Globalisation, Societies and Education

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cgse20

Education reforms and democracy in Pakistan: the problem of privatisation

Gul Muhammad Rind & Kathleen Knight Abowitz

To cite this article: Gul Muhammad Rind & Kathleen Knight Abowitz (2022): Education reforms and democracy in Pakistan: the problem of privatisation, Globalisation, Societies and Education, DOI: 10.1080/14767724.2022.2142934

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2142934

Published online: 08 Nov 2022.

GLOBALISATION, SOCIETIES AND EDUCATION
https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2142934

Education reforms and democracy in Pakistan: the problem of privatisation

Gul Muhammad Rind[a] and Kathleen Knight Abowitz[b]

[a]Department of Education, Sukkur IBA University, Sindh, Pakistan; [b]Department of Educational Leadership, Miami University, Oxford, OH, USA

ABSTRACT

In many nations around the globe, including Pakistan, education is losing ground as a public good to become another market-based commodity as the state shrinks its responsibility to schooling. This presents challenges to democratic futures, and particularly for young democratic states such as Pakistan. The government of Pakistan is pouring a significant amount of money into the private provision of education, encouraged by the policies and investments of international donor-partners such as the World Bank and Asian Development Bank. These changes in educational provision represent the impacts of neoliberalism and globalisation on Pakistani policymaking and the growing influence of the conceptualisation of education as a private commodity. To address these trends, we offer a normative philosophical framework for a conception of education as a critical public good in Pakistan, drawing on Islamic tradition, public good theory, human rights, and common good global education theories.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 18 January 2022
Accepted 29 October 2022

KEYWORDS
Globalisation; education reforms; privatisation; democracy; Pakistan

Introduction

Education privatisation is a phenomenon that is expanding internationally (Verger, Fontdevila, and Zancajo 2016). The rising pattern of market forces in education and the shift of government spending through private provision undermines the concept of education as a public good. In Pakistan until the 1970s, schooling was primarily provided through the public mode by the state. While a few elite private schools, Madrasas (Islamic schools) and missionary schools existed, which constituted only 3% of total schooling, a large majority of students were receiving common education from government schools (Institute of Social & Policy Sciences [I-SAPS] 2010). However, in the 1980s, government officials began to shift their approach, easing education regulations and policies, allowing private sectors to invest in education and opening more private schools and colleges (I-SAPS 2010). From the 1990s onward, private schools mushroomed, not only in big urban areas but also in underdeveloped rural regions. These shifts conformed to the growing assumptions in this time period among global educational policy-makers that private provision of education would allow Pakistan to expand its overall literacy rate and educational attainment more rapidly than the public provision of education. Currently, the government of Pakistan is pouring a significant amount of money into the private provision of education, encouraged by the policies and investments of international donor-partners such as the World Bank (WB) and Asian Development Bank (ADB). These changes in educational provision represent the impacts of neoliberalism and globalisation on Pakistani policymaking, and the growing influence of the conceptualisation of

CONTACT Gul Muhammad Rind gulrind@iba-suk.edu.pk Department of Education, Sukkur IBA University, Sindh, Pakistan

education as a private commodity, the quality and provision of which is directly based on a family's purchasing power.

The evolution of education policy signifies the diminution of education as a public good in Pakistani society. According to Lewin (2015), education is a public good in the sense that its benefits extend to all. As a public good, many argue that it should be 'available free at the point of service delivery' (95) asserting a clear responsibility for provision by the state for a quality education system for all students, regardless of social class, region, or family background. In this regard, Pakistan has major challenges, as we will show here, in its present pursuit of education goals increasingly through market-based policies.

The 18th Amendment to the Pakistan Constitution, approved in 2010, states that 'the State shall provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age of five to sixteen years.' This commitment is reflected in the National Education Policy (NEP) 2009, Government of Pakistan [GoP 2009], in response to the challenges of fulfilling this promise in Pakistan's highly stratified society:

> Our education system must provide quality education to our children and youth to enable them to realise their individual potential and contribute to the development of society and nation, creating a sense of Pakistani nationhood, the concepts of tolerance, social justice, democracy, their regional and local culture and history based on the basic ideology enunciated in the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. (17)

Within this vision, several aims and values stand out. The first is the idea of creating a sense of Pakistani nationhood while maintaining regional and local cultures; critical to this balance is the second aim, that of tolerance for cultural differences and diverse perspectives. The third aim is captured in the complex concept of social justice, naming ongoing issues in Pakistan of social hierarchies and poor educational opportunities for underprivileged, poor and rural students, as well as girls and students with disabilities. These three goals are identified in multiple educational documents (including NEP 2009 and 2017) as goals for the nation. Yet as we will argue, these aims are compromised by Pakistan's increasing use of privatisation in education policymaking.

This paper will discuss the implications of market-based reforms in education, following a brief history of education in Pakistan. We then offer a normative theoretical framework for a conception of education as an essential public good, drawing on interpretations of Islamic tradition, public good theory, human rights, and common good global education discourses. We use this framework to show the normative resources for a Pakistani conceptualisation of education as a public good, one which is central to the educational goals of wider social justice and realisation of democratic society. In the final section, we summarise three harms that educational privatisation causes for education as common good.

A brief history of education in Pakistan

Pakistan gained independence from the British Empire in 1947 after the partition of India.

The country faced immediate, enormous challenges of resource shortages and proportionally received fewer resources from the divisible pool of united India (Bengali 1999). Its geographic and strategic position in the region were factors in Pakistan's emergence as a security state, which spent too little on social welfare and development. The newly liberated country, having an enormous uneducated population, faced a massive challenge to its survival. At that time, universal primary education was the main objective, and to this end considerable resources were allocated for developing infrastructure (Bengali 1999). Despite such steps, required objectives of education have not been achieved due to political instability, and the treatment of education as a step child, in terms of national priorities (Ahmad et al. 2014).

According to Government of Pakistan data (Pakistan Education Statistics 2016-17 2018), approximately 22.84 million children are out of school and, as per the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER-Pakistan 2019) those who go to school often do not achieve basic learning levels. The current literacy rate (10 years and above) is just below 60% (Pakistan Social & Living Standard

Measurement Survey 2017-18), and there are great disparities in access and outcomes between urban and rural areas, as well as between genders (Bengali 1999). Table 1 shows the literacy rate disparity based on rural vs. urban and gender.

Pakistani power brokers (including leaders in civil, military, political and business sectors) have developed, over time, the present system of education which consists of five distinct types: public schools, Madrasas, elite private schools, army public schools, and low fee private schools (LFPS). Currently a large number of students are enrolled in public schools, but the share of private sector enrolment is increasing, mainly in LFPS. The expansion of the private sector is a direct result of privatisation policies in education and government, on the grounds that these policies improve the public sectors' capacity and efficiency, as we examine in more detail below. According to Pakistan Education Statistics 2017–2018 (GoP 2021), 56% of students enrolled are in the public sector and 44% are in the private sector including LFPS, with less than 1% of the total enrolled in either Madrasas schools or the small number of elite private schools (Andrabi et al. 2006). While it has been acknowledged by the Ministry of Education, among others, that such parallel education systems violate the uniformity of the national education system (Fancy and Razaq 2017; GoP 2009), there is no sign that officials will alter the present direction, as low-fee private schools continue to grow in number, and government spending on public education has not been increased.

In the last decades, Pakistan has utilised various initiatives to respond to the serious challenges in education. Pakistan has committed to UNESCO's *Education for All* (EFA) movement goals. The objective of the policy was to meet the learning needs of all children by 2030 as per revised sustainable development goals (GoP 2017). In 2010, Pakistan added article 25A, or the 'Right to Education,' to its constitution, which declares that the state is responsible for providing free and compulsory education to every child from age 4–16. The Right to Education advocacy campaign followed the passage of Article 25A, seeking to urge the government, including provincial legislative bodies, to create a system of free and compulsory education for all children in the country (Right to Education Pakistan 2018). These are all laudable efforts and steps towards a strong education system, yet as Bizenjo (2020) notes, 'the actions on ground do not corroborate with the promises, despite persistent renewal of government commitments' (2). Despite being a mainstay of the National Action Plan to improve education quality through increased spending, there has been little improvement. Public education expenditures were 2.3% of GDP in 2018–2019, and 2.4% in 2017–2018 (Amin 2020), keeping Pakistan ranked 154 out of 189 countries in the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Index ranking (UNDP 2020). With government spending on public education stagnant, private education has expanded. 'The last few decades are considered a golden period for private sector education entrepreneurs which embarks the structural shift in the educational paradigm of Pakistan. Since 1999–2009, the number of private schools have multiplied three-fold' (Bizenjo 2020, 2).

While private schools are filling gaps in the provision of education in Pakistan, expansion of privatisation at the expense of a strong, secure public education sector is harming Pakistan's future as a democratic republic. We argue that the country's use of the education market to grow its infrastructure is a short-term savings at a long-term cost: without a strong public education system, educational aims of national unity, tolerance of human diversity and social justice related to educational equity will all be elusive.

Table 1. Literacy rate in Pakistan based on Urban vs. Rural and Gender.

	Literacy Rate (10 years and above in %)			Out of School Children (5-16 years in %)		
Regions	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Urban	71	60	66	19	22	20
Rural	54	32	42	28	43	35
Pakistan	61	42	51	25	36	30

Source: Pakistan Social & Living Standards Measurement Survey ([PSLM] 2018–2019 2020) Report.

Globalisation and education privatisation in Pakistan

Societies organised schools long before nation-states developed. As Levin (2019) describes, 'intermingling of public and private dimensions of education has a long history' (5). As nation-states began to create educational systems, private and public dimensions combined in various ways, dependent on context. However, the development of nation-states throughout the last two centuries witnessed the creation of public provision of educational systems. Deemed as critical to the interests of national development, and the building of democratic norms and outcomes in education, these systems made slow yet steady progress towards equity and inclusion goals.

Through Pakistan's early development in the post-war period, there was still widespread agreement that the role of the welfare state was to secure equitable provision of schooling for all citizens. Yet this consensus has been unravelling in the half century since, as privatisation and neoliberalism have powerfully emerged in tandem. Neoliberalism is a political-economic theory 'which proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by the Privatisation of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterised by private property rights, individual liberty, free markets and free trade' (Harvey 2005, 145).

In educational policymaking, neoliberalism has produced two distinct patterns: international cooperation in policy particularly for developing nations, and privatisation around the globe. Globalisation has opened more routes for bilateral cooperation, making possible joint efforts through government as well as the non-governmental level to set international standards and structures in educational policy developments (and, as we will discuss below, are too often dominated by the interests of former colonial powers, shaping the educational futures of formerly colonised nations like Pakistan). Globalisation, under the influence of neoliberal ideology, has also gone hand in glove with privatisation, or the 'the transfer of governmentally (i.e., state) provided resources and/or services to the private sector' (Satz 2018, 1). The private sector has become increasingly powerful and prevalent in setting education agendas across the Global North and South, often eclipsing the power of state and national actors (Adamson, Astrand, and Darling-Hammond 2016).

Today in Pakistan and elsewhere, public interests in education and other sectors are slowly being eclipsed (Carnoy 2016; Levin 1987). Private interests include the enhancement of individual growth as well as economic competitiveness. Privatisation and deregulation enable global industries and international organisations (IOs) to collaborate without government restriction or guidelines to make decisions; the dominance of private interests has powerfully shaped educational policy to serve a country's economic 'global competitiveness' (Carnoy 2016, 29). Globalisation has shifted the orientation of education ministries from promoting democratic values and shared social interests, to championing the neoliberal market system (Robertson and Verger 2012).

In Pakistan, over the last three decades we see expansion of private and hybrid schooling models in particular. According to education statistics for 2017–2018, the public sector institution grew only 6% from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017. However, 'Other Public institutions,' such as public- private partnerships, show growth of nearly 200% in the same period. We also see expansion in private sector institutions, including elite private schools, LFPS, Madrasas and philanthropist-sponsored private schools; these collectively show 50% growth from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017. Details are given in Table 2.

The growth of privatisation in Pakistan and other developing nations can be traced countries' own by default polices in the form of LFPS along with the role of IOs (such as World Bank) and

Table 2. Number of educational institutions by sector 2013–2014 to 2016–2017.

Year	2013–2014	2014–2015	2015–2016	2016–2017
Public	174,142	175,196	185,740	183,177
Other Public	4,882	5,100	5,325	13,892
Private	81,544	87,659	112,381	122,119

Source: Adapted from Pakistan Education Statistics 2017–2018, AEPAM, Pakistan.

development agencies, part of the global education superstructure (Hameed-ur-Rehman and Sewani 2013; Verger, Fontdevila, and Zancajo 2016; Spring 2009), which includes philanthropic donors and corporate investors as well. These institutions, described in the next section, contribute to the dominance of privatisation policies that we see in Pakistan and other countries.

The role of international organisations and development agencies

IOs such as the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) are key drivers of private sector participation in education (Ball and Youdell 2007). In developing countries in particular, IOs are a strong instrument for providing loans (and debt) and for motivating structural reforms in the social sector. Indeed, the Pakistan Ministry of Education acknowledges the generous support of IOs, stating that their programme focus is limited while also admitting that their involvement may be counterproductive for achieving long-term sustainable development: 'getting optimum value from these investments has become a challenge in the absence of institutionalised mechanisms for donor coordination' (GoP 2009, 13). Pakistan is also one of the world's major recipients of international donor funding; the funding from WB, ADB and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) contributed almost 18% of total federal budget in 2001 (Burki and Hathaway 2005; Malik and Naveed 2012). Beyond the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (both of which finance the government to promote the private sector), bilateral partner agencies such as USAID and UK Department for International Development (DFID) also provide support in financing as well as implementing educational initiatives. According to UNESCO (2020), Pakistan receives 32% of DFID's total budget and 4% of USAID's total budget in basic education. In such a situation the role of the private sector and non-state actors are powerful in shaping the educational aims of the country.

The World Bank, in collaboration with a number of other international actors including the UN, promotes individual knowledge models which are focused on economic growth as primary aims of education (Klees, Samoff, and Stromquist 2012). While economic productivity is an important goal of education, the narrow focus on this aim, particularly on the part of external partners, has the effect of weakening and erasing local knowledge, languages and cultural traditions that are of central importance to cultural continuity (Spring 2009; Shahjahan 2016).

With Pakistan's heavy reliance on foreign donations and loans for funding their education sectors, the power imbalances of this model are obvious (Ron Balsera, Klees, and Archer 2018). These organisations shape the market-driven educational 'solutions' provided to the weaker nations of the Global South (Giroux and Giroux 2006), setting up an educational infrastructure that is corrosive to the achievement of a robust and representative public sector in nations like Pakistan. This infrastructure has also produced a diverse array of hybrid models for privatisation, including public-private partnerships which currently enjoy popularity among policymakers.

The rise of low-fees private schools (LFPS)

Several internal and external factors cause the mushrooming of private schooling in Pakistan. The government's inability to meet increasing demands for schools, due to low state spending on education, was an initial factor (Archer and Muntasim 2022). More recently, the World Bank and DFID later supported the government in developing the framework of scaling up LFPS as an efficient way (low-cost) to achieve the goals of Education for All (Andrabi, Das, and Khwaja 2008; Barber 2013).

Beyond the level of provision is the role of parental choice of schools, where choices are available. Rashid and Muzaffar (2015) attribute the growth of private schools due, in part, to the available choices to the middle-class parents, who are increasingly selecting private schools. In addition, Andrabi, Das, and Khwaja (2008) noted that the cost of attending LFPS is low in Pakistan, and even lower-middle class parents feel the value of private schools in better outcomes. We, however, argue that these LFPS are also costly, and inaccessible to the lowest quintile of the population.

Srivastava (2016) noted that LFPS by design are inequitable and less inclusive as their main motive is to earn profit even from the poor. Other than tuition, these schools also include hidden costs, including books, bags, shoes, and uniforms. The myth of better quality in private schools is not supported by the evidence. The better quality of students' achievement in the private education sector is largely due to the socio-economic advantages of their families. Using the ASER Pakistan 2012 and 2019 data, research by Amjad and MacLeod (2014) as well as Rind (2022) revealed that the majority of the parents who have better socio-economic positions send their children to private schools. The higher academic achievement of students from private schools also diminished when other socio-economic factors (e.g., income, parents' education, availabilities of resources, and private tuitions) are controlled. In addition, these LFPS encroach on the dignity and professionalism of the teachers by paying less than market wages while hiring low-qualified teachers based on contracts. These practices reduce the scope of education as a commodity to be offered, prioritising lower-costs for middle class families, and system efficiency, above access and quality for all students, including the poor and very poor (Srivastava 2016; Rind 2022).

Public-Private partnerships

At the broadest level, PPPs are defined as institutional arrangements or mutual contracts between government and private actors to share resources and risks to produce certain products or services (Patrinos, Barrera Osorio, and Guáqueta 2009). PPP advocates in education believe that they provide an innovative structure which can reduce bureaucratic inefficiencies, also can counter the private sector hegemony (Baum et al. 2014; Friedman 1955). Skeptics, by contrast, view PPPs as a borrowed model from industry which, when applied to education, can create problems like enhancing inequality and narrowly define the quality of education through outcome-based learning and evaluate it through, standardisation and testing (Adamson, Astrand, and Darling-Hammond 2016; Steiner-Khamsi and Draxler 2018). Pakistan has endorsed the PPP model for educational provision. Pakistan's National Education Policy 2009 specifically recommended the model of public-private partnerships (PPPs). More recently, the Sindh and the Punjab Provinces of Pakistan have launched one of the world's largest PPP programmes in education. The educational reform projects based on PPPs in Pakistan receive a substantial amount of government grants ($1.7 billion) and also attract external financing from the World Bank and other international organisations (Afridi 2018).

According to Draxler (2013), the strategic use of the word 'partnership' in this model appears disingenuous, as 'it implies shared objectives and values … when 'public private' is added as a qualifier, the whole package seems to make mouths water with the potential of business methods and talents working to assure an ever more perfect public good' (Draxler 2013, 46).

Despite the allure of PPP's and heavy investment in this educational infrastructure, managing these partnerships in the larger interests of the public is quite difficult. Some private actors will pursue self-interest far beyond ethical bounds, manipulating partnership contracts for profit maximisation and at the cost of social and environmental loss. Others will walk away when unforeseen difficulties arise, causing disruptions of all kinds for students and families, with the poorest having the least flexibility to quickly respond to educational disruptions (Draxler 2013; Koning 2018). Draxler (2013) argues that those partnerships are always more costly in terms of resources, particularly human resources, because of efforts to manage, operate and evaluate partnerships; these factors, over time, weaken the arguments for PPPs as cost-saving models. This model also poses a serious threat to equity and social cohesion in two ways: by helping produce an uneven system of schools, while simultaneously diminishing both the authority and responsibility of the state for bringing out high quality educational opportunities for all children, particularly those whose social class, gender, or rural location jeopardizes the provision of these opportunities by private sector options. We expand on these two critiques in a later section. Again, we see evidence of Pakistani education policymakers choosing short-term financial savings for the sacrifice of a longer-term educational and political goals in the country.

PPP schools in Pakistan show mixed results in education access and quality (Amjad and MacLeod 2014; Ansari 2020). Simultaneously these schools create more inequality in academic achievements and also bring negative externalities for existing nearby government schools. As polices of PPPs are largely formulated by donors to Pakistan, the ownership of these donor-driven policies get distorted when applied in context of (e.g., Sindh, Pakistan) which creates challenges at the implementation level (Rind 2022).

This section has summarised the Pakistani educational situation with a focus on changes in recent decades; these changes are characterised by a weak welfare state and the rise of neoliberal, market-based policies. We have sketched the rise of privatisation in Pakistan education and its specific forms. Our next section develops a normative framework for education as critical public good in Pakistan, providing a theoretical grounding for our critiques of privatisation as it impacts democratic structures and futures. This framework demonstrates the strong foundations available for Pakistani educational policy-making oriented towards education as a common good. In the final section of the paper, we show the potential educational and political consequences of educational privatisation for Pakistan's democratic future.

Education as a critical public good for Pakistani democracy

The development of a quality public education system in Pakistan has faced many challenges thus far. Among these are the remnants of a dense bureaucratic colonial administrative structure, a weak civil society, a large and young population and the challenges of democratising and integrating a pluralistic Islamic culture (Weinbaum 1996). The country's economic development challenges have made privatisation policies in education too tempting to resist in the face of neoliberal forces and global education superstructures interfacing with post-colonial countries.

While democratic countries around the world certainly host a mix of public and private sector combinations to create educational systems suited to their population's unique needs, the conception of education as a public good is an essential backbone of a democratic nation-state. Without strong public governance guaranteeing the important shared goals for all students within its borders, the country of Pakistan will fail to meet the goals of social cohesion, tolerance amidst pluralism, and educational equity, set forth in its founding constitutional and educational social contracts with its people.

In this section, we spell out the sources and content of these shared goals, showing how education as a public good can be understood in the context of Pakistan's own cultural resources, and within the global discourses of moral and political responsibility towards equitable educational provision. Three normative ideals of the public good can inform Pakistani educational policy-making moving forward: (1) education as informed by Islamic cultural resources for social justice, (2) education as an agreement between governing state representatives and its people, or citizens; and (3) education as a human right, and a common, global good. These three overlapping philosophical foundations offer a set of principles for policy-making futures.

Education as an Islamic public good

Pakistan was founded as an Islamic republic, and Islamic values are intertwined into the polity's conception of democracy, and culture, including education. The Vision of Education 2030 states that 'The ideology of Islam forms the genesis of the State of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, as mentioned Objectives Resolution in 1949: Wherein the principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance and social justice, as enunciated by Islam, shall be fully observed' (GoP 2009, 31). According to the constitution of Pakistan, 'No law shall be enacted which is repugnant to Islam' (Rahman 1970, 4). Thus, democracy is not associated with secularism, which presents dilemmas and tensions in educational provision in different regions of the country. Equitable and inclusive education for girls and religious minorities are prominent among these tensions (Hussain and Salim 2011;

Purewal and Hashmi 2015). As Weinbaum (1996) notes, 'Much debated in Pakistan as elsewhere is the question of whether Islam poses serious obstacles to realising a democratic state' (650). We consider this question to mark an ongoing, complex negotiation of religious values, traditions and politics emerging out of the evolving, pluralistic Islamic cultures comprising a democratic Pakistani society.

Yet in spite of these tensions, it is important to note some assets of Islamic culture when it comes to equitable education provision. Islamic values, while complex with regards to some issues such as gender or religious minorities, are a potential source of moral and political strength when it comes to access of quality education across lines of wealth, status and privilege. Quranic expressions and life practices of the prophet Muhamad show an aversion toward the accumulation of wealth and place emphasis on distributive justice. The system of *Zakat*, where wealthy people are instructed to pay some portion of their income to state or poor or destitute people, supports this ideal. This system commands that accumulated money should be spent on the welfare of the state, for public goods such as education, health and other social security provisions (Heyneman 2004; F. Rahman 1970). In addition to the principle of *Zakat,* Ahmad and Hassan (2000) argue that in the Islamic economic system justice gets priority over efficiency, where distributive justice is based on (1) guarantee of fulfillment of basic needs all (2) equity in personal income, and (3) the elimination of extreme inequality.

While the resources for social justice in educational provision might be present in Islamic principles or doctrine, blending secular democracy with Islamic religious, cultural, and familial traditions is a part of Pakistan's evolving story as a nation-state. Quoting legal theorist Na'im (2008) and Dallmayr (2010) argues that motivations of ordinary citizens which are 'partly influenced by their religious beliefs and cultural conditions' must be suffused with 'their appreciation of and commitment to the values of constitutionalism and human rights, including the rights of religious minorities and nonbelievers' (An-Naím 2008, 4–6; in Dallmayr 2010, 163). As Rizvi (2005) argues, those who hold a synchretistic view (rather than a singular or 'authentic' view) of the Islamic tradition are strongly informing iterations of Islam committed to democracy and justice. Meanings of social justice in Islamic democratic nations are pluralistic and evolving. These traditions in Islam can serve to challenge the structural power and social stratification based on wealth and power, too often reproduced in the inadequate provision of quality public education in rural and poor areas. Islamic practices and traditions can — with leaders who embrace commitments to constitutionalism and human rights — be resources for strengthening public education for all, as well as helping provide a basis for national unity as social stratification is reduced, over time.

A public, civic good

> Public education has always had an important social, civic and political function; it is related to national identity, the creation of a sense of shared destiny and the shaping of citizenship. (UNESCO 2015, 65)

As the development of national education systems around the world indicates, the provision of education by the state has historically been viewed as a responsibility to the good of its citizens and to instrumental goals such as political stability, individual flourishing, and economic vitality of individuals and society.

While public good theory comes out of market economics (UNESCO 2015) it has been used by many policy theorists to flesh out arguments for the state provision of goods. In the field of public economics, public goods are characterised by non-excludability and non-rivalry in their consumption (Samuelson 1954). Goods are non-excludable when an individual person's consumption of it cannot be practically excluded or prohibited. Goods are non-rivalrous if someone else's consumption of the good does not diminish its benefits to me. Streetlights are a perfect example of a public good. A particular person cannot be excluded from enjoying the security of a well-lit street, nor does one person's enjoyment of those lights diminish another person's full experience of their benefits

(Deneulin and Townsend 2007). But beyond streetlights, there are many mixed or imperfect public goods, and one of these is education, which serves a blend of public and private functions and interests. Education is 'consumed' by individuals and individuals *can* be excluded from its provision, as government schools the world over have done to minoritised groups of various types for many years. But the benefits of one person's education benefit others in the society; your ability to live peacefully with your diverse neighbours, to work with others to start a business and employ people in your community, or to develop a youth sports programme for kids in your city are all potential outcomes of an education which has public and civic aims and purposes.

To say that education is a mixed public good is not to say that governments can simply opt in or out of providing education for all. While public goods do not have to be provided by governments, and indeed there are public goods which are optimally provided by non-governmental entities, the provision of high quality education must be understood as a distinct responsibility of political leaders (Harel 2018). The provision of education is so critical to the development and reproduction of a democratic society that it is understood to be in the fundamental commission, or duty, of government.

> Which institutions have a 'commission' to pursue public goals, and why is this commission so important? The answer to these questions is that public officials have commission, and that commission is important because decisions made by public officials are decisions that are made in our name—in the name of the political community. (Harel 2018, 6)

Education goods are deemed so critical to social and individual flourishing in democratic countries that they must be systematically guaranteed by political leaders — who are representatives of citizens executing an important political responsibility — and not left to nonaccountable agents of private or semi-private entities (Harel 2018, 2). The concept of education as a public good signals 'commitment to educational provision in the public interest to enhance social development, in contrast to a limited focus on individual private benefits' (Locatelli and Christie 2019, 26–27). Education produces positive externalities beyond individual benefit, including social cohesion, equality, reduced violence, greater stability and increased economic competitiveness. As Locatelli and Christie (2019) argues, education provision thus must be adopted as a principle of governance, which suggests

> the need to strengthen the functions and role of the State in a context characterised by the growing involvement of non-state actors in educational policy and provision. This can be related to the need to make education non-excludable and non-rivalrous, according to the very characteristics of public goods in the strict economic sense. Given its intrinsic value, [quality] education should be available to all. This is strictly associated to the need to reinforce the responsibility of public authorities in respecting and fulfilling this principle, which requires them to ensure public funds and provision. (27)

A national system of accessible, well-funded schools, accessible to all, is ultimately and finally the responsibility of government. Neoliberal policies cannot erase these responsibilities, but they can unfortunately incentivise government in 'shedding' them to private actors (Rizvi 2016, 6) whose interests in the development of education as a domestic public good is always inherently compromised, no matter how well-intentioned.

A human right and a common good

There are powerful global resources for conceiving of education as a common good. Article 26 of the 1948 United Nations Declaration of Human Rights states that 'everyone has a right to an education' (United Nations 1948). UNESCO and the UN Millennium Development Goals (2015) all work towards creation and ongoing assessment of aims for high quality and equitable provision of primary education, rooted in the normative foundation of human rights.

Yet the individualist notion of rights, while an essential idea in global education discourses, has proven too limited to contain the theorising of educational provision. Two concepts — global

public goods, and common goods — have more recently begun to shape normative notions of educational provision. Global public goods (Kaul, Grunberg, and Stern 1999) are goods which are experienced by more than one group of countries, benefitting a broad spectrum of the population across those countries and which do not discriminate across those populations. Included in the global goods typology are natural global commons (ozone layer, for example); human made global commons (scientific knowledge, cultural heritage); and global policy outcomes (health, as the COVID pandemic has demonstrated): 'global public goods are goods whose characteristics are such that their provision cannot be left to market mechanisms (unlike private goods) or national government action (unlike domestic public goods)' (Deneulin and Townsend 2007, 22).

Yet the conception of global public goods too suffers an individualistic perspective in the sense that these goods are viewed as instrumental to individual human flourishing, whether that be in the realm of knowledge, health, or peace. Education is an important instrument for individuals, governments, economies and cultural traditions to flourish, yet that instrumental benefit captures only part of what makes education an essential and shared good for human communities.

Education is the kind of good that 'defies valuation as only instrumentally beneficial for individuals' (Deneulin and Townsend 2007, 24). Education creates relationships, shared values, normative aims and opportunities for shared civic work; education generates beauty, new knowledges and sustains indigenous and local knowledges, as well. Education is, in this sense, a 'common good, … constituted by goods that humans share intrinsically in common and that they communicate to each other, such as values, civic virtues and a sense of justice' (Deneulin and Townsend 2007, 24). Hollenbach (2002) offers a definition of 'the good realised in the mutual relationships in and through which human beings achieve their well-being' (18). UNESCO's statement on education as a global common good centres sustainable development as a key starting point for conceiving of how education can create development that is environmentally and economically sustainable as well as socially just (2015).

The concept of common goods works in tandem with that of public goods to help re-envision the structures needed to provide education in a diverse, young democracy such as Pakistan. As Locatelli (2019) argues:

> considering education as a common good may provide the elements on which to build alternative and more inclusive approaches to schooling in order to counter merely economic and utilitarian solutions which may contribute to the spreading of inequalities worldwide. It is about responding to the failures of governments to deliver quality education not by relying on market-based approaches to schooling or returning to the ways of functioning of highly centralised bureaucratic states, but by envisaging new and innovative public institutions that can improve quality and efficiency thanks to the empowerment of and the greater cooperation among the forces present in society. (128)

Education as a common good helps us understand the incomplete vision of shared social goods in the present model of Pakistani educational reform driven by privatisation and neoliberal agendas. Education has value for persons and communities as a medium for individual flourishing, an achievement of cultural inheritance, and a communal creation. Education's benefits to Pakistani communities cannot be measured by simple tabulations of the number of jobs added to the economy, or as measured by the output on Pakistani students in international standardised tests.

This section has focused on the three normative resources that can contribute to a Pakistani conception of education as a common good. The first is that of Islamic values of education, in particular those focused on social justice as it pertains to equity of opportunities provided to rich and poor, urban and rural. The second is that of the state's commitment to a responsibility for provision of an educational system for its citizens, the voters, in whose name an education system should serve and produce benefit. A political community, such as a state, is responsible for ensuring the complete funding and executing a shared, high quality system of education open and available to all. The third resource is international and transnational; the normative ideas that education is both an individual human right and a global common good. As such, the normative vision for education as an Islamic, public and common good can be built out of this integrated vision, using the strengths of all

three domains to build a public education system that provides high quality education to all. In our last section, we connect the dots between this vision and the present trajectory of global educational privatisation in failing to achieve it.

Privatisation's harms to Pakistan's democratic futures

Every society must chart its own course, and a relatively new democracy like Pakistan — with its significant educational challenges as well as rich potential resources — is no different. Pakistan has evolved as a democratic nation at the same time that the global consensus of the state's primary role as provider of quality educational opportunity has been unravelling. As a result, the percentage of growth in the private education sector is outpacing the public, representing what we view as a dangerous trend for the vitality of Pakistani democracy. In this concluding section, we examine three impacts of privatisation on education as an Islamic, public and global common good in Pakistan. This examination underscores how privatisation hampers the very goals that key Pakistani education documents of the last thirty years articulate: education for creating a sense of nationhood, education to assist in the development of tolerance and acceptance of cultural, linguistic and other forms of difference; and education which achieves greater social justice in educational access and outcomes across gaps of rich and poor, urban and rural, boys and girls.

Privatisation increases individualist education goals, values and curriculum

> Market considerations often lead to the development of a different conception of curriculum, teaching and learning than those based on the notion of education as a public good. When education is commodified, it inevitably serves personal interests ahead of those of communities at large. (Rizvi 2016, 8)

Education privatisation rhetoric is often circulated in countries through uses of metaphors emphasising education as a commodity that is consumable at the family and individual level. If education is a consumable good, like buying breakfast cereal or a car, then obviously we ought to free up markets to benefit the individual consumer. Likewise, if education is a consumable good benefitting (primarily) the individual student, or that student's family, then education should, it follows, be shaped to satisfy their private interests. If education is a commodity and only a commodity, then we can expect education to become a more individually-imagined endeavor and increasingly focused on values of competition and economic achievement rather than values such as social cooperation, community enrichment and social equality. Normative frameworks for education as a common good, sketched above, help us to see the nihilistic and profoundly incomplete conceptions of education when framed as a commodity in this way.

Privatisation reduces commonality

> One of the key concerns about privatising education is the extent to which it threatens to diminish a needed commonality; this commonality is important for equality. Where students are segregated on the basis of race and class, it is harder for them to view each other as equals. They are strangers to each other's lives and concerns. (Satz 2018, 6)

Educational researchers have demonstrated how privatisation increases segregation on the basis of social class, ethnicity and race. Privatisation policies in Chile have clearly shown this outcome (Adamson, Astrand, and Darling-Hammond 2016), and various privatisation schemes in U.S. metropolitan regions have had similar results (Lubienski and Lubienski 2014). Researchers have long known that voucher programmes 'skim' the best students and leave lesser wealthy or privileged students in so-called 'failing' and de-funded public school systems (Witte 2000).

Pakistan's goals for its educational system of society and nation, stated in the NEP 2009 include 'creating a sense of Pakistani nationhood, the concepts of tolerance, social justice, democracy, their regional and local culture and history based on the basic ideology enunciated in the Constitution of

the Islamic Republic of Pakistan' (GoP, 17). Students who are in a school system which is largely segregated by social class, ethnicity or race simply will not be able to learn the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for these goals. Without a sense of common educational aims and practices across social sectors, the present social class and urban/rural stratifications seen in the Pakistani system and others will only grow. A market-based system cannot fulfill this sense of commonality that is so central to democratic nation-building. The normative framework for education as a common good directly confronts the individualising and segregationist consequences of privatisation policies by promoting clear values for education as a force for social integration, and the reduction of ethnic and religious polarisation.

Privatisation reduces a sense of shared political responsibility

If citizens do not share meaningful opportunities to learn and grow from a young age in diverse schools that integrate social classes and groups, then it logically follows that these same citizens will struggle to adopt a sense of shared responsibility. 'By acting as a polity—that is, by using public officials to perform certain tasks—citizens become responsible for the decisions made by these officials' (Harel 2018, 13). This sense of shared responsibility is part of the 'social adhesive that binds together members of the polity' (13). In privatisation policies, Harel notes, this adhesive is not present:

> In particular, privatisation downplays the political dimension of responsibility by absolving citizens of their collective responsibility. As already mentioned, this argument does not turn on the psychology of joint activity and its advantages. Rather, the argument turns on political engagement facilitating citizens taking collective responsibility for sovereign action. (13)

Harel's point is that privatisation policies ultimately reduce citizen bonds, and thereby also reduce citizens' sense of responsibility towards one another and the nation at large. In this era of political polarisation in many nations, this outcome of privatisation is profound. Collective responsibility for the education of a society's most powerful shared resource — it's young people — is undermined when privatisation logic dominates any sense of education as a common good in policy-making.

These three outcomes of privatisation are not idiosyncratic; they are results of privatisation policies across sectors and around the world. That said, there are multiple forms of privatisation policies, and multiple ways that nations are experimenting with increasing the participation of private sectors in education, with varied results, including some positive ones.

Yet our focus here is on the particular toxic outcomes created when privatisation in education outpaces and results in a stronger private sector than a public one in educational provision in the context of a young democracy with rich pluralism, challenges of extreme poverty and disparity in educational provision. We have argued that Pakistani's status as an emerging democratic state makes the centrality of a strong, well-funded public education sector essential to its success. We have articulated a normative framing for education as an Islamic, public and common good in the Pakistani context, creating a powerful though complex structure for greater commitment to and investment in a public and common school system in the country. This does not diminish the important role of a private education sector in a country's larger educational structural offerings, but argues for a powerful state mechanism for funding, controlling and guiding educational structures in more indigenous ways, that are built around conceptions of education as a common good that emerge out of Pakistan's resources — culturally, religiously and in the global contexts of the present era.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

Adamson, Frank, Bjorn Astrand, and Linda Darling-Hammond. 2016. *Global Education Reform: How Privatization and Public Investment Influence Education Outcomes*. New York: Routledge.

Afridi, Momina. 2018. "Equity and Quality in an Education Public-Private Partnership: A Study of the World Bank-supported PPP in Punjab, Pakistan." Oxfam Research Reports. OXFAM.

Ahmad, Khaliq, and Arif Hassan. 2000. "Distributive Justice: The Islamic Perspective." *Intellectual Discourse* 8 (2): 159–172.

Ahmad, Iqbal, Kahil Ur Rehman, Asghar Ali, Itbar Khan, and Fazal Akber Khan. 2014. "Critical Analysis of the Problems of Education in Pakistan: Possible Solutions." *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)* 3 (2): 79–84.

Amin, Tamir. 2020. "Percentage of GDP: Public Expenditure on Education Further Declines." *Business Recorder*, June 10, 2020. https://www.brecorder.com/news/1003611

Amjad, Ravish, and Gordon MacLeod. 2014. "Academic Effectiveness of Private, Public and Private–Public Partnership Schools in Pakistan." *International Journal of Educational Development* 37: 22–31.

Andrabi, Tahir, Jishnu Das, and Asim Ijaz Khwaja. 2008. "A Dime a Day: The Possibilities and Limits of Private Schooling in Pakistan." *Comparative Education Review* 3: 329–355.

Andrabi, Tahir, Jishnu Das, Asim Ijaz Khwaja, and Tristan Zajonc. 2006. "Religious School Enrollment in Pakistan: A Look at the Data." *Comparative Education Review* 3: 446–477.

Ansari, Ali H. 2020. "Cream Skimming? Evaluating the Access to Punjab's Public-Private Partnership Programs in Education." *International Journal of Educational Development* 72 (January): Article 102126.

Archer, David, and Tanvir Muntasim. 2022. "Financing SDG 4: Context, Challenges, and Solutions," in Grading Goal Four: Tensions, Threats, and Opportunities in the Sustainable Development Goal on Quality Education, ed. Antonia Wulff (Leiden; Boston: Brill Sense).

ASER-Pakistan. 2019. "2020 Annual Status of Education Report.".

Ball, Stephen J, and Deborah Youdell. 2007. "Hidden Privatisation in Public Education." Education International, 66.

Barber, Michael. 2013. "The good news from Pakistan. 2013." Reform Research Trust 33.

Baum, Donald R., Lara Lewis, Loni Lusk-Stover, and Harry Anthony Patrinos. 2014. "What Matters Most for Engaging the Private Sector in Education: A Framework Paper." Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER), no. 8. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Bengali, Kaiser. 1999. "History of Educational Policy Making and Planning in Pakistan." Sustainable Development Policy Institute, no. 34.

Bizenjo, Sikander. 2020. "Education in Pakistan: Are Low-Cost Private Schools Closing the Gender Gap?." *International Journal of Educational Development* 77: Article 102209. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102209.

Burki, Shahid Javed, and Robert M. Hathaway. 2005. *Education Reform in Pakistan: Building for the Future*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Carnoy, Martin. 2016. "Educational Policies in the Face of Globalization: Whither the Nation State." In *The Handbook of Global Education Policy*, edited by Karen E. Mundy, Andy Green, and Bob Lingard, 27–42. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Dallmayr, Fred. 2010. *The Promise of Democracy: Political Agency and Transformation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Deneulin, Séverine, and Nicholas Townsend. 2007. "Public Goods, Global Public Goods and the Common Good." Edited by P.B. Anand. *International Journal of Social Economics* 34 (1/2): 19–36. doi:10.1108/03068290710723345.

Draxler, Alexandra. 2013. "International PPPs in Education: New Potential or Privatizing Public Goods?" In *Public Private Partnerships in Education: New Actors and Modes of Governance in a Globalizing World*, edited by Susan L. Robertson, Karen E. Mundy, Antoni Verger, and Francine Menashy, 43–62. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Fancy, Haider, and Jamila Razaq. 2017. "Accountability in Education in Pakistan." In *20. Global Education Monitoring Report*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000259549

Friedman, Milton. 1955. "The Role of Government in Education." In *Economics and the Public Interest*, edited by Robert A Solo, 127–134. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Giroux, Henry A., and Susan Searls Giroux. 2006. "Challenging Neoliberalism's New World Order: The Promise of Critical Pedagogy." *Cultural Studies ? Critical Methodologies* 6 (1): 21–32. doi:10.1177/1532708605282810.

Government of Pakistan. 2009. National Education Policy 2009.

Government of Pakistan. 2017. National Education Policy 2017.

Government of Pakistan. 2021. "Pakistan Education Statistics 2017-18. National Education Management Information System." *Academy of Education Planning and Management* 1–142.

Hameed-ur-Rehman, M., and Salima Moosa Sadruddin Sewani. 2013. "Critical Analysis of the Educational Policies of Pakistan." *Dialogue (Pakistan)* 8 (3): 247–260.

Harel, Alon. 2018. "Why Privatization Matters: The Democratic Case Against Privatization." In *Privatization*, edited by Jack Knight, 52–78. New York: New York University Press.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Heyneman, Stephen P. 2004. *Islam and Social Policy*. 1st ed. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
Hollenbach, David. 2002. *The Common Good and Christian Ethics. New Studies in Christian Ethics 22*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hussain, Azar, and Ahmad Salim with Arif Naveed. 2011. *Connecting the Dots: Education and Religious Discrimination in Pakistan: A Study of Public Schools and Madrassas*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. November 2011
Institute of Social & Policy Sciences. 2010. *Private Sector Education in Pakistan: Mapping and Musing*. Institute of Social and Policy Sciences: Islamabad.
Kaul, Inge, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern. 1999. *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Klees, Steven J., Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist. 2012. *World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives. Comparative and International Education : A Diversity of Voices, Volume 14*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Koning, Mireille. 2018. "Public–Private Partnerships in Education Assessed Through the Lens of Human Rights." In *The State, Business and Education: Public-Private Partnerships Revisited*, edited by Gita Steiner-Khamsi, 169–188. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. NORRAG Series on International Education and Development.
Levin, Henry M. 1987. "Education as a Public and Private Good." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 6 (4): 628–641. doi:10.2307/3323518.
Levin, Henry M. 2019. *Privatizing Education: Can the School Marketplace Deliver Freedom of Choice, Efficiency, Equity, and Social Cohesion?*. New York: Routledge.
Lewin, Keith M. 2015. *Educational Access, Equity, and Development: Planning to Make Rights Realities. International Institute for Educational Planning*. Paris: UNESCO.
Locatelli and Christie. 2019. "Reframing Education as a Public and Common Good." Springer International Publishing. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007978-3-030-24801-7
Lubienski, Christopher, and Sarah Theule Lubienski. 2014. *The Public School Advantage: Why Public Schools Outperform Private Schools*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Malik, Rabea, and Arif Naveed. 2012. "Financing Education in Pakistan: The Impact of Public Expenditure and Aid on Educational Outcomes." RECOUP Working Paper 42. Centre for Education and International Development, University of Cambridge.
Naím, Abdullahi Ahmed. 2008. *Islam and the Secular State: Negotiating the Future of Sharía*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Pakistan Education Statistics 2016-17. 2018. National Education Management Information System, Academy of Educational Planning and Management.
'Pakistan Social & Living Standards Measurement Survey (PSLM) 2018-19. 2020. Islamabad: Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, Government of Pakistan.
Patrinos, Harry Anthony, Felipe Barrera Osorio, and Juliana Guáqueta. 2009. *The Role and Impact of Public-Private Partnerships in Education*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
Purewal, Navtej, and Naimatullah Hashmi. 2015. "Between Returns and Respectability: Parental Attitudes Towards Girls' Education in Rural Punjab, Pakistan." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 36 (7): 977–995. doi:10.1080/01425692.2014.883274.
Rahman, Fazlur. 1970. "Islam and Social Justice." *Pakistan Forum* 1: 4–9.
Rashid, Abbas, and Irfan Muzaffar, eds. 2015. *Educational Crisis and Reform: Perspectives from South Asia*. 1st ed. Oxford University Press.
Right to Education Pakistan. 2018. http://rtepakistan.org/about-rte-pakistan/
Rind, Gul Muhammad. 2022. "Evaluating the Role and Impact of Public-Private Partnerships in Education in Achieving the Goal of Equitable Access to Quality Education in the Sindh, Pakistan." Doctoral diss., Miami University.
Rizvi, Fazal. 2005. "Representation of Islam and Education for Justice." In *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*, edited by Cameron McCarthy, Warren Crichlow, Greg Dimitriadis, and Nadine Dolby, 2nd ed., 167–178. New York: Routledge.
Rizvi, Fazal. 2016. "Privatization in Education: Trends and Consequences." In *Education Research and Foresight Series, no.18*, edited by UNESCO, 1–12. Paris: UNESCO.
Robertson, Susan L., and Antoni Verger. 2012. "Governing Education Through Public Private Partnerships." In *Public Private Partnerships in Education: New Actors and Modes of Governance in a Globalizing World*, edited by Robertson Susan, Mundy Karen, and Verger Antoni, 21–42. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
Ron Balsera, Maria, Steven J. Klees, and David Archer. 2018. "Financing Education: Why Should Tax Justice Be Part of the Solution?" *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 48 (1): 147–162. doi:10.1080/03057925.2017.1394743.
Samuelson, Paul A. 1954. "The Pure Theory of Public Expenditure." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 36 (4): 387–389. doi:10.2307/1925895.

Satz, Debra. 2018. "Some (Largely) Ignored Problems with Privatization." In *Privatization*, edited by Jack Knight. *Nomos, LX*. New York: New York University Press.
Shahjahan, Riyad A. 2016. "International Organizations (IOs), Epistemic Tools of Influence, and the Colonial Geopolitics of Knowledge Production in Higher Education Policy." *Journal of Education Policy* 31 (6): 694–710. doi:10.1080/02680939.2016.1206623.
Spring, Joel H. 2009. *Globalization of Education: An Introduction. Sociocultural, Political, and Historical Studies in Education*. New York: Routledge.
Srivastava, Parachi..2016. "Questioning the Global Scaling Up of Low-Fee Private Schooling: The Nexus Between Business, Philanthropy and PPPs." In *World Yearbook of Education 2016: The Global Education Industry*, edited by Antoni Verger, Christopher Lubienski, and Gita Steiner-Khamsi, 248–263. New York: Routledge.
Steiner-Khamsi, Gita, and Alexandra Draxler. 2018. *The State, Business and Education: Public-Private Partnerships Revisited. NORRAG Series on International Education and Development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
UNDP. 2020. "Human Development Index (HDI)." http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi
UNESCO. 2020. "Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education: All Means All." Paris.
UNESCO Publishing. 2015. *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?* Paris: UNESCO.
United Nations. 1948. Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
Verger, Antoni, Clara Fontdevila, and Adrián Zancajo. 2016. *The Privatization of Education: A Political Economy of Global Education Reform. International Perspectives on Education Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Weinbaum, Marvin G. 1996. "Civic Culture and Democracy in Pakistan." *Asian Survey* 36: 639–654.
Witte, John F. 2000. "Education in the New Millenium: Continuity and Change in Public Education." *Stanford Law & Policy Review* 11 (2): 225–234.