

Making Sense Of Public-Private Partnership A Case of Punjab Education Foundation

Saima Zubair¹, Aamir Saeed^{*2}

^{1,2}Institute of Administrative Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

* Corresponding author: aamir.ias@pu.edu.pk

The difference between policy rhetoric of Public Private Partnership PPPs and likely outcomes of these reforms call forth a dialectic investigation of the reform-agenda processes and the actors involved in it. This paper is based on a case analysis of PPP Model of Punjab Education foundation (PEF), which was established in the wake of neo-liberalism. The Model of PPP is considered to be responsible for a mushroom growth of Private entrepreneurs for the provision of public education. The private provision of education is legitimized in the garb of efficiency, quality and access. These public private partnership reforms are dictated by the donor agencies and IFIs as the hegemonic power to remotely control the policies ultimately resulting into ideological shifts in developing countries like Pakistan. Using the sense making technique the contents of the PPP model and the underlying rationale for the inception of Punjab Education Foundation are explained in the light of the governance context of Pakistan; hence the nature of this paper is more predictive than descriptive to explain the likely and apparent repercussions of Public-Private Partnerships as a reform agenda in the education sector of Pakistan.

Keywords: Public-Private Partnership, Punjab Education Foundation, Education

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: 28 July 2019
Revised: 15 December 2019
Accepted: 30 December 2019

DOI: 10.31580/jpvai.v2i4.1150

© Readers Insight Publication

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this paper is to make sense of Public-Private partnership as a reform agenda through developing a context of Pakistan. The rationale and PPP model of Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) have been taken into account to identify likely repercussions which are seen through the lens of the external involvement in Pakistan. The Punjab Education Foundation PEF was established as a result of education sector reforms in Pakistan. The reforms are portrayed as effective and successful if they harness public demand and serve as a means to achieve positive change in the society. Initially PEF from 1991 to 2004 PEF was working as a limited scope financial institution then in 2004 PEF was reappointed as an autonomous body under the Punjab Education Foundation Act-XII of 2004 to promote quality education with the help of public private partnership. The Punjab Education Sector Reform Program (PESRP), was started in 2003 funded by the World Bank and the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the PESRP has undertaken major investments in education and disbursed funds on the fulfillment of at least eight out of ten such agreed indicators. The Punjab government meets most of the PESRP's cost (about USD 3.5 billion) with support from donors, mainly the World Bank (USD 350 million) and DFID (USD 200 million). The PESRP was introduced with three dominant goals: improving access of education to poor children, quality, and governance in education. A devolved administrative structure with increased targeting of educational expenditures to poorer households was also planned.

The promotion of PPPs as a core education sector reform was adopted as a strategy in 2001 at the federal level with consultation of provincial level officials. However, the program's general impact has not been noteworthy as the enrollment trends still show stagnating primary and middle school enrollments and inequity of education

gender wise. There were a lot of programs conceived under PESRP in 2001 one of the programs is the Punjab Education Foundation developed under the umbrella of Education Foundations.

The Rationale for Developing PEF

There are three tiers federal, provincial and local of the governance structure of Pakistan with reference to education. The federal level of the government is responsible for education policy and planning whereas the provincial level is responsible for education delivery and management and local or district level is responsible for actual provision of education. Hence foundations were established to implement PPPs as autonomous agencies under the education strategy plan. These Foundations were established in 1990 to 1994 and were restructured in 2004 as autonomous organizations linked to the Ministry of Education to facilitate private sector involvement and participation in education.

These foundations are five in total, National Education Foundation (NEF), Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) and Balochistan Education Foundation (BEF) Sindh Education Foundation (SEF) and Frontier Education Foundation (FEF). PEF introduced many new projects and programs after the restructuring in 2004. In 1990s Pakistan faced difficulty in the provision and improvement of quality education. Besides this difficulty there were a lot more problems like lack of educational facilities, buildings, untrained and less qualified teachers and non-availability of the text books.

Government of Pakistan took steps to alter this upsetting situation in the education sector by giving importance to basic and higher education through bottom-up and top down strategy (Khan.A, 2011). One of such endeavors in Punjab province like other provinces is Punjab Education Foundation as an autonomous body. Low income households and children belonging to poor families have only limited

access to quality education. Punjab education foundation was considered to be a step towards filling the gap through public private partnership. Hence PPP becomes an alternative option to provide quality education services to the low stratum of the society through public financing.

In such partnerships the private sector is to provide support to the education through its philanthropic activities. The government guides policies, provides funding and finances to these private institutions and these private institutes delivers education services to the underprivileged class. This public private partnership has increased radically apparently bringing change across the world and serving people from high income level to low income level.

The provision of education and financing is the responsibility of the governments but because of budget deficit, the public sector opted to make innovative partnerships with the private sector to provide education in most parts of the world (Sosale, 2000). Private education consists of a range of providers including the non-profit schools run by the NGOs, for profit schools operating as enterprises and publicly funded schools which are operated by private boards.

The rationale behind this PPP is to exploit the private sector's capacity to improve service provision and make equitable access to education. When the state cannot provide education to all and there is an excess demand for schooling the private sector is encouraged for the service provision. Apparently when the government provides demand based finances and contracts out with the private sector it becomes a great opportunity for those poor parents who cannot afford quality education for their children and the private sector for the providing support services has to ensure quality and effective use of public resources (Habib, 2013).

PPP Reforms as Remedy for the Maladies in Education

Education is compulsory by law for the first time. Article 25-A of the 18th Amendment states: "The State shall provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age of five to sixteen years in a manner as may be determined by law." Pakistan faces many challenges in education sector for example a large number of out of school children, illiteracy and poor quality of education. PPPs in education sector were adopted as a remedy because public sector cannot solely execute the responsibility of providing quality education as it lacks financial and human resources and the capacity to implement a wide-ranging program with good governance. One of the major problems with Pakistan's public education sector has been the widespread corruption within the system, which has led to the phenomenon of "ghost schools," i.e. where teachers are on the payroll but not doing well in teaching the classes. PPPs can be formally defined as an arrangement based on mutual commitment between public sector organizations and those organizations outside the public sector (Selsky and Parker, 2005).

In short it is a combination of both private sector and public sector for social advantages. However this definition doesn't specify which function is associated with each actor. There is no single model of PPP rather there are various model identifying different functional responsibilities. PPPs have also been defined as a middle way between the state capital and privatization (Leitch and Motion, 2003).

Privatization has rarely shown desired results in developing countries, neither in decreasing national debts nor in performing superior in running the business (Broadbent and Laughlin, 2003). There are wide varieties of actors involved in partnerships. It can be a partnership between government and for profit business or a partnership between government, NGOs and private sector. Hence it can be a multi-stakeholder partnership joined to achieve certain goals. The multiple meanings, ideological commitments and underlying premises have also been studied, Partnerships are considered as policy & political tools (Linder, 1999) and the implementation depends on the successful development of legal agreements, procedures and contracts defining the relationship between different actors (Pongsiri, 2002).

The effectiveness of partnerships has been questioned as long as they existed. Some PPPs are critiqued on quality grounds while other studies see PPPs as positive and instrumental way for social advantages. The measure of success especially in the service provision sector should be quality so this leads to the contestation that how to measure quality in education sector or how to measure education in terms of access and quality? PPPs don't always ensure access, quality & democracy. It may decrease the cost in the short term but doesn't necessarily reduce regulation cost, the government has to monitor them and guard the public good (Rosenau, 1999). Deception may lie at the core of such partnerships which makes them apocryphal regarding the delivery of their proclaimed results, so conceptual inconsistencies are found in PPPs in terms of outcome. Through private rent seeking opportunities the private sector may advance interests under the garb of sharing the power with state and the unprivileged (Dixon, R and Kouzmin, 2004).

Pakistan is far behind achieving its MDGs, every developing country struggling to achieve the EFA targets set for 2015 (UNESCO, 2010). The state has failed to provide adequate schooling and PPPs as the anchor of Pakistan education strategy have taken the place to address the inequalities in the education sector. This failure of state in the provision of education has caused rise in private education providers but this flawed partnerships are a growing concern.

The EVS scheme by PEF has to be assessed in order to address the issue of equity. There is a growing shift of government to get into partnerships but the essence of the partnerships is unable to address equity. The traditional modes of education provision are considered ineffective to achieve international targets. Since 1990s Pakistan has promoted the idea of PPPs for increasing access and quality education. Partnerships lack equal distribution of power & trust between the partners (Farah and Rizvi, 2007). PPPs have attracted the attention of the international players and the national government to address the issue of quality and access but governments still control the national education systems despite these global trends (Scholte, 2000).

The PPP Model of PEF

The model of PEF incentivizes the private sector education by the government but these financial incentives vary across different cases. These financial incentives can be in the form of subsidies, concessions for utilities and voucher schemes, not only the free land for school building, concessions in domestic rather than commercial rates for electricity & gas bills but a limit on the units is applied and even tax exemptions. There are no limitations on what type of schools can avail these facilities rather some elite private schools are included in the list. This model is different from the one where the government directly gets involved in the provision of services. In PEF model the government provides finances to the private sector based on the recommendation of World Bank that the state should provide finances for education for all children which is claimed to be a more cost efficient mode of education provision. The government becomes responsible for providing the environment where the private sector can be fostered to provide education. Hence the role of the government shifts from service provider to the facilitator of service provision and the public sector doesn't play any role in the management decisions of the school. The staff of the schools continues to be from the private sector and schools have the autonomy in hiring and firing decisions.

The public sector introduced the voucher scheme according to which the government pays fees to the private schools for students belonging to the underprivileged class. This model lacks effective monitoring and regulation which could otherwise be provided by local community board and NGOs. This model minimized this need for effective monitoring. This model promotes the role of private sector instead of traditional role of the government. The public sector negotiates the fee structure by paying through voucher scheme, the private school charges higher fees than the government schools. The government can support low income students through vouchers or by

urging the private sector to consider a lower fee structure in exchange of financial benefits and subsidies.

Education Voucher Scheme

Education voucher scheme is a provincial scheme and in each province there is an autonomous body to help improve education. In Punjab a foundation called Punjab education foundation has been created for the same purpose. PEF started its Education Voucher Scheme in 2005 with the assistance from the World Bank. These vouchers are not equally distributed in the partner schools. Some schools may receive higher percentage of vouchers because of it being renowned among the students and parents. The parents of a student can also choose to enroll their child in a school charging a fee higher than Rs. 300. In this case, the government voucher covers for the first Rs. 300 of the fee. The parents then directly pay the difference to the school. The program, so far, has focused on urban slums. A low-income locality is selected and all children of the households (whether poor or not) in the locality qualify for the voucher.

Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) has planned to further expand its EVS program in all districts of the province wherein currently it is operational in 17 districts of the Punjab. EVS is an innovative way to increase private sector participation. The sustainability & continuation of this program largely depends on donors' willingness to contribute. A higher turnover rate of teachers is observed in private schools because teachers tend to get more job security in the public sector (Rehman et al., 2019). Such private schools facilitate the training grounds for teachers but once the teachers get experience they move on to public sector. This high turnover rate undermines the quality of education.

Responsibility passed on to the Private Sector

The government acts as the facilitator and passing the responsibility to the private sector for education provision clearly manifests the inability and failure of the government. This gives rise to the perceptions of the parents that state education has been privatized hence they don't send their children to private schools since it is the responsibility of the government to provide education. The economic policy of the government is crucial to the success since the government is the provider of the financial incentives. This foundation was established in the General Musharaf era when a steady growth was reported by the provincial government which was later affected in the era of president Zardari. Changes in the management and board of directors affected the progress of the programs. The transparency and accountability of PEF administration was questioned in 2009. Questions were raised about the social responsibility of PPPs and efficacy in the absence of board of directors. Changing governments and policies can affect such types of PPP models.

The Public Private Partnerships PPPs are related to these reforms as an ideological wave emerged in the last three decades i.e. participation of private sector in the deliverance of public services with public funds. The reasons for this initiative as public sector reforms can be deciphered on the basis of socio-economic & political conditions of the country adopting it. This PPPs initiative can be viewed in the education sector as well generally resulting in an increasing role of the private sector in providing public education and hence these PPPs are considered as the "Anchor of Educational Reforms" & "New modes of Governance".

There is no concrete consensus over the definitions of PPPs because it has wide variety of arrangements however PPPs can be regarded as an umbrella term for any type of private participation in public education superseding arrangements from completely public to almost completely private provision of education. It's important to explore the political process behind the provision of public services with the involvement of private sector and understand the trends and the actors involved in this shift.

The evaluation of the motivations and interests of these actors who are at national and international level and the ways in which the private sector and governmental institutions interact and affect each other, is needed to develop an understanding of the rationale for adopting PPPs.

The intervention rationale behind private sector involvement was that the government has fiscal & resource constraints to expend for development, in order to overcome this predicament it needs to build an alliance with governmental and business interests thus formed the core of PPPs. These high pronounced reforms are ideological in nature but to assess these reforms such as PPPs are difficult because they are under the garb of increased efficiency and managerial autonomy which are given to partner schools.

A constitutional amendment called 18th Constitutional Amendment was passed in 2011; this amendment removed the concurrent list and brought significant changes in the education sector. In addition responsibility for education was devolved from the federal to provincial governments. In the wake of this 18th amendment the federal Ministry of Education has been devolved.

In pursuit of achieving EFA and MDG targets the privatization and decentralization have also been promoted as noticeable education policy shifts, these changes such as privatization, decentralization are considered to bring improvement in governance system through accountability and adoption of new business management practices into public management.

These global comparative indices such as EFA and MDG targets provide the basis for global comparisons in education policy within which global standards for education are enclosed (Spring). The success of educational reforms in one context doesn't necessitate success in another context. There is an increased realization of globalizing the education policy as preferred policy priorities for education (Rizvi and Lingard). The LEAPS study and Annual Status of Education Report show relatively positive outcomes of these low cost private schools in terms of teacher-student attendance and provision of quality education. These positive outcomes should be evaluated on some other dimensions: whether we are moving towards privatization of education through PPP policy or whether an implicit objective is to promote privatization by minimizing the role of the government.

Making Sense of PPP

This section heuristically builds the governance context under which the educational reforms were introduced and also the ideological basis accompanying them. The political leaders only provided lip service to administrative reform, and supported only that reform which did not serve to be a threat to their status quo and power/positions, therefore remain stuck to the already established administrative systems.

Reformers had views of changing the bureaucratic laws and order systems of public administration and institutionalizing development administration. The reform program of 1980's included privatization and institutionalizing de-bureaucratization to reduce red tape in government administration (Caiden). Certain Government failures were pointed out such as over burdened states cause inefficient and ineffective tasks, elite bureaucrats were considered to be responsible for misusing resources. The excessive intervention of the state led to limited freedom of citizens, therefore devolution is considered to be a rationale to avoid corruption and all other fallacies caused by bureaucracy. These flaws in the bureaucratic model led to the creation of a reform model termed as New Public Management (NPM).

Narrative of New Public Management (NPM) Reforms

New public management reform is an umbrella term and different reforms come under as different categories e.g. structural reforms, budgetary reforms, procedural reforms, and relational reforms. Reforms involve privatization, outsourcing, downsizing, decentralization all these reforms are aimed to improve service

delivery, enhance efficiency and effectiveness. Flattening the hierarchical structure, communication, decision making and a certain flow of authority are all the structural formations. De-bureaucratization means to decrease government intervention, eradicating dysfunctions caused by bureaucracy, and to make civil servants more attentive towards the needs of the citizens. Privatization and co-production are the means to achieve de-bureaucratization. So the goals of administrative reforms are to expand public service delivery system, simplification of administrative processes and procedures, improve policy making and decentralizing the power and authority.

Privatization is of different kinds, tactical, pragmatic and systematic privatization. Tactical privatization means that the government gets the work done through private sector or non-for-profit making organizations whereas pragmatic privatization means that the government acts as the deciding body to achieve its reform objectives. Systematic privatization is to bring about structural changes in the governance and administration and led to the public-private arrangement under new public administration (Farazmand). Structural reforms are about bringing change in the framework of the organizations which are involved in the provision of public services. The purpose behind these structural reforms and institutional changes is to enhance the quality of service provision (Peters, 1995).

Co-production is another form of new public management reform strategy, which is about forming a liaison or partnership between public and privately owned organizations. The purpose is to deliver services more effectively at minimized cost by contracting out with private or government organizations. Citizenship is another form of coproduction when the citizens finance the public organizations willingly and accept some work load of the government. Successful coproduction must involve experimentation and innovation in the methods used for making decisions and delivering services. For such an arrangement to work best a community has to develop a supporting structure for an "experimenting policy"; i.e., a political and administrative climate where citizens, public employees, and public officials are willing to try new methods of delivering traditional public services (Levine, 1984, p.185).

Transference of Ideologies through Reforms and Foreign Assistance

The foreign assistance serves as an instrument bringing reforms and ideologies with it in the national policy. The ideology of neoliberalism is imposed by IMF and World Bank on the countries which are dependent on these foreign aids through Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs). This economic restructure for debt repayment lowers the living standards of the people and the entire focus gets diverted from education, health and development to debt repayment.

The major impact of this foreign assistance is the reduced role of the government through privatization which further aggravates the conditions of the people bringing impoverishment and the gap between upper and lower strata keeps on increasing hence under developed countries like Pakistan gets into a vicious circle of poverty. Since the 1990s, the role of the for-profit private sector has also emerged in development debates in the context of an international neo-liberal agenda advocating a reduced role for the state (Roze, 2010).

The foreign aid has affected the pace of development but on the other hand it has increased the debt burden (Khan). The IFIs most pertinent for Pakistan since 1960 are the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB). Pakistan joined World Bank in 1950 and is among the top ten recipients of World Bank lending. However, World Bank lending to Pakistan has varied over time. Another source of finance is IMF which got into different agreements with Pakistan after 1988 though it first came into agreement in 1958 but until 1988 no significant amount was determined. According to a report on situational analysis of the education sector revealing the inherent inequalities in the

education system, there were some 97 education development projects funded by external agencies in different parts of Pakistan dealing with improving governance (Mujahid, 2011). Other major areas receiving foreign assistance are Capacity Building, Elementary Education, Reconstruction and Teachers' Training. This foreign assistance shows the extent of external involvement and the global policy influence is pretty evident in the educational policies of Pakistan (Ali & Tahir, 2009).

The Political Incentives for Introducing Educational Reforms

There were reasons why the government got into the discourse of PPPs; the apparent motives were financial incentives whereas the prime motives were associated with political incentives of the military led government of that time which toppled the elected government in 1999. In pursuit of gaining international legitimacy for this military coup d'état, this regime was quick to adopt the developmental reforms, induct and give out ministerial and advisory positions to NGO leaders, and start a major process of development reforms initiating the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, designing of the Devolution Plan and Education Sector Reform Strategy simultaneously. Seeing these efforts by the military regime the international development agencies dropped their reservation and reluctance (A. Khan). All the international development agencies and donors started to participate in the policy formation process and became active partners in designing the strategy documents. All donors at this time were the proponents of PPPs given that forging partnerships for development is one of the eight MDGs (Habib, 2013).

The impact of the international development institutions is promoting the idea of PPPs and it's pretty evident in these documents as many of these strategy documents frame PPPs within the Millennium Development Goal No. 8 which emphasizes on forming partnerships in development (National Plan of Action on Education for All Pakistan, 2003). At the time of writing the education strategy paper in 2001 all key donors in the education sector – World Bank, Asian Development Bank, DFID, and USAID, the United Nations agencies, the Japanese Government, Norwegian Agency of Development Cooperation (NORAD), and European Union (EU) actively supported the idea of PPPs. The World Bank and the USAID pledged to prop up the Education Foundations and invest in programs involving the private sectors like voucher scheme. DFID, UNICEF and NORAD supported formation of PPPs through all their core programs and pledged to work through the Foundations. NORAD proposed a six year \$22 million program for promoting quality education, particularly among girls. It proposed to partner with the National Education Foundation to develop a \$6.5 million project to give a hand for the establishment of 350 community schools in FATA through PPPs. Out of its \$81 million allocation to education over six years, the European Commission allocated \$45 million to Sindh Education Foundation to implement the Education Sector Reforms and promote PPPs in all 16 districts of Sindh (Moe, 2006). The military government found PPPs as a suitable way to appease the international development community and NGOs simultaneously for unburdening the accountability pressures in the provision of basic social services. Thus, it turned out to be a win-win position for the military led government where by adopting the right language of development dictated by the international donors it gained international legitimacy and financial support but in practice never had to open up the system to facilitate genuine public participation in running of state institutions (Khan, 2011). The result is that PPPs remained isolated projects within the education sector in Pakistan rather than leading to a genuine forging maximum utilization of energies of the state, and the private sector and as the military government became stronger and support of the western governments became conditional on bigger issues like the 'war on terror' than routine policies around education. Hence the emphasis on PPPs reduced in the draft National Education Policy 2008 which was written by people from within the government system and many of

the NGO advisors were dropped.

New Modes of Domination (Neo-Colonialism)

There is another aspect of foreign assistance and educational reforms which tend to portray reforms as bringing moderation and prosperity in Pakistan ultimately strengthening the relations between Washington and Islamabad. Harnessing the development and reform of the public education system are considered to not only contribute to Pakistani economic prosperity, social tolerance and reduced extremism, it will help improve the image & tolerance for the United States by demonstrating American interest in the human development of average Pakistani citizens (Curtins, 2007). In the post-2001 era, the United States has viewed Pakistan as an important ally. Both historically and in recent years Pakistan has been a key recipient of US foreign aid though the assistance has fluctuated over decades. (Epstein and Kronstadt). US financial assistance to Pakistan was raised from \$28 million in fiscal year 2004 to \$66 million in fiscal year 2005. The Fiscal Year 2008 State Department Congressional Budget Request included \$52 million for general education programs and an additional \$50 million for earthquake reconstruction of schools and health facilities.

The 2007 Emergency Supplemental Budget Request called for another \$110 million to develop Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), including the education sector. Pakistan's western tribal areas are far-flung, remote, poor, and traditional in cultural practices.

The Congressional Research Service report 2013 describes the reservations in terms of the social and economic privation of the inhabitants which may make the region an attractive proliferation ground for violent extremists. The U.S assisted development initiative for the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), launched in 2003, has sought to improve the quality of education, develop healthcare services, and increase opportunities for economic growth (USAID). Foreign involvement in education policies has also been to eradicate extremism. The 9/11 Commission report issued in July 2004 highlighted the importance of educational opportunities in South Asia and Middle East to uproot the ideology of extremism hence increased oversight of US financial assistance programs to Pakistan increased spending on education. In order to deliver high-quality education throughout Pakistan by the government officials and private sector the USAID's education program provides them with training, technical assistance, and infrastructure (Curtins, 2007).

This promise to deliver high quality education seems to possess some covert objectives. If we move into the retrospection of British rule in India, education was used as an instrument to indoctrinate the elite layer of the society. This elite layer of Indian society was slyly enticed to learn English and encouraged them in absorbing values and notions of the British so that it would be conducive to the British occupation of India, and furthering British goals of looting and getting hold of India's physical wealth and exploiting its labor. Hence they embarked on a journey to conquer and control Indian minds which is pretty evident by Thomas Macaulay articulation of the goals of British colonial imperialism in 1835 (Trevelyan, 1838).

The ostensible motives are to eradicate the ideology of extremism but it's more like promoting the ideology of liberalism, autonomy and freedom. This liberalism and autonomy are the most cherished values of the western society so as the political liberalism which prohibits the interference of the government and demands the neutrality towards all conceptions which enable the individuals to pursue their own visions of good with freedom and autonomy (Bishop, 2007). This influence is frequently referred to as educational neocolonialism in the sense that Western paradigms tend to shape and influence educational systems and thinking elsewhere through the process of globalization (Nguyen, Elliott and Terlouw, 2010).

All these financial aids and excessive foreign involvement in state policies indicate new modes of domination. As united India and

Pakistan has been a colonized state but still Pakistan doesn't seem to be freed vis-à-vis foreign domination and external involvement. Colonization is a system and deeply rooted in the societies of both colonized and colonizers and colonizers cannot be simply eradicated with the declaration of independence (Sokefeld). World Bank as a "Master Explicator" explicates concepts such as "development" and "educational reform" as if the so-called Third World is unable to identify and solve its own problems (Anwaruddin, 2014). This 'aid' for the development devises numerous underhand ways to accomplish objectives formerly achieved by naked colonialism. It is this sum total of these modern attempts to continue colonialism while at the same time talking about 'freedom', which has come to be known as neo-colonialism (Nkrumah, 1967). It justifies its intervention on the educational policies and priorities in the developing countries and uses the power of its money and knowledge to establish a neocolonial relationship with the loan-recipient countries (Anwaruddin, 2014).

The narrative in the World Bank annual development report "The State in a Changing World" contributed to the global movement of minimizing the scope and authority of the state (WorldBank). The policy of PPP indicates a global domination through IFIs and hence proves to be a borrowed policy from international agencies. This policy of PPP as a favored international policy has been introduced by the policy makers of Pakistan to address local level issues. In National Educational Policy 1998 Pakistan declares that it cannot take the burden alone in the education process so private enterprises will be encouraged to establish educational institutes especially in rural areas. These policies were adopted as the language of new allies whereby the local policy elites adopt the international discourse to their own objectives (Silova, 2004).

In fact the context of Pakistan within which the PPP policy arrived, is very different from the context where this policy actually was designed and originated (UK or USA). The reforms are merely cosmetic changes to the existing governance structure and don't address the actual problems at the grass root level. These reforms proved to be a complete failure because of a faulty governance system & influence of colonial legacy. The basic tenets of the governance structure are accountability, rule of law, role of civil servants and democracy all are not prevailing in the bureaucracy of Pakistan in a true sense rather the setup is a continuation of the rules, policies, codes, procedures and laws of the colonial setup which served the rulers not the masses (Saeed, 2013; Saeed *et al.*, 2018; Farooq *et al.*, 2018).

All these ideologies give rise to certain principles like privatization leading towards a capitalistic economy. The colonial powers may have relinquished the physical control over the states by the declaration of independence but now they are controlling and maintaining the hegemony through ideologies and dominance over the economic relations of production and ownership which is the manifestation of neocolonialism. Lenin defines imperialism at the beginning of 20th century as the monopoly stage of capitalism which means that new imperialism is surely an economic phenomenon (Lenin). We can conclude that foreign innovations, foreign aids, reforms and ideas are infused in the local policy making as instruments to maintain hegemony without seizing and physically controlling the territories. These donor agencies have an influential position in the determination of the education policy based on their knowledge and financial resources (Ali, 2008). The PPP policy was adopted for quality, access and equity but it is becoming a source of inequity and privatization of education through expansion of private schools. The government of Pakistan really needs to revisit the PPP policy and make education as a high priority area.

Is Education A Public Good Or Private Commodity?

After analysing PPP reforms in the light of the governance context we have come to the point where the question arises whether education is a public good or private commodity? Recent years have witnessed an expansion of the private sector's role in the financing and provision of education services in many



countries. The sophisticated forms of non-state involvement in education have emerged through PPPs as a key trend. Governments in different countries are facing constraints in financing or provision of education.

The skewed expansion of schools with inappropriate type of schooling for children from certain backgrounds, is the result of the misallocation of the public spending within the public sector domain which ultimately resulted into the segregation of the population into economically disadvantaged minorities, girls, indigenous people, poor children with some physiological or psychological problems (Sosale, 2000). In many countries misallocation of resources is also responsible for inappropriate or oversubsidized expansion of tertiary education at the expense of basic education. Many scholars are the proponents of public private partnerships as the suitable remedy in the face of the difficulty in provision of public services. The principle of bearing the burden with private sector, is also related to taxation policies of the governments.

The governments in poor countries find it difficult because of low taxation base to collect enough tax revenues to expend it on public education. The author Shopbana Shosale traces trends in private sector development in 11 of 70 World Bank education projects in 1995-97. In the three years span of time (1995-97), the world bank provided about \$4.9 billion to assist its client countries in education reforms efforts (Sosale, 2000). As an external donor the world bank's greater focus is on the expansion of the role of private sector to meet the excess demands of education ensuring access, equity and coverage. Tensions, confusions and power plays are also seen when it comes to practically implement public private mix for provision of services. Public rationality is to see education as a public good but private rationality is to see education as a private commodity. The perceived disadvantage of public private partnership could be that the business partners don't focus on public good as primary concern (Latham, 2009).

There is also some corporate profitability associated with PPP model. According to Steve James (2000) the Glasgow Education PPPs exemplified as a solution to modernize secondary education by building 29 schools by 2003, were not spurred by the educational needs of Glasgow's 30,000 secondary pupils but for corporate profitability. Education was considered as a lucrative market of £5 billion which became one of the causes of Lobbygate Scandal in Scotland where many prominent politicians were exposed as being too accessible to a particular group of lobbyists working for companies interested in PPPs (James, 2000). Australians also appear to be ambivalent about 'privatization' of public services considering whether PPPs are robbing the public sector to pay the private sector (Crump and Slee, 2005). One view of PPP is as 'Language Game', there are multiple gamers to the meaning of PPP which try to cloud other strategies and purposes (Linder, 1999).

Perceptions about State Education

There is a major objection that concerns the private provision on state education. If poor parents rely on & support private education, this 'carries a real risk of undermining the government schooling system' (Probe). A widely accepted reason of why parents rely on private education is their perception of accountability. In a private school, the teachers are accountable to the manager who owns the right to fire them and, through him or her to the parents who can withdraw their children, hence the teachers have job insecurity and they are paid for their performance. In a government school, the chain of accountability is much weaker, as teachers have a permanent job with salaries and promotions unrelated to performance (Probe, 1999). In a study private schools in Ghana, Nigeria and India are outlined to explore these issues of de facto privatization. The results of the study show a majority of enrollment in private schools in poor urban or peri-urban areas and minority in rural areas (Tooley and Dixon, 2006). A research shows that even the poorest households in Pakistan use private schools extensively, and that utilization increases with income. Lowering private school fees or distance or raising

quality raises private school enrollments, partly by withdrawal from government schools and partly from enrollments of children who otherwise would not have gone to school (Alderman, Orazem, & Paterno, 2001). So we can see that the efficiency claim of the private sector has influenced the masses' opinion and perception as well.

Parents should not 'withdraw their children from the public education system and put them in private schools', for this 'reduces parental pressure to improve government schools' (Watkins, 2004). A Research in Haryana, India found that unrecognised private schools are operating practically in every locality of the urban centres as well as in rural areas' often located adjacent to a government school (Aggarwal, 2000). A research conducted in Lahore, Pakistan suggests that 51% of children from families earning less than \$1 a day attend private schools, even when there are government alternatives (Alderman, Kim, & Orazem, 2003).

The objection of private schools being inequitable was considered to be overcome through State and/or donor agency funded targeted vouchers for poorest out of school children and girls, to use within the private schools. It appeared to be cost effective way to increase enrollment of the poorest by providing vouchers but it might be argued that this position would be tenable only for urban and peri-urban situations, where there were already large numbers of private schools (Tooley & Dixon, 2006). If so, then targeted vouchers may also lead to an increase in the supply-side of private schools in rural areas, just as their numbers are higher in urban or small town areas where fee-paying capacity is higher (Tooley & Dixon, 2006). The evidence on relative cost effectiveness of public and private schools was not strong enough to justify measures to privatize state systems. But where the mushrooming of private systems are allowed they will perhaps provide adequate value for those who wish to enrol. There is evidence, however, from many countries that private systems are often used by the richer groups in order to maintain their elite status (Colclough, 1996). The state responsibility to provide and supply education services was considered to be an orthodox view among economists which was replaced by the neo-liberal group of critics who say that education systems in developing countries should be financed more directly by private households particularly because of the financial burdens facing many governments. Private schooling can be supportive to governments facing financial constraints but under certain circumstances which are more tightly defined than those generally allowed by most neoliberal authors (Colclough, 1996). The private interests throughout the world are putting negative effects upon how state education is perceived.

Non-State Provision of Education

Different partnership arrangements, sponsorships, state independent schools and private sector take over schools form the patchwork of how state education is privatized. Private involvement in state education is seen as the effective way of raising standards and bringing improvements. The state education strategy shift towards increased role of private sector involvement in England or in many other countries, arises the question of whether this represents a shift back to elitism but elitism in a different form (Green, 2005). Non-state provision is changing the education dynamics in many developing countries. Basic education is often regarded in international agreements and national constitutions as being a state responsibility, and increasingly expected to be fee-free for government provision. At the same time, concern for achieving Millennium Development Goals and Education for All by 2015 has led to a focus on the role that non-state providers can play in extending education access and improving its quality (Roze, 2010). On one hand the commentators advocate that the state should play a significant role in providing financial support in the development of such private provision so to extend choice to the poor (Patrinis, Felipe and Juliana, 2009). On the other hand, other commentators argue that the emergence of private providers primarily highlights problems with government schooling which remains the only form of

provision for the poorest who have no choice, and so government financing needs to focus on strengthening its own provision (UNESCO).

The role of aid donors in promoting non-state provision is particularly striking in the fragile states having weak political will and capacity to deliver basic services. The donor engagement in such environments tends to lead to the development of parallel, fragmented systems, which can weaken state authority and make it difficult to restructure a consistent education system when conditions become more favourable (Osaghae). These state and non-state relations are not straightforward and can take many different forms. They are shaped by the type of non-state provider, the activity in which they are engaged and the context in which they are operating. Despite international advocacy to the role of non-state providers in supporting the move towards EFA and the desire for developing partnerships with government, many of the contributions highlight the lack of clarity in national policy and planning (Rose, 2010).

Conclusion

Education as a public good is considered to be a sole responsibility of the government but when private sector gets involved into the private provision of the public good it transforms into a private commodity. It is easily perceptible that the motives and interests of both private and public sectors are different and often conflicting. The main motive of private sector becomes profit maximization when it comes to service delivery making the citizens their clients. This massive proliferation of private sector gives rise to corporate form as opposed to state. From 13th century the state was above the corporate form to the end of 18th century but from 1970s a corporate form was introduced protected by neo classical theory. In neoclassical theory the state is consistently represented as the inefficient, the partisan and the contrived (Hanlon, 2008; McLean, 2004). This theory maintained a reduced status of the state and its regulatory powers and an increase of the relative power of the corporate form weakening the state's sovereign prerogative. These reforms like Public Private Partnerships also reengineered the state to guarantee the success of private sector. The consequences of these reforms entail "demise of the state" (Veldman, 2013) or state deficit. Non-state provision is, however, increasingly widespread in many developing countries in response to the inaccessibility and poor quality of state provision. Its unplanned expansion has led to proposals for developing 'public – private partnerships'. However such partnerships are inadequately developed in national planning, with potentially adverse consequences for equity (Rose, 2010). There also existed a gap between the rhetoric and practice of educational partnerships in the UK, instead of symmetric and social democratic practices these practices appeared to be facilitating and legitimating the private sector involvement in the delivery of public policies (Cardini, 2006).

This paper opens up new avenues for future researches towards finding the actual performance of the partner schools to figure out anomalies. In order to validate the predictive capacity of this paper it is important to study the difference between the policy rhetoric which promises the efficiency and access to quality education, and the policy implementation or actual outcome at the end of the citizens.

References:

Aggarwal, Y. (2000). Public and private partnership in primary education in India: a study of unrecognized schools in Haryana. National Institute of Educational Planning & Administration .

Alderman, H., Kim, J., & Orazem, P. F. (2003). Design, evaluation, and sustainability of private schools for the poor: the Pakistan urban and rural fellowship school experiments. *Economics of Education Review* , 265–274.

Alderman, H., Orazem, P., & Paterno, E. (2001). School Quality, School Cost, and the Public/Private School Choices of Low-Income Households in Pakistan. *The Journal of Human Resources* , 304-326.

Ali, S. (2008). National policy global imperatives: role of international

agencies in education policy in Pakistan. Paper presented at the British Association for International and Comparative Education (BAICE) Annual Conference. Glasgow, UK.

Ali, S., & Tahir, M. S. (2009). Reforming education in Pakistan-Tracing global links . *Journal of research & reflections in Education* , 1-16.

Anwaruddin, S. (2014). *Educational Neocolonialism and the World Bank: A Rancièrean Reading*.

Bishop, R. (2007). *Philosophy of Social Sciences*.

Broadbent, J., & Laughlin, R. (2003). Public private partnerships: an introduction. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* , 332 - 341.

Caiden, G. E. (1991). *Administrative reform comes of Age*. New York: Ratzolow-Druck.

Cardini, A. (2006). An analysis of the rhetoric and practice of educational partnerships in the UK: an arena of complexities, tensions and power. *Journal of Education Policy* .

Colclough, C. (1996). *Education and the Market: Which Parts of the Neoliberal Solution are Correct?* Elsevier Science Ltd , 589-610, .

Crump, S., & Slee, R. (2005). Robbing public to pay private? Two cases of refinancing education. *Journal of Education Policy* , 243–258.

Curtins, L. A. (2007). *US aid to Pakistan: Countering extremism through education Reforms*. The Heritage Foundation.

Dixon, J., R, D., & Kouzmin, A. (2004). The dilemma of privatized public services: Philosophical frames in understanding failure and managing partnership. *Public Organization Review* , 25-46.

Epstein, S., & Kronstadt, A. (2013). *Pakistan: U.S. Foreign Assistance*. Congressional Research Service.

Farah, I., & Rizvi, S. (2007). *Public-Private Partnerships: Implications for Primary Schooling in Pakistan*. Social Policy Administration.

Farooq, M., Saeed, A., Ahmad, K., Ata, G., Sami. (2018). Making Sense of Electronic Media Regulatory Agencies: A Case of PEMRA. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, XI (3), 437- 456

Farazmand, A. (2007). *Global Administrative Reforms & transformation of governance & public administration* . London: Taylor Francis Group.

Green, C. (2005). *The Privatization of State Education: Public Partners, Private Dealings*. Routledge.

Habib, M. (2013). *Education in Pakistan's Punjab: Outcomes and Interventions* . *The Lahore Journal of Economics* , 21-48.

Hanlon, G. (2008). 'Rethinking corporate social responsibility and the role of the firm – on the denial of politics'. *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hood, C. (1995). The new public management in the 1980s variation on a theme. *Accounting organization & society* , 93-109.

James, S. (2000). Glasgow pushes the privatization of schools and housing. *World Socialist Web Site* , 1-2.

Khan, A. (2011). *PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION: A CASE IN PAKISTAN*. Austin: The University of Texas .

Khan, O. A. (1993). *The impact of foreign aid on economic development, the management of Pakistan's economy*. Karachi: Oxford university press.

Latham, M. (2009). *Public-Private Partnerships in Education*. The Information Portal for global developments in private education.

Leitch, S., & Motion, J. (2003). Public private partnership: consultation, cooperation & collusion. *Journal of Public affairs* , 273-277.

Lenin, V. I. (1916). *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*.

Linder, S. H. (1999). Coming to terms with the public-private partnership: A grammar of multiple. *The American Behavioral Scientist* , 35-51.

McLean, J. (2004). Transnational corporation in history. *Indiana Law Journal* , 363–377.

Mujahid, M. (2011). *Situational analysis of the education sector* . Islamabad: UNESCO, Pak.

(2003). *National Plan of Action on Education for All Pakistan (2001-2015)*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education in collaboration with UNESCO.

Nguyen, P.-M., Elliott, J., Terlouw, C., & Pilot, A. (2010). Neocolonialism in education: Cooperative Learning in an Asian Context. *Durham Research Online* , 1-23.

Nkrumah, K. (1967). *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. S & S Quarterly Inc. , 78-81.

Osaghae, E. (2007). *Fragile states. Development in Practice* , 691–9.

Patrinos, H., Felipe, B.-O., & Juliana, G. (2009). *The Role and Impact of public private partnerships in education*. Washington Dc: The World Bank.

Pongsiri, N. (2002). Regulation and public-private partnerships. *International Journal of Public sector management* , 487-495.

Probe, T. (1999). *Public report on basic education in India* . Oxford: Oxford university press.

Rehman, S., Sami, A., Haroon, A., & Irfan, A. (2019). Impact of Sustainable Leadership Practices on Public Sector Organization: A systematic



- Review of Past Decade. *Journal of Public Value and Administration Insights*, 2(3), 1-5.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing Education Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Rosenau, P. V. (1999). Introduction: The strengths and weaknesses of public-private policy. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 10-34.
- Roze, P. (2010). Achieving Education for All through public private partnerships in education. *Development in practice*, 473-483.
- Saeed, A. (2013). Governance System of Pakistan: Continuation of Colonial Policies. *Journal of political studies*, 199-218.
- Saeed, A., Sajid, H., Ata, G., Rathore, K., Sami, A. (2018). Making Sense of Current Power Policies in Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, XI (3), 457- 474
- Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization : A critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Selsky, J., & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-Sector partnership to address social issues: challenges to theory & practice. *Journal of management*, 849-873.
- Silova, I. (2004). Adopting the language of the new allies. The global politics of educational borrowing and lending, 75-87.
- Sokefeld, M. (2005). From colonialism to post colonialism: Changing modes of domination in the northern areas of pakistan. *The journal of Asian studies*, 939-973.
- Sosale, S. (2000). Trends in Private Sector Development in World Bank Education Projects. *Policy Research Working papers*, 1-55.
- Spring, J. (2008). *Globalization of education: an introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Tooley, J., & Dixon, P. (2006). De facto' privatisation of education and the poor: implications of a study from sub-Saharan Africa and India. *A Journal of Comparative and international education*, 443-462.
- Trevelyan, C. (1838). *On the education of the people of India*. PATERNOSTER-ROW.
- UNESCO. (2009). *Education for All Global Monitoring Report. Overcoming Inequality: Why Governance Matters.*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- USAID. (2010, May 16). *usaid From the American People*. Retrieved January 4, 2014, from <http://www.usaid.gov/>: <http://www.usaid.gov/news-information/congressional-testimony/>
- Veldman, J. (2013). Politics of the Corporation. *British Journal of Management*, 18-30.
- Watkins, K. (2004). Private education and "education for all"—or how not to construct an evidence-based argument. *Economic Affairs*, 8-11.
- WorldBank. (1997). *The state in a changing world*. World Development Report.