

Analysis of Mapping the Private Sector Involvement in Correctional Institution Development and Operation Based on Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Model

Sani Siti Aisyah¹, Adrianus Eliasta Meliala², Iqraq Sulhin³

^{1,2,3}Department of Criminology, University of Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Sani Siti Aisyah

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20241006>

ABSTRACT

This study integrates various views on the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) model in correctional institution based on the experiences of various countries (United States, United Kingdom, Australia, France, Japan, Canada). Referring to the terminology of PPP in a broad sense, the correctional institution PPP models according to this study are: 1) the “private governance” model; 2) the “hybrid management” model; 3) the “service infrastructure” model; and 4) the “contracting out certain limited functions” model. The characteristics of the four correctional institution PPP models are mapped in the task specifications in correctional institution, both in the development and operation stages of correctional institution. In the correctional institution development stage, there are design, construction and financing. In the correctional institution operation stage, there are accommodation services or building maintenance; management and administration; and correction services. Only the “private governance” model regulates the involvement of the private sector in all stages of correctional institution development and operation. Through an analysis of the terminology of “correctional institution” and correction function, this

study elaborates on the characteristics of the four correctional institution PPP models by mapping private sector involvement in correctional services (order, amenity and service) which show the specific functional characteristics of correctional institution. The “private governance” model allows private sector involvement in all three aspects of correctional services, while the “service infrastructure” model does not allow the private sector to be involved in all aspects of the correctional services in question. The “hybrid management” model and the “contracting out certain limited functions” model allow private sector involvement in the amenity and service aspects, but not in the order or custody aspects.

Keywords: correctional institution, correctional service, order-amenity-service, Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

INTRODUCTION

Public-Private Partnership (hereinafter referred to as PPP) is becoming an increasingly popular phenomenon globally as the number of sectors and countries implementing it increases. Many countries have promoted PPP as a public policy instrument, both developed countries such as the UK, America and Australia, and developing countries such as India and

China (Wang, et al., 2018). More and more governments in developing countries are interested in using PPP to provide infrastructure assets and public services (World Bank Group, et al., 2014). Many governments are turning to the private sector to design, build, finance and/or operate new and existing infrastructure facilities to improve service delivery and management of facilities that have hitherto been provided by the public sector (Farquharson, et al., 2011). PPPs have become increasingly popular as a means of procuring and maintaining public sector infrastructure, in sectors that include transport (such as roads, bridges, tunnels, railways, ports and airports), social infrastructure (such as hospital, school, correctional institution and social housing), public utilities (such as water supply, wastewater treatment and sewage disposal), government offices, special service accommodation such as communications networks or defence equipment, etc. (Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018).

PPPs in various infrastructures have been widely analyzed, but little is known about PPPs in criminal justice such as correctional institution (Cabral & Azevedo, 2008). Researchers rarely focus their studies on the prison (or correctional institution) sector (Cabral & Saussier, 2013), perhaps because the process of obtaining relevant information in the correctional institution context is not easy: unconsolidated data and confidentiality are factors that often interfere and often hinder the implementation of research in the prison sector (Dilulio, 1996 in Cabral & Saussier, 2013).

Several literatures have discussed various PPP practices in correctional institution based on the experiences of various countries. The PPP practices in correctional institution are explained in terms of alternative models of private sector participation in correctional institution services (Grimsey & Lewis, 2004), private participation models in correctional institution services (Cabral & Saussier,

2013), private contract models or PPP spectrum in correctional institution (Allen & English, 2013), or correctional institution PPP models (Aisyah, et al., 2024). Aisyah, et al. (2024) integrated the opinions of Grimsey & Lewis (2024), Cabral & Saussier (2013), and Allen & English (2013) regarding various PPP practices in correctional institution to give rise to four correctional institution PPP models, namely: 1) the "privatization" model 2) the "hybrid management" model; 3) the "service infrastructure" model; and 4) the "contracting out certain limited functions" model. Neither Grimsey & Lewis (2004), Cabral & Saussier (2013), Allen & English (2013), nor Aisyah et al. (2024) detail the characteristics of various PPP practices in correctional institution based on the task specifications in correctional institution (development and operation).

The correctional institution PPP project is very complex with many interacting tasks that are worthy of further investigation (Oshima, 2015). Oshima's (2015) study has explained the division of operational tasks in correctional institution that allows for considering correctional institution PPP patterns that reflect various correctional institution governance structures. According to him, operational tasks in correctional institution consist of: 1) security tasks, namely maintaining order in correctional institution and preventing escapes and riots; and 2) maintenance tasks, namely providing food, laundry and other services for prisoners as well as cleaning and repairing facilities. The division of correctional institution operational tasks according to Oshima (2015) is not based on an analysis of the correctional function of the correctional institution. For this reason, this study will explain the correctional institution operational tasks based on an analysis of the correctional institution terminology itself as an institution that has a corrective function to be used in elaborating the characteristics of the four correctional institution PPP models proposed by Aisyah, et al. (2024).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

Although PPP has become a popular approach to providing public infrastructure and services, there is no general agreement on the definition of PPP (Wang et al., 2018). There is no single, internationally accepted definition of PPP (World Bank Group et al., 2014). There are several alternative names for PPP, including (Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018): 1) P3, used in North America; 2) Private Finance Initiative (PFI), a term originating in the UK, but also used in Japan and Malaysia; 3) Private Participation in Infrastructure (PPI), used in Korea; 4) P-P Partnership (to avoid confusion with PPP which stands for “purchasing power parity”, a method of comparing currency exchange rates to reflect the true cost of goods and services across countries); and 5) Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure (PPPI). However, over time, the term PPP has become more universally accepted.

The term PPP originated in the United States in the early 20th century, initially relating to the joint delivery of public and private sector education programs (Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018). According to Yescombe & Farquharson (2018), in the 1960s, the term PPP began to be used more broadly to refer to public-private joint ventures for urban renewal. PPP is also used in the United States to refer to the provision of publicly funded social services by non-public sector agencies (Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018).

PPPs come in several types and are used in different ways and situations (Wang, et al., 2018). In order to understand PPP, a broad and narrow perspective can be applied to define the term PPP. In a broad sense, PPP refers to any type of collaborative venture or activity undertaken by the public and private sectors. PPP is a general term that refers to various types of public-private partnerships (Reynaers, 2014). PPP is a contractual arrangement between the public (national, state, provincial, or local) and a private entity in which the skills, assets, and/or

financial resources of each of the public and private sectors are allocated in a complementary manner so that the risks and benefits are shared to provide optimal service and good value to citizens (ADB, 2020: xii). PPP is a more comprehensive concept, encompassing several modes of private participation (privatization, concessions, outsourcing, institutional cooperation for joint production and public policy networks) in the provision of public utilities (Hodge & Greve, 2007; Laffont & Straub, 2008 in Cabral & Saussier, 2013).

If Hodge & Greve (2007) and Laffont & Straub (2008) state that privatization is one form of PPP, Savas (2000) states that PPP is one form of privatization. Savas (2000) discusses PPP as a medium for infrastructure privatization. According to Savas (2000), privatization is a dynamic concept that in the simplest sense means a change from an arrangement with a government producer to an arrangement with a private producer. However, Savas (2000) acknowledges that PPP is a general term for a cooperative arrangement between the public and the private sector. The term PPP is generally used in three different ways (Savas, 2000: 106): 1) PPP is used loosely, and somewhat grandly, referring to any arrangement involving the public and private sectors together to produce and deliver goods and services (eg contracts, franchises and grants); 2) PPP is used for complex, multi-partner and privatized infrastructure projects; and 3) PPP refers to formal collaboration between businesses and community leaders and local government officials to improve urban conditions.

In a narrow sense, PPP refers to a contractual arrangement between the public and private sector with characteristics including a long term of cooperation, risk sharing, and a complex process. Long contractual arrangements and risk sharing are key features in defining PPP (Wang, et al., 2018). PPP is a long-term contract between a private party and a government entity to provide a public asset or service in

which the private party assumes significant risk and management responsibility and remuneration is linked to performance (World Bank Group, et al., 2014). PPP is often seen as a complex process (Ross & Yan, 2015) due to the need to align the objectives of a large number of parties involved: on the private sector side, there are investors, lenders and companies providing construction and operational services; on the public sector side, there are public sector entities that create, implement and oversee PPP policies and those that procure and manage PPP contracts; and the general public who use the facilities provided by the PPP (Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018).

The key elements of a PPP are as follows (Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018): 1) a long-term contract (PPP contract) between the public and private parties; 2) design,

construction and operation of the public infrastructure (the facility by the private party, i.e. the use of private sector capital to finance all or a substantial portion of the construction facility; 3) payments over the term of the PPP contract to the private party for the use of the facility, either by the public party or by the general public as users of the facility or both; 4) the facility remaining in the ownership of the public party or returning to the ownership of the public party at the end of the PPP contract; and 5) some form of risk sharing between the public and private parties and the provision of public services. In defining PPPs, Yescombe & Farquharson (2018) focus on “project-based” or “contract-based” PPPs which are described in the following spectrum of private sector involvement in public infrastructure provision:

	Public Project	Public-Private Partnership					Private Project
Contract Type	Public-sector procurement	Franchise (Affermage)	Design-Build Finance-Operate (DBFO) *	Build-Transfer-Operate (BTO) **	Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) ***	Build-Own-Operate (BOO)	
Construction	Public Sector	Public Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	
Operation	Public Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	
Ownership	Public Sector	Public Sector	Public Sector	Private sector during construction, then public sector	Private sector during contract period, then public sector	Private Sector	
Who Pays ?	Public Sector	Users	Public Sector or users	Public Sector or users	Public Sector or users	Private-Sector off-taker, public sector, or users	
Who is paid ?	n/a	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	Private Sector	

Note:

: also known as Design-Construct-Finance-Manage (DCFM) or Design-Build-Finance-Maintain (DBFM)

: also known as Build-Transfer-Lease (BTL), Build-Lease-Operate-Transfer (BLOT) or Build-Lease-Transfer (BLT)

: also known as Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT)

Figure 1 Spectrum of Private Sector Involvement in Public Infrastructure Provision

Source: Yescombe & Farquharson (2018); authors modified with color differences

In line with Yescombe & Farquharson (2018) who have presented a specific

definition of PPP, Farquharson, et al. (2011) also define PPP specifically which

refers to the meaning of PPP in a narrow sense. While Yescombe & Farquharson (2018) define PPP specifically which focuses on “project-based” or “contract-based” PPP through the spectrum of private sector involvement in the provision of public infrastructure, Farquharson, et al. (2011) focus the presentation of PPP coverage on discussing the types of capital-intensive PPPs, namely user fee-based PPPs and availability-based PPPs. User fee-based PPPs and availability-based PPPs are identified by Farquharson, et al., (2011) as capital-intensive PPPs where the PPP arranges for the private sector to provide public infrastructure under a long-term contract with a public sector agency. Under such an arrangement, the private sector typically agrees to do the following (Farquharson, 2011): 1) design and build, expand or improve public sector infrastructure; 2) assume substantial financial, technical and operational risks; 3) receive financial returns through payments over the term of the contract from the user, from the public sector or from a combination of both; 4) usually return the infrastructure to public sector ownership at the end of the contract. According to Farquharson (2011), terms such as BOT (build-operate-transfer) and DBFO (design-build-finance-operate) are often used to describe such schemes.

Correctional Institution

The term “correctional institution” is often used interchangeably with the term “prison” as a place of execution of prison punishment for lawbreakers. Correctional institution is identified by Rubin (2019) as one of the prison templates (describing architecture, supervision and philosophy) of the 20th century series in America, especially after World War II. Rubin (2019) states that correctional institutions are built in rural settings and planted with trees, plants, and grass so that they resemble a network of community colleges and universities; inmates live in small dormitories supervised by a "correctional officer" and a number of

"treatment" staff; during the day, they spend their time in some combination of educational classes, vocational training, and various forms of therapy all in the name of rehabilitation.

In line with Rubin (2019), Stohr & Walsh (2022) also attach the term correctional institution to the function of treatment or rehabilitation. Stohr & Walsh (2022) state that a correctional institution is an institution (prison) that carefully classifies prisoners into treatment programs that meet their needs and deficiencies. According to Stohr & Walsh (2022), the emergence of correctional institutions was influenced by the desire to make changes (reform) and philosophical problems (rehabilitation). They describe the emergence of correctional institutions as one of the events in a series of major correction events in the United States that have emerged since the 1960s.

Correction is stated by Stohr & Walsh (2022) as a general term that covers various functions carried out by government (and private) institutions related to the punishment, treatment, supervision and management of individuals who have been convicted or accused of committing crimes. These functions, as explained by Stohr & Walsh (2022), are carried out in correctional institutions, prisons, jails or other security institutions as well as in community-based correctional institutions. In line with the statement by Stohr & Walsh (2022), Hanser also identified correctional institutions as one of the institutions that have a corrective function. Correction, according to Hanser (2020), is a process in which practitioners from various institutions and programs use tools, techniques and facilities to engage in organized security and treatment functions intended to correct criminal tendencies among the offender population. As the term suggests, corrective efforts exist to “correct” (improve), “change”, or “put right” the attitudes and behaviors of the “client” (Stohr & Walsh, 2022).

The success or failure of correctional institution in correcting the criminal tendencies of prisoners through the

implementation of various correctional functions is largely determined by correctional institution management. If most correctional institutions fail, it is because they are not well managed, poorly managed, or not managed at all (Dilulio, 1987). According to Dilulio (1987), the three main criteria for correctional institutions success are order, amenity and service which represent the quality of correctional institution life. Order is the absence of individual or group errors that threaten the safety of others (simply no assaults, rapes or riots); amenity is everything that increases the comfort of the inmates (good food, clean cells, sufficient recreation); service is everything that is intended to improve the life prospects of prisoners (educational programs, vocational training, job opportunities) (Dilulio, 1987: 11-12). According to Dilulio (1987), a good correctional institution is a correctional institution that provides as much order, amenity and service as possible based on human and financial resources.

If Dilulio (1987) uses the criteria of order, amenity and service in analyzing the success or failure of correctional institution, Cornwell (2021) uses the aspects of security, humanity and the rehabilitative potential of correctional institution. According to Cornwell (2021), a failed correctional institution is a correctional institution where efforts to secure and fulfill the basic needs of prisoners are not fully met and corrective actions are ignored at the managerial level. The criteria for the aspects of security, humanity and the rehabilitative potential of correctional institution put forward by Cornwell (2021) have the same content as the criteria for order, amenity and service put forward by Dilulio (1987).

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, the researcher used a literature study by exploring literature containing the theme of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) and correctional institutions from various sources such as books and journal articles. Various patterns of PPP practices in

correctional institution put forward by several sources are integrated into four models of correctional institution PPP which are then elaborated based on the specifications of private sector involvement in the stages of correctional institution development and operation. Analysis of task specifications in correctional institution development and operation is carried out by referring to Van Herk (2016) which explains various jobs in the development and operation of infrastructure in general. To elaborate on the specific characteristics of correctional institution operation compared to other institutions or infrastructure, the researcher conducted an analysis of the terminology of correctional institution and correctional function.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Referring to Aisyah, et al (2024), the correctional institution PPP model based on the experience of various countries (United States, England, Australia, France, Japan, and Canada) consists of: 1) the “privatization” model; 2) the “hybrid management” model; 3) the “service infrastructure” model; and 4) the “contracting out certain limited functions” model. Aisyah, et al (2024) put forward the four correctional institution PPP models by integrating various types of private sector involvement in correctional institution based on the opinions of Grimsey & Lewis (2004), Cabral & Saussier (2013), and Allen & English (2013). According to Grimsey & Lewis (2004), alternative models of private sector participation in prison services consist of: 1) UK PFI “design-construct-maintain-finance” (DCMF) model; 2) French mixed management “design-construct-finance” (DCF) model; and 3) service infrastructure model. Cabral & Saussier (2013) stated that the private participation model in prison consists of: 1) prison privatization in America; 2) delegation of non-core activities in prison services in France; and 3) the Brazilian experience which is a model between America and France. According to Allen &

English (2013), the private contract model or PPP spectrum in prisons consists of: 1) full-scale model; 2) hybrid model; and 3) certain limited function contracting out model.

Observing the explanation of various types of private sector involvement models in correctional institution according to the

three sources, Aisyah, et al. (2024) stated that there are similarities in characteristics in several types of models in the different terms used by each source. For this reason, Aisyah, et al. (2024) stated that there are four correctional institution PPP models as explained in the following table:

Table 1. Mapping of PPP’s Correctional Institution Models based on Construction and Operation

PPP’s Correctional Institution Model	Private Role		Contract Characteristics
	Correctional Institution Construction	Correctional Institution Operation	
The “Privatization” Model	Designs, builds and finances the prison building	All services within the prison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated contract for the construction and operation of all services - Contract term is usually 25 or 30 years
The “Hybrid Management” Model	Designs, builds and finances the prison building	Prison services except custodial services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hostelry services (food, hygiene, cleaning services) - Health services - Education - Vacational and job training - Reentry services - Industry - Transportation - Building maintenance (facility management) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 separate contracts (1 contract to build and maintain prison buildings; and 1 contract to operate the prison or to provide certain services) - Contract term os abaout 10 or 15 years
The “Service Infrastructure” Model	Designs, builds and finances the prison building	Building maintenance (accommodation services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 integrated contract for the construction and maintenance components of prison buildings - Contract term of about 10 years
The “Contracting Out Certain Limited Functions” Model	-	Certain limited functions, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Catering - Building maintenance - Provison of regime activities 	Shorter contract term (e.g. 5 years) than other PPP models

Source: Aisyah, dkk (2024)

The explanation of the four correctional institution PPP models in the table above illustrates that the private sector can be involved in correctional institution, both in the development and operation stages.

However, the type of private sector involvement in correctional institution differs based on the type of correctional institution PPP model. Referring to table 1, the “privatization” model, the “hybrid

management” model, and the “service infrastructure” model regulate private sector involvement for the development of (new) correctional institution, but the three correctional institution PPP models differ in regulating private sector involvement at the correctional institution operation stage. Only the “privatization” model allows private sector involvement in all correctional institution operations (provision of correctional institution services). The “hybrid management” model allows private sector involvement in almost all correctional institution services, except custody. The “service infrastructure” model only allows private sector involvement in the maintenance of correctional institution buildings.

Regarding the choice of the term "privatization" for the correctional institution PPP model that allows private involvement in all components of correctional institution operations or is described as a private correctional institution (private prison), Aisyah, et al. (2024) refer to Cabral & Saussier (2013) who mention prison privatization in America as one model of private participation in prison services. When Aisyah, et al. (2024) mention that the "privatization" model is one of the correctional institution PPP models, then according to them, privatization is part of PPP or PPP has a broader meaning than privatization. The opinion of Aisyah, et al. (2024) is in line with the opinion of Hodge & Greve (2007) who stated that privatization is one form of PPP. PPP is a more comprehensive concept, covering several modes of private participation (privatization, concession, outsourcing, institutional cooperation for joint production and public policy networks) in the provision of public utilities (Hodge & Greve, 2007). The opinion of Aisyah et al. (2024) and Hodge & Greve (2007) refer to the definition of PPP in a broad sense, namely as a general term that refers to various types of public-private cooperation (Reynaers, 2014).

However, on the contrary, Savas (2000) stated that PPP is one form of privatization. Savas (2000) discusses PPP as a means of privatizing infrastructure. Privatization is a dynamic concept that in its simplest sense means a change from an arrangement with a government producer to an arrangement with a private producer (Savas, 2000). According to Savas (2000), one way of understanding PPP is the view that PPP is used for complex, multi-partner and privatized infrastructure projects.

In addition to these differences of opinion, there are also opinion that imply that PPP is not part of privatization or privatization is not part of PPP. The term PPP is often confused with privatization (Farquharson, et al., 2011; Yescombe & Farquharson, 2018). Both Farquharson, et al. (2011), and Yescombe & Farquharson (2018) firmly state that PPP is not the same as privatization. There is a clear difference between these two forms of private sector involvement: privatization involves the permanent transfer of previously publicly owned assets to the private sector, while PPP must involve the ongoing role of the public sector as a “partner” in an ongoing relationship with the private sector (Farquharson, et al., 2011). Yescombe & Farquharson (2018) state that perhaps the two most fundamental differences in PPP (unlike privatization) are: 1) ownership of the assets is not transferred to the private sector; and 2) the contracting authority is ultimately responsible for the provision of public services provided by the PPP. In PPP, the public sector holds primary responsibility for service delivery although the private sector provides services for a long period of time (ADB, 2020).

Due to the diversity of views related to PPP and privatization, as shown by various different literature sources, this study proposes that the naming of the correctional institution PPP model "privatization" be replaced with the "private governance" model. This is intended to overcome the confusion of the term PPP and privatization. The characteristics of the "private

governance" model are the same as the characteristics of the "privatization" model (Cabral & Saussier, 2013; Aisyah, et al., 2024), the UK PFI "design-construct-maintain-finance" (DCMF) model (Grimsey & Lewis, 2004), or the "full-scale" model (Allen & English, 2013). Thus, this study proposes that the correctional institution PPP models consists of: 1) the "private governance" model; 2) the "hybrid management" model; 3) the "service infrastructure" model; and 4) the "contracting out certain limited functions" model.

To further elaborate on the four correctional institution PPP models, this study will develop or modify the mapping of correctional institution PPP models described in table 1. Table 1 has presented an explanation of the various types of private sector involvement in correctional institution development and operation based on the characteristics of the four prison PPP models. However, table 1 has not explained the types of activities in the correctional institution development stage and the types of services provided by the private sector.

Referring to Van Herk (2016), the facility development components consist of design, construction and financing, while the operating components consist of building and installation maintenance (often understood as facility management); facility services (which indicate the functional characteristics of a particular facility); and monitoring and supervision. The information from Van Herk (2016) is used by the author to determine the scope of the correctional institution development and operation components.

The development and operation of correctional institution are very important in realizing the objectives of the correctional institution itself as an institution that carries out the correctional function to correct the criminal tendencies of criminals. The correctional function can be carried out by correctional institution through the delivery of correctional services when correctional institution facilities are well available

through development and supported by the operation of all other supporting services. The provision of correctional services requires the development, improvement, maintenance, and operation of correctional institution (Grimsey & Lewis, 2004).

Similar to Van Herk (2016), the author determines the development components consist of design, construction and financing. Meanwhile, the operating components according to Van Herk (2016) are modified by the author by adjusting the characteristics of the correctional institution so that they can be distinguished from other institutions or infrastructure. The operation of the correctional institution, which is carried out after the correctional institution building is available through the development process, is carried out to provide its own benefits related to the existence of the correctional institution building itself. These benefits can be conveyed through the provision of various services. Like buildings in general, correctional institution buildings must be maintained so that their condition can remain good. For this, accommodation or maintenance services are needed. Van Herk (2016) refers to these services as building maintenance and installation.

In addition to accommodation services, monitoring and supervision are also needed, which are definitely found in institutions other than correctional institution because they function to control the provision of services in any institution. If Van Herk (2016) mentions monitoring and supervision, the author prefers to use the terms management and administration. Monitoring and supervision are part of the management function so that the concept of management has a broader meaning. In addition, the author prefers the terminology of management and administration as part of the components of correctional institution operations by referring to Macaulay (2013) who uses this terminology to distinguish the role of the private sector in the "privatization" model (referring to the "private governance" model) with "hybrid

management" model. According to Macaulay (2013), the "hybrid management" model excludes the role of the private sector in management and administration that are not excluded in the "privatization" model. The terminology of management and administration implies control over the implementation of all activities in an institution. In the "private governance" model, control of all correctional institution activities is carried out by the private sector or private correctional institution companies.

Then, what are the characteristics of correctional institution services? Van Herk (2016) stated that facility services indicate the functional characteristics of certain facilities. As previously stated by Hanser (2020) and Stohr & Walsh (2022), correctional institution facilities have a corrective function that aims to improve the criminal tendencies of criminals. The corrective function is inherent in the terminology of correctional institution which is the characteristics or distinguishing features of correctional institution, as an institution, from other institutions. Thus, the characteristics of correctional institution services are related to the implementation of the corrective function in order to improve the criminal tendencies of criminals.

As an institution that carries out prison punishment for criminals who have been found guilty (violated the law) by a court judge, correctional institution must carry out prison punishment by providing security and treatment aimed at improving the attitudes and behavior of prisoners. In an effort to improve the attitudes and behavior of prisoners, correctional institution must be in a safe, humane and productive state. Conditions that support improvements in the attitudes and behavior of inmates indicate the good quality of prison (or correctional institution) life.

The quality of prison life, according to Dilulio (1987), can be measured by order, amenity and service. Order is the absence of individual or group misconduct that threatens the safety of others (simply no

assaults, rapes or riots); amenity is anything that enhances the comfort of the inmates (good food, clean cells, adequate recreation); services are anything that is intended to improve the life prospects of the inmates (educational programs, vocational training, employment opportunities) (Dilulio, 1987: 11-12). According to Dilulio (1987), order, amenity and service are the three goals of good prison governance and represent the best moral choice for a society that wants to be fair and compassionate towards convicted criminals.

The terminology of "order" is attached by Dilulio (1987) to the terminology of "custody" which essentially refers to the security function, while the terminology of "amenity and service" (a combination of the two) is attached as the terminology of "treatment". Linking Dilulio's opinion (1987) with Hanser's opinion (2020) which states that the correctional function consists of security and treatment functions, the author argues that the correctional function of correctional institution consists of aspects of order, amenity and service. Safe correctional institution condition (closely related to order) can be achieved through activities within the scope of security or custody functions, while humane correctional institution condition (closely related to amenity) and productive correctional institution condition (closely related to service) can be achieved through activities within the scope of treatment functions. For this reason, the author uses order, amenity, and service to represent the correctional function of correctional institution which are the scope of correctional services (characteristic services of correctional institution).

In relation to the previous explanation, the components of correctional institution operations that the author determines consist of accommodation services (building and installation maintenance); correctional services (order, amenity, and service); and management and administration. Correctional services are often referred to as core services or functions because they

reflect the direct relationship between the state (correctional institution authorities) and its citizens (prisoners). The core function of government is the core of political governance and closely reflects the relationship between the state and its members (Jing, 2010). Meanwhile, accommodation services as well as management and administration are often

referred to as additional or supporting services because these services support the performance of core service delivery. Based on the explanation that has been provided, the characteristics of the four PPP models in correctional institution based on the task specifications in the correctional institution can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Mapping of the PPP Models in Correctional Institution Based on Task Specifications in the Correctional Institution

Corrcetional Institution PPP Model	Developm ent	Operation				Contract Characteris tics	
	Design, Build & Financing	Accommodati on Service	Correctional Services				Management & Administration
			Service	Amenity	Order		
The “private governance” model						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 integrated contract for the developme nt and operation of all services - contract term is usually 25 or 30 years 	
The “hybrid management” model		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - building maintenance - transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - educati on - job and vocatio nal trainin g - reentry service s - industri es 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - hostelry services (food, hygiene, cleaning services) - health services 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 separate contracts (1 contract to construct and maintain the prison building; and 1 contract to operate the prison or to provide certain services) - contract term is around 10 or 15 years 	
The “service infrastructure” model		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> building maintenance 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 integrated contract for the constructi on and 	

							mainten ce compon ents of prison buildings - contract term is approxima tely 10 years
The “contracting out certain limited functions” model		building maintenance	certain limited functio ns, such as the provisi on of regime activiti es	certain limited functions (such as catering)			Shorter contract term (e.g. 5 years) compared to other PPP models

Description: yellow color indicates the role of the private sector
Source: processed by the author (2024) from various sources

CONCLUSION

This study proposes that private sector involvement in correctional institution described in the correctional institution PPP models (“private governance” model, “hybrid management” model, “service infrastructure” model, and “contracting out certain limited functions” model) should be elaborated specifically based on the stages of development (design, financing and construction) and operation (accommodation services, management and administration, and correctional services). The specification of private sector involvement in correctional institution development and operation will show the characteristics of various correctional institution PPP models. Among the four correctional institution PPP models, only the “contracting out certain limited functions” model does not regulate private sector involvement in correctional institution development.

In the correctional institution operation stage, all correctional institution PPP models regulate private involvement in accommodation services or building maintenance. Only the “private governance”

model allows private involvement in correctional institution management and administration, indicating that the private sector has full authority in controlling all services or activities in the correctional institution and is represented in private correctional institution (private prison). The correctional institution facility services that show the functional characteristics of correctional institution are correctional services, which consist of aspects of order, amenity and service. The “private governance” model allows private involvement in all aspects of correctional services, while the “service infrastructure” model does not allow private involvement in all aspects of these correctional services. The “hybrid management” model and the “contracting out certain limited functions” model allow private involvement in aspects of amenity and service, but not in aspects of order or custody.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, Rob., & English, Paul. (2013). Public-Private Partnerships in Prison Construction and Management. Justice & Development Working Paper No. 83347. Legal Vice Presidency, The World Bank. Public-private partnerships in prison construction and management (worldbank.org)
2. Aisyah, Sani Siti., Meliala, Adrianus., & Sulhin, Iqraq. (2024). Public-Private Partnership Model of Correctional Institution: A Comparison Study in Various Countries. *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 7(3): 1-13. <https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/JS-Parchives/public-private-partnership-model-of-correctional-institution%3A-a-comparison-study-in-various-countries>
3. Asian Development Bank (ADB). (2020). *Public-Private Partnership Monitor: Indonesia*. ADB. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22617/SGP210069-2>
4. Cabral, S., & Azevedo, P. F. (2008). The modes of provision of prisons services in a comparative perspective. *Brazilian Administrative Review*, 5(1), 53-69 <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/bar/v5n1/v5n1a05.pdf>.
5. Cabral, Sandro., & Saussier, Stephane. (2013). Organizing Prisons through Public-Private Partnerships: a Cross-Country Investigation. *Brazilian Administration Review*, 10(1): 100-120. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262665166_Organizing_Prisons_through_Public-private_Partnerships_A_Cross-Country_Investigation
6. Cornwell, David J. (2021). *Prisons, Politics and Practices in England and Wales 1945-2020: The Operational Management Issues*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-84277-2>
7. Dilulio, John Jr. (1987). *Governing Prison: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management*. New York: The Free Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=s6AsM5Y_MUIC&printsec=frontcover&hl=id&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
8. Farquharson, Edward., Clemencia, Tores de Mastle., Yescombe, E.R., & Encinas Javier. (2011). *How to Engage with the Private Sector in Public-Private Partnerships in Emerging Markets*. The World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/serve_r/api/core/bitstreams/3e06cd5d-fc7f-5a17-ae96-1102e0bdbcdc/content
9. Grimsey, D., & Lewis, M. (2004). *Public private partnerships: The worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781845423438>
10. Hanser, Robert D. (2020). *Introduction to Corrections (Third Edition)*. Sage Publications, Inc. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=PBh7DwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=id&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
11. Hodge, Graeme., & Greve, Carsten. (2017). On Public-Private Partnership: A Contemporary Review. *Public Works Management & Policy*, 22(1): 55-78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724x16657830>
12. Hodge, Graeme A. & Greve, Carsten. (2007). Public-private partnerships: An international review. *Public Administration Review*, 67: 545-558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00736.x>
13. Jing, Yijia. (2010). *Prison Privatization: A Study of Causes and Magnitude*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc. <https://archive.org/details/prisonprivatizat0000jing/mode/1up>
14. Macaulay, Fiona. (2013). Modes of prison administration, control and governmentality in Latin America: adoption, adaptation and hybridity. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 13(4): 361-392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2013.834114>
15. Oshima, Kosuke. (2015). Public-Private Partnerships, Dividing Operational Stage, and Optimal Governance Structures. *Public Organization Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-015-0321-3>
16. Reynaers, A. M. (2014). Public Values in Public-Private Partnerships. *Public Administration Review*, 74(1): 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12137>
17. Ross, T. W., & Yan, J. (2015). Comparing Public-Private Partnerships and Traditional Public Procurement: Efficiency vs Flexibility. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 17(5): 448-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2015.1029333>

18. Rubin, Ashley T. (2019). "History of the Prison". in Deflem, Mathieu (Ed.). *Handbook of Social Control*. Eiley-Blackwell.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119372394.ch20>
19. Savas, E. S. (2000). *Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships*. Sage Publication, Inc. Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships | SAGE Publications Ltd
20. Stohr, Mary K., & Walsh, Anthony. (2022). *Correction the Essential (Fourth Edition)*. Sage Publication, Inc.
https://books.google.co.id/books?id=H0D8DwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=id&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
21. Van Herk, Els. (2016). Public-Private Partnership. Europris Real Estate and Logistics Expert Group.
<https://www.europris.org/wp-content/uploads/PPP.pdf>
22. Wang, Huanming., Xiong, Wei., Wu, Guangdong., & Zhu, Dajian. (2018). Public-private partnership in Public Administration discipline: a literature review. *Public Management Review*, 20(2): 293-316
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1313445>
23. World Bank Group., Asian Development Bank., & Inter-American Development Bank. (2014). *Public-Private Partnerships: Reference Guide (Version 2.0)*. Washington, D.C. Public-Private Partnerships Reference Guide: Version 2.0 | Public Private Partnership (worldbank.org)
24. Yescombe, E.R., & Farquharson, Edward. (2018). *Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure: Principles of Policy and Finance (Second Edition)*. Elsevier Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-100766-2.00021-8>

How to cite this article: Sani Siti Aisyah, Adrianus Eliasta Meliala, Iqram Sulhin. Analysis of mapping the private sector involvement in correctional institution development and operation based on public-private partnership (PPP) Model. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2024; 11(10): 45-58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20241006>
