construct the educational experiences of individuals, groups and communities as they experience varying levels of access to

formal, non-formal and informal educational resources during their life course (see, e.g., Gupta, 2024, 2022b).

As such, the vantage point of shadow education offers unique perspectives into the diverse and everyday geographies of education in the past, present and future. Indeed, there is value in recognising the complex geographies of education that have historically operated in parallel to formal schooling globally (Kučerová, Holloway & Jahnke, 2020). For example, in the early 2000s, Jeffery and colleagues offered unique perspectives on the spatial inequalities education promotes, or sometimes resolves, in highly intersectionally diverse locales in India. When articulating the educational experiences of people in Bijnor, for example, Jeffery and colleagues (2006) show the territorialisation of tuition within everyday discussions on quality education in the town, making obvious the importance and social legitimacy of devoting time to shadow education for achieving aspired success in life. Here, time is constructed in relation to its significance in a person's life and society, offering meaning to a sense of history to an individual's educational trajectory, whilst also signifying its relevance to collective biographies of India's youth who pass time and use resources available to them through formal and non-formal educational institutions as they wait in the hope of a better future.

The analysis of time vis-à-vis shadow education that I have presented in this section signals how to identify, acknowledge and amplify the multifaceted nature of geographies of education within and across places to fully capture the spaces shadow education occupies across time. Importantly, reading, analysing and understanding shadow education timescapes create opportunities for recognising *extended* educational timescapes beyond, yet in relation to, formal schooling. It is this extension of school time that shadow education occupies, which remains largely unnoticed within the mainstream discussion of geographies of education. Unveiling the educational practices and processes in this extended time and space will facilitate further explorations into the relationship between education and everyday geographies.

## CONCLUSION

The discussion above has provided a *flavour* of how the field of geographies of education may look if we were to focus on examining non-formal educational processes and experiences that curate everyday schooling practices. I have attempted to unpack what this assessment will constitute, including how to capture the components of tutoring provisions and the implications of studying them for understanding everyday educational realities more holistically. This is done by highlighting a three-fold thematic analysis of placements, spatialities and temporalities of tutoring businesses, often in relation to formal schooling, across cultural contexts globally. These conceptual lenses reveal how the shadow education system organises its services and gains social legitimacy without having any legal-rational authority to secure such a status in contemporary society. Furthermore, the placements, spatialities and temporalities of tutoring also unveil the nature of the relationship between shadow education and

formal schooling, thus offering novel insights into often-hidden structures, experiences and processes involving everyday geographies of education, some of which are discussed below.

The discussion on the places shadow education occupies illustrates the heterogeneity of tutoring provisions both within and across countries. By using 'shadow' as a conceptual rather than merely a descriptive framework, this chapter exposes how tutorial provisions mimic (albeit in varying ways) the structure of formal education, and how, in doing so, they reproduce the myth of meritocracy, which in turn drives the perceived need for tutoring services in contemporary society. Simultaneously, the discussion signifies that tutoring businesses are reactive to the formal education system, and not all reactions are in alignment with schooling norms. Specific educational practices are produced in shadow education structures that strategically deviate from or challenge these norms, thus making this industry dynamic and relevant to ever-evolving educational landscapes. For instance, studies have noted a remarkable difference in pedagogical approaches adopted by tutorial centres vis-à-vis schools (see an Indian case in Gupta, 2022a) and how the curriculum in the former has influenced the curriculum in the latter (see, e.g., a South Korean case in Zhou & Kim, 2006). Overall, by analysing shadow education placements, future studies will be equipped to assess the ways in which shadow education contributes to the reproduction of inequalities and problems that are embedded in the everyday functioning of formal schools. Doing so will also highlight how shadow education creates new socio-educational concerns across educational landscapes more broadly.

This chapter also unpacks the spatial arrangements of shadow education by demonstrating the role of political economy, educational policies and the advent of the new digital era in shaping these arrangements. While the discussion on placements had been directly about shadow education in relation to formal schooling, the section on spatialities focused on broader global and local processes which cohere in particular contexts to (re)configure the shadow education sector. For instance, the rapid growth of the digitalisation of education, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, resulted in significant changes to the processes of education delivery globally and led to innovative transformations in the shadow education industry. The effect of these transformations was felt not just locally, but also regionally, globally and transnationally. Hence, going forward, studying the spatialities of shadow education will be incredibly valuable for understanding emerging geographies of education more broadly.

Understanding educational geographies through the lens of shadow education timescapes – as analysed in this chapter through the prism of institutions (with features such as mapping, advantage, diversity and adaptability), individuals, and society as a whole – offers novel perspectives for comprehending how tutoring provisions carve out spaces for themselves alongside schools within the larger market of education delivery. The unique set of timescapes provides shadow education institutions with resources to successfully circumvent formal education, whilst also making them robust and responsive to ever-changing educational needs across times and spaces. An example of this is the resilience shadow education businesses showed during the

COVID-19 pandemic, to not just survive, but actually thrive through maximising and capitalising on opportunities the digitalisation of education provided them with (see Pimlott-Wilson & Holloway, 2021). Furthermore, how shadow education timescapes change across and within education systems and the role of forces such as globalisation, colonialism and the internationalisation of education in catalysing these changes could be topics worth exploring in future studies. Going forward, scholars may wish to examine the genealogies of shadow education, focusing on how the circumvention processes have challenged, whilst also operating in alignment and alongside the formal education systems across histories. Doing so will inevitably bring to light some of the hidden ways in which education systems have evolved and how socio-economic inequalities have been maintained throughout this evolution across places and spaces.

In crucial ways, the significance of investigating national histories through the lens of shadow education will uncover often concealed ways in which social reproduction has operated through education as a social institution globally. Unpacking national histories comparatively across countries can also allow for establishing the relationship between the experiences of colonialism and the local histories that have been shaped by those experiences within and across places. These insights will be instrumental in providing a nuanced understanding of the complexities underlying the contemporary realities of educational landscapes. Moreover, both kinds of spatial assessments of local and international comparative histories can be useful approaches to diversifying the contemporary geographical understanding of education, thus making the field more sensitive towards differences and inclusive in its approach.

Overall, this chapter has reviewed some of the key ongoing deliberations in the field of everyday geographies of education, by drawing on examples of shadow education in different parts of the world and discussing key sites through which it operates and the impactful links between formal schooling and tutoring provisions. In future, geographers of education should therefore consider the potency of shadow education in their ongoing and future explorations and study this crucial aspect to understand everyday geographies of schooling in particular and education more broadly. Finally, the everyday geographies of shadow education are still embedded in the future agenda for geographies of education and learning as a field itself, that is, to compare 'how perceptions, practices and power-relations amongst policymakers, educators and learners shape the geographies of education and learning' (Holloway & Jöns, 2012, p. 486). The only twist here is to study these topics from the vantage point of shadow education in order to uncover usually concealed mechanisms through which spatial inequalities are produced, managed, sustained and reproduced globally.

## REFERENCES

- Aurini, J. (2006). Crafting legitimization projects: An institutional analysis of private education businesses. *Sociological Forum*, 21(1), 83–111.
- Baker, D. (2014). *The schooled society: The educational transformation of global culture*. Stanford University Press.
- Bray, M. (2023). Geographies of shadow education: Patterns and forces in the spatial distributions of private supplementary tutoring. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 53(3), 343–360.
- Brehm, W. (2021). *Cambodia for sale: Everyday privatization in education and beyond*. Routledge.
- Cullinane, C., & Montacute, R. (2023). *Tutoring – the new landscape: Recent trends in private and school-based tutoring*. The Sutton Trust. <https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Tutoring-The-New-Landscape.pdf>
- Gupta, A. (2024). Coached habitus: Mapping the role of shadow education in shaping students' educational trajectories. *British Educational Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4085>
- Gupta, A. (2023a). The nature and scope of English private tutoring: An analysis of the shadowing process and middle-class identity in globalising India. In K. Yung, & A. Hajar (Eds.), *International perspectives on English private tutoring: Theories, practices and policies* (pp. 55–72). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gupta, A. (2023b). Revisiting educational advantage and social class: A Bourdieusian analysis of middle-class parents' investment in private schooling and shadow education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 44(1), 26–42.
- Gupta, A. (2022a). Social legitimacy of private tutoring: An investigation of institutional and affective educational practices in India. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 43(4), 571–584.
- Gupta, A. (2022b). Middle-class mothers' participation in tutoring for spoken English: A case of unlocking middle-class identity and privilege in contemporary India. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 44(5), 739–753.
- Gupta, A. (2022c). A 'shadow education' timescape: An empirical investigation of the temporal arrangement of private tutoring vis-à-vis formal schooling in India. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 70(6), 771–787.
- Gupta, A. (2021a). Exposing the 'shadow': An empirical scrutiny of the 'shadowing process' of private tutoring in India. *Educational Review*, 75(3), 394–410.
- Gupta, A. (2021b). Teacher-entrepreneurialism: A case of teacher identity formation in neoliberalizing education space in contemporary India. *Critical Studies in Education*, 62(4), 422–438.
- Gupta, A. (2020). Heterogeneous middle-class and disparate educational advantage: Parental investment in their children's schooling in Dehradun, India. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 41(1), 48–63.
- Gupta, A., & Zhao, X. (2023). Teachers' work under responsibilising policies: An analysis of educators' views on China's 2021 educational reforms. *Journal of Education Policy*, 39(4), 622–639.
- Hallsén, S. (2021). The rise of supplementary education in Sweden: Arguments, thought styles, and policy enactment. *ECNU Review of Education*, 4(3), 476–493.
- Holloway, S. L., & Jöns, H. (2012). Geographies of education and learning. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(4), 482–488.
- Holloway, S. L., & Kirby, P. (2020). Neoliberalising education: New geographies of private tuition, class privilege, and minority ethnic advancement. *Antipode*, 52(1), 164–184.
- Holloway, S. L., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2021). Solo self-employment, entrepreneurial subjectivity and the security–precarity continuum: Evidence from private tutors in the

- supplementary education industry. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 53(6), 1547–1564.
- Jeffery, R., Jeffery, C., & Jeffery, P. (2006). Parhai ka mahaul. An educational environment in Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh. In G. d. Neve, & H. Donner (Eds.), *The meaning of the local: Politics of place in urban India* (pp. 116–140). Routledge.
- Kim, Y. C. (2016). *Shadow education and the curriculum and culture of schooling in South Korea*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kobakhidze, M. N. (2020). Desacralising teachers: Inside Myanmar's educational capitalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 18(5), 481–494.
- Koh, A. (2016). On 'Gods' and 'Kings' in the tutorial industry: A 'media spectacle' analysis of the shadow education in Hong Kong. In J. Moss, & B. Pini (Eds.), *Visual research methods in educational research* (pp. 189–208). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kučerová, S. R., Holloway, S. L., & Jahnke, H. (2020). The institutionalization of the geography of education: An international perspective. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 11(1), 13–34.
- Piao, H., & Hwang, H. (2021). Shadow education policy in Korea during the COVID-19 pandemic. *ECNU Review of Education*, 4(3), 652–666.
- Pimlott-Wilson, H., & Holloway, S. L. (2021). Supplementary education and the coronavirus pandemic: Economic vitality, business spatiality and societal value in the private tuition industry during the first wave of Covid-19 in England. *Geoforum*, 127, 71–80.
- Samuell, C. (2023). Shadow education, Bourdieu, and meritocracy: Towards an understanding of Juku and inequality in Japan. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 25(1), 45–66.
- Silova, I., & Bray, M. (2006). Introduction. In I. Silova, V. Budiene, & M. Bray (Eds.), *Education in a hidden marketplace: Monitoring of private tutoring* (pp. 17–24). Open Society Institute.
- Ventura, A., & Jang, S. (2010). Private tutoring through the internet: Globalization and offshoring. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11, 59–68.
- Zhou, M., & Kim, S. (2006). Community forces, social capital, and educational achievement: The case of supplementary education in the Chinese and Korean immigrant communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(1), 1–29.