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Summary and Argument

A majority of African governments have not officially stated their position on privatization of and in education, yet many of them have education policies whose implementation call for some form of privatization in the management of their education system. As a result, privatization of and in education tend to be hidden. Malawi for instance, does not have clear guidelines as regards to privatization of and in education. Despite this being the case, privatization of and in education in Africa is occurring at a rapid pace. I argue that such privatization is largely influenced by international targets and donors. The paper demonstrates how international targets (Education For All goals and Millennium Development Goals) and global donors (World Bank and International Monetary Fund) are influencing privatization of and in education in Malawi. I evaluated Malawi’s national educational policies, the National Education Sector Plan (NESP) 2008-2017, the Education Sector Implementation Plan (ESIP) 2009-2013, and the Policy Investment Framework (PIF) 2001-2012, and concluded that the policies adopt a framework and recommendations of international targets and donors hence providing a platform for privatization of and in education in Malawi. I argue that through NESP, ESIP and PIF, the government shows support to global policies that calls for privatization of and in education by implementing education policy reform agenda that include decentralization, community support to education programme, reducing inequalities in education, and information sharing. I have further shown the forms of privatization of and in education which Malawi is practicing as a response to international targets and donors. My summation is that national governments have no option but to adopt some form of privatizations as one way of attracting budget support for national development programmes. In the summation, the study is also looking at the implications of privatization on the post 2015 agenda. Is privatization contributing to the attainment of the EFA goals and MDGs? Are we going to achieve universal primary education and gender equity through privatization?
Section 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This section provides an insight on the flow of arguments and direction of the paper. It is thus describing how the paper has been arranged. It also explains the methodology used to come up with the arguments and conclusions made by the paper.

1.1 Introduction

Privatization is one of the hottest issues currently being debated in the education sector\(^2\). Around the world, forms of privatization are being introduced into public education system. Many of the changes are a result of deliberate policy changes under the banner of “educational reform” and their impact can be far reaching, for the education of students, for equity, for the condition of teachers, and other educational personnel (Ball and Youdell 2007; Levin and Belfield 2002; Tooley and Dixon 2006). Other changes may be introduced unannounced: changes in the way schools are run which may be presented as “keeping up with the time” but in reality reflecting an increasingly market based, competitive and consumerist orientation in our societies (Ball and Youdell 2007:3; Osokoya 2007). In both cases, the trend towards privatization of public education is hidden. It is camouflaged by the language of “educational reforms” or introduced stealthily as “modernization” (Ball and Youdell 2007:3).

Though privatization of and in education remains hidden in several parts of the world\(^3\), it is fast occurring around the world including Africa\(^4\). Many governments worldwide have introduced various forms of privatization into public education and move to privatize sections of public education (Ball and Youdell 2007:8). Non-state Provision (NSP) of education is being delivered by various stakeholders including Faith Based Organizations (FBOs), Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), and private providers, and it is taking various forms including Public Private Partnership (PPPs) in education, New Public Management (NPM), private tutoring, community schools, for profit schools, and low fee private schools amongst others\(^5\).

\(^2\) There has been increased research on privatization of and in education around the world, studies include those done by Tooley and Dixon (2006); Ball and Youdell (2007 and 2008); Osokuya (2007); www.peri.org

\(^3\) Privatization tendencies often remain hidden behind the talk of choice, accountability, effectiveness, and the nuances or significances are missed by a media and public that is either inattentive to the implications of “for-profit” activity or competition between state providers in mainstream public education or is now wholly used to these practices (Ball and Youdell 2008:72).

\(^4\) See Osokoya (2007); Ball and Youdell (2007 and 2008); PERI at www.peri.org

\(^5\) See Levin and Belfield (2002); Ball and Youdell (2007); Tooley and Dixon (2006); Grey Capital Matters (2012) for detailed discussion on forms of privatization in and of education.
In this paper, I agree with the argument that privatization of and in education is occurring at rapid pace in Africa, and Malawi in particular. My argument is that it is being influenced by international targets and global actors/donors on education that includes Education for All, Millennium Development Goals, the World Bank, and International Monetary Fund (IMF). I have therefore focused on showing how these international targets and donors influence privatization of and in education. This has been done by analyzing national education policies in Malawi (NESP, ESIP, and PIF) for the purpose of demonstrating how they have adopted the framework and goals of the international targets and donors which call for some form of privatization in the education sector. However, I have also gone further showing the structures which privatization of and in education has taken, and how those forms are being practiced in Africa and Malawi in particular. The question as to whether privatization influences increased quality, choice, competition, efficiency, and effectiveness in the management and delivery of both private and public education is a subject for further research. My other interest however, was analyzing the implications of privatization of and in education on the post 2015 agenda. Is privatization contributing to the attainment of the EFA goals and MDGs? Are we going to achieve universal primary education and gender equity through privatization?

This paper has been divided into four sections. Section 1 constitutes the introduction and the methodology, which has presented key arguments of the study and how the study was conducted. Section 2 looks at the approaches and theories in the study of privatization in and of education. This section has provided concepts, forms and approaches, and perspectives that this paper has adopted in analyzing its argument. The section has also presented international targets, and an analysis of donors (IMF and World Bank) programmes on education. The purpose was to identify how their programme and goals influence privatization of and in education. This has been done particularly in section 3, where the study has demonstrated how international targets and donors influence the privatization of and in education in Africa, and Malawi in particular. Section 3; thus provides a discussion on the structures and practice of privatization of education in Africa, vis-à-vis Malawi. The section provides a detailed analysis on national education policies in Malawi, and how the policies adopt the framework and structure of the international targets and donors on education. Finally is Section 4, which is the conclusion of the study. In this section the paper has provided summary of the study, and implications of privatization on educational goals in relation to the post 2015 agenda.

1.2 Methodology

This study takes a qualitative approach. Literature review was the major source of data and the data was analyzed through content analysis. Thus concentration was on themes and the research question. Through desk research, international policies on
education such as Education for All and Millennium Development Goals were evaluated against Malawi’s national policies, particularly National Education Sector Plan; NESP (2008-2017), and Education Sector Implementation Plan; ESIP (2009-2013), and Policy Investment Framework; PIF (2001-2012). These policies were targeted because they are the current policies guiding the management of education in Malawi. The purpose was to identify ways how international policies are influencing privatizations of and in education. Publish and unpublished literature was consulted in order to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework/approach for analyzing arguments. In addition, global actors/donors particularly IMF and World Bank programmes on education were also analyzed in order to assess how they influence privatization of and in education in Africa, and Malawi in particular.
Section 2

CONCEPTS AND APPROACHES IN PRIVATIZATION OF AND IN EDUCATION

In this section I have provided some definitions and approaches in the study of privatization of and in education. These definitions and approaches have been adopted from various sources in order to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework/approach that will assist in analyzing the argument of this paper. The section has also presented international targets on education which are very crucial to this study, particularly in section 3, where the study has demonstrated how the defined forms, concepts and the international targets and donors influence the privatization of education in Africa, and Malawi in particular.

2.1 Defining privatization of and in education: forms and perspectives

Privatization is the transferring of activities, assets, and responsibilities from government/public institutions and organizations to private individuals and agencies (Tooley and Dixon 2006:444; Barry 2009:88). However, “privatization” in education sector is an umbrella term referring to many different educational programmes and policies (Levin and Belfield 2002; Tooley and Dixon 2006). Privatization of education is sometimes described as a form of decentralization, given that it may involve the transfer of decision making authority, responsibility and tasks from higher to lower organizational levels or between organizations which is Hanson’s (1998:112) general definition of decentralization. According to Levin (2001) cited in Levin and Belfield (2002) privatization is also often thought of as liberalization where agents are freed from government regulation, or as marketization where markets are created as alternatives to government services or state allocation systems.

For many, privatization simply means increasing the role of parents in the financing of education. This movement has thus rather negative and threatening connotation: it is associated with increased inequalities in access to education and the breaking of social cohesion (Levin and Belfield 2002). For others, privatization is much more a positive move, implying more resources for the education sector, more efficient use of these resources, and more flexibility in education delivery. The debate is loaded with more ideological consideration, and little evidence is produced (Levin and Belfield 2002).

---

7 Cited in Tooley and Dixon (2006:443)
According to Patrinos and Ariasingam (1997) cited in Tooley and Dixon (2006) privatization is often categorized into two ideal types (first involving demand-side financing; second, involving reforms to the educational supply. Demand-side financing reforms include the introduction of targeted vouchers—that is targeted at particular disadvantaged groups, including girls, to permit them to attend private schools (e.g. in Colombia, King et al. 1997; Angriest et al. 2001; in Bangladesh, King & Bellew, 1993; in the USA, Witte, 1996)\(^8\); universal vouchers, to enable all who desire to access private schools (e.g. in Chile, Castaneda, 1992; in Sweden, Sandstrom and Bergstrom 2002); and tax credit to allow those using private schools to claim some or all of their fee payment against taxation (e.g. in USA, Hoxby, 1998; cited in Tooley and Dixon 2006).

Reforms to the supply-side of schools include public-funding of new or existing private schools (e.g in North America, Bosetti 2000; O’Reilly and Bosetti, 2000; in Europe, Frasse et al., 1997; Karsten, 1999).\(^9\) However, a third type of privatization has been noted either explicitly or implicitly in the literature—where responsibilities for education have been transferred de facto to the private sector, through the rapid growth of private schools, rather that de jure, through reform or legislation (Tooley and Dixon 2006).

Ball and Youdell (2007 and 2008) have however, classified the various perspectives of privatization as existing in two forms namely; endogenous (privatization in education) and exogenous (privatization of public education) as follows:

**a) Privatization in Public Education**

Ball and Youdell (2007; 2008) call this endogenous privatization. Such forms or privatization involve the importing of ideas, techniques and practices from the private sector in order to make the public sector more like business and more business-like.

According to Ball and Youdell (2007; 2008) the forms of endogenous privatization include the following:

**i. Quasi-markets**

This involves the introduction into the state education systems of forms of school choice—the right of parents to choose between schools. Choice is facilitated by moves to diversify local education provision alongside the introduction of combinations of: per capita funding; the devolution of management responsibilities and budgets to schools; the provision of school vouchers\(^10\) for use in public or private schools; the relaxation of enrollment regulations; and the publication of performance outcomes as a form of

\(^8\) Cited in Tooley and Dixon (2006:443)
\(^9\) Ibid.
\(^10\) See Bohlmark and Lindahl (2008) and Levin and Belfield (2002:9) on how ‘vouchers’ work as an aspect of quasi-market privatization.
market "information" for parent-choosers. That is the removal of or weakening of bureaucratic controls over school recruitment, school funding tied to this recruitment, and support for and encouragement for choice and of movement around the system.

An outcome that policy makers seek from these moves is the production of competition between schools, competition that is expected to have the effect of raising standards across the system; either through the closing down of poor schools which fails to attract sufficient parental choices or by raising the performance of these poor schools as the result of competition for choices.

ii. The Manager and New Public Management

According to Hood (1991) the term New Public Management refers to a focus on management, and not policy, and on performance appraisal and efficiency; disaggregating public bureaucracies into agencies which deal with each other on a user pay basis; the use of quasi-markets and contracting out to foster competition; cost cutting; and style of management that emphasize, among other things, output targets, limited term contracts, monetary incentives and freedom to manage. Thus New Public Management is about outcomes (Peters and Pierre 1998:232 cited in Ewalt 2001) and to Ball and Youdell (2007:18) this means making the public sector more business-like.

According to Ball and Youdell (2007:18) the manager is relatively a new actor on the stage of public sector organizations and is the central figure in the reforms of public sector and the introduction of quasi-markets. The term "educational management" began to be used in the 1970s, and brought with it a set of methods, ideals and concepts (objectives planning, human resources, performance monitoring, and accountability) from the private sector (Ball and Youdell 2007:18). The manager is the key agent of organizational change and a cipher for privatization policies. Significance education policy shift from the 1980s on gave managers devolved powers to control their organizational budgets, their workforce (pay and recruitment), and internal-decision in innovative and creative ways to achieve goals and purposes of education reform (Ball and Youdell 2007:18). According to OECD (1995:8) cited in Ball and Youdell (2007) the purpose of such devolution is to "encourage managers to focus on results by providing them with flexibility and autonomy in the use of both financial and human resource".

New Public Management has been the primary means through which the structure and culture of public services are recast in order to introduce and entrench the mechanisms of the market form and forms of privatization. In doing so it affects how and where socially policy choices are made and systematically sidelines and disempowers

---

11 See Rommel, Christiaens and Devos (2005), Kapoor (1995) and Jones and Kettl (2003) for further discussions on New Public Management, and as well as Public Sector Reform
12 Cited in Bevir, Rhodes and Weller (2003:1)
educational practitioners. It also increasingly subjects them to new forms of control through performance management techniques (Ball and Youdell 2007:20).

iii. Performance Management, Accountability, and Performance Related Pay

Accountability, and performance management mechanisms, sometimes including performance-related pay are techniques of reform which were transferred into the public sector from business. These techniques are intended to ensure that educational processes are made more transparent but can also have powerful effects in re-orienting the work of schools and teachers and changing the values and priorities of school and classroom activities (Ball and Youdell 2007:20). This can include at school level: governments setting benchmarks and targets for schools and school systems to achieve; the publication of school performances as ‘league tables’; tying school funding to performance. And teacher level; tying teachers pay to student outcomes (performance related pay); fixing of pay levels and contract conditions locally at the level of the school; breaking the link between qualifications and employment in education and the introduction of ‘skill mix’ into schools whereby the number of qualified teaching personnel is limited and augmented by a range of unqualified staff on lower pay and weaker contracts; and the introduction of systems of appraisal and performance review of teachers. These techniques operate to make schools more like business, and classrooms become forms of production (Ball and Youdell 2007:20).

b) Privatization of Public Education

Ball and Youdell (2007; 2008) call this ‘exogenous’ privatization (bringing the private sector into schools). Such forms or privatization involve the opening up of the public education service to private sector participation on a for profit basis and using the private sector to design, manage or deliver aspects of public education.

According to Ball and Youdell (2007:16) the forms of ‘exogenous’ privatization include the following:

i. Public Education for Private Profit

The participation of the public sector in the delivery of public education is growing internationally. The private sector and NGOs have long been involved in the delivery of education in parts of the developing world where full state education funded

---

13 This also true for Africa, including Malawi; In section 3, I have given cases of University of Malawi privatizing some sections of education delivery, and the devolving of some primary school management activities to School Management Committees at school level as prescribed by the NESP statement.
education has not been established. These providers have also long delivered elite, religious and other alternative forms of education in western industrialized nations (Ball and Youdell (2007). Public education for private profit has included private tutoring, and the operating of private schools in many parts of the world.

According to Ball and Youdell 2007:22) this private sector participation ranges from multi-million dollar building projects (PPPs) and national contracts for systems management and testing to involvement in the small scale, everyday activities of schools and with teachers. For instance, in the USA many district schools now contract-out their assessment and student testing, data management, remedial services and subject-specific curriculum development work. The education market within which private companies participate is in fact a series of often discrete sectors and specialties which some companies work across and others specialize within (Ball 2007). For instance, whiteboards are increasingly common in classrooms around the world and bring with them the use of commercial teaching software and training provided by boards companies.

ii. Private Sector Supply of Education: Contracting Out Services

In the education sector, governments have historically made considerable use of contracting out for non-core educational services, such as school transport, cleaning, and food services. However, in recent years there has been a broadening in the scope of contracting undertaken in the education sector. In many countries this practice is now so normalized that it provokes little or no public comment. Malawi is one of the examples where contracting out of education services is rapidly emerging. Recent cases include those of the University of Malawi contracting out cleaning and food services, and the management of student loan scheme. The Malawi National Examination Board (MANEB) also contract out the printing of national examinations for primary and secondary school education.

iii. Private Sector Supply of Education: Contracting Out Schools

In a number of national settings individual state schools or groups of schools have been handed over to private companies to run under contract on a for profit basis. Here private providers are regarded as being able to provide a better quality of education services than municipal schools, although always this is not a case in practice. In some case the privatization of the public schools concerned remains hidden in that as new public-private hybrid institutions are formed under contract for fixed terms it is not

---

14 Example cited in Ball and Youdell (2007), see P23 for more examples on how the private sector is participating in the delivery of education around the world for a profit fee.
15 Cited in Ball and Youdell (2007:23)
16 Ibid.
always clear to parents and community members what the status of these schools is or will be in the future (Ball and Youdell 2007:27). Furthermore, packaged as a change in management in the interest of choice, efficiency and effectiveness, the significance of the fact that such schools are now delivered by the private sector is obscured. In other cases like Sweden and Columbia the privately run schools as presented as a distinct alternative to and as response to the failings of the state (Ball and Youdell 2007:27).

iv. Public Private Partnerships

These arrangements involve the use of private providers to design, build, manage and operate state education facilities on a lease-back basis. This transfers capital costs and some risk to the private sector. It also commits governments or local authorities to long-term lease payments (Ball and Youdell 2007:29).

v. International Capital in Public Education

There is significant international capital interest and activity in public education and this operates on a trans-national level. This involves commercial enterprises making commitments to develop education, and through this they buy companies providing educational services or they buy and manage schools, and education services (See Ball and Youdell 2007:30). For instance, Edison and Bright Horizons Family Solutions (one of the largest providers of private places in UK) and Edexcel (University of London) examination board was bought by US testing and publishing giant Pearson Media. Nord Anglia runs schools in Moscow, Pudong (Korea) Warsaw, Shangai, Bratislava and Berlin and in 2005 entered into a joint venture with ETA Ascon Group (UAE) to launch Star British Schools in the United Arab Emirates (see Ball and Youdell 2007:30).

vi. Commercialization or Cola-isation

According to Ball and Youdell (2007:31) this involves commercial companies targeting their products/brands at child/youth consumers through schools. This is what is called in the US the cola-isation of schools, selling to school children through vending machines, and the development of brand identity and loyalty through displays of logos, sponsorship and equipment promotions. Molnar (2005) cited in Ball and Youdell (2007:31) states that schools by their nature carry enormous goodwill and thus can confer legitimacy on anything associated with them. Some companies also produce curriculum materials and maintain educational websites. These practices are so normalized that their role in privatization of education can go unrecognized (Ball and Youdell 2007:31).
vii. Philanthropy, Subsidy, Aid

In some settings the private sector, benefactors or philanthropists, social entrepreneurs, and parents subsidize state schools through donations and payments. They support extra classes, student activities, school meals, and sometimes even basic costs and overheads, as in Poland and Holland for example. This tendency is also seen where state schooling is supplemented by the work of NGOs. Companies or philanthropic individuals or social entrepreneurs are also increasingly involved in initiating educational innovations (Ball and Youdell 2007:32). It is now common knowledge that Affordable Private Schools (APS) exist in most of the developing countries in the world. Several studies conducted in the recent past have identified the existence of low-cost private schools in urban and rural areas across countries such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, and Dominican Republic, South Africa, China and others. These schools are independently owned and operated by local entrepreneurs to serve a large population of the working poor and lower income families by charging lower fees (Grey Matters Capital 2012).

According to Ball and Youdell (2007) the first form of privatization (endogenous) where the public sector is asked to behave more like the private sector is well wide spread and well established. The second form of privatization (exogenous), where the private sector moves into public schools to participate in designing and running of programmes, is a newer but rapidly growing form of privatization. These forms of privatization are not mutually-exclusive and are often inter-related, indeed exogenous privatization is often made possible by prior endogenous forms (Ball and Youdell 2007). These instances are even true for Malawi, where endogenous privatization seems to be wide spread and well established, and exogenous privatization is happening at a rapid speed. These forms are indeed mutually exclusive for Malawi. For instance, primary school management has been decentralized, at school level it has been left in the hands of school management committee, which comprise of community members and PTA members, and community leaders surrounding the school. On the other hand, the University of Malawi has privatized some sectors of the system at college level. They have privatized catering, security, landscape, cleaning, and the management of student’s loan scheme.

The distinctive forms of privatization can be found in diverse national settings across the globe (Ball and Youdell 2007:33) and they change the way in which education is organized, managed and delivered; how the curriculum is decided and taught; how

---

17 See Grey Matters Capital (2012) for a detailed list of the studies.
18 See NESP (2008), However, PTA means Parents and Teachers Association, this grouping forms part of the School Management Committee at primary school level.
19 See Section 3 for further details on the forms of privatization in Malawi.
student’s performance is assessed; and how students, teachers, schools, and communities are judged. Private firms and consultants are now very active in selling education services that have often previously been delivered to schools by state authorities or local and national governments agents (Ball and Youdell 2007:24). Services now being sold out to the school include maintenance and catering services, IT hardware, connectivity and technical support and back office work such as pay roll and human resource. Professional services such as continuing professional development, school improvement and performance enhancement, inspection and teacher supply are also sold to schools (Ball and Youdell 2007:24).

It is not simply education and education services that are subject to forms of privatization: education policy itself- through advice, consultation, research, evaluations, and forms of influence- is being privatized. Private sector organizations and NGOs are increasing involved in both policy development and policy implementation (Ball and Youdell 2007). In developed countries the issues at hand are provision and accountability. Here, privatization can be advantageous to parents, who are given more freedom and choice when deciding schools for their children, and greater control over the way their children are educated (Levin and Belfield 2001).

In many developing countries, the privatization of education has indeed brought about an increase in the share of private financing, sometimes at the basic education level, but more commonly at the post basic education level. The number of private schools and private universities has increased at the same time as fees have been introduced in some public schools (Levin and Belfield 2001). This trend has emerged largely as result of the incapacity of the state to satisfy the increasing demand of education at all levels.

2.2 International targets on education: a focus on EFA goals and MDGs

It is imperative for this paper to give an analysis of international targets on education because they have been used as bench mark for analyzing privatization of education in Malawi. International meetings have declared a series of development goals for education since World War II, about once every 20 years, each time pledging universal primary schooling in poor countries. In 2000, the largest ever gathering of heads of state adopted new set of goals including universal access to primary completion and full gender parity in education by 2015 (Clemens 2004: 2; 8). The largest gathering-unanimously resolved that (by the year 2015) “to ensure that children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to compete a full course of primary schooling and that girls and boys will have equal access to all levels of education” (UN doc A/RES/55/2 cited in Clemens 2004:9).

Tables 1 and 2 give a summary of the building blocks/development goals for universal primary education and gender goals for gender parity in education respectively:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Year</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1952-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

See also Smith R.K.M (2004)
know, learning to do, learning to be and learning to live together. The text is widely adopted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>World Education Forum, Dakar (\textit{Dakar Declaration})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Millennium Summit, New York (\textit{Millennium Declaration})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Building blocks/development goals for gender parity in education\textsuperscript{21}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Year</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>UN Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>World Plan of Action for the implementation of the Objectives of the International Women’s Year, Mexico City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing (\textit{Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Shaping the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century OECD Development Assistant Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Millennium Summit, New York (\textit{Millennium Declaration})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are perspectives that meeting these educational goals mainly depend on the commitment of international players such as UNESCO and on sufficient funding, and as well as political will from developing countries, but this was proved not to be the case by other scholars\textsuperscript{22}. Meeting these educational goals goes beyond UNESCO’s commitment, sufficient funding from development partners, and political will from governments. Evidence shows that government is not the only key actor, the most important actors are parents, people whose incentives can only be modified to a limited degrees by governments, as well as government actors outside the education policy sphere who shape the economic in which those parents act (Clemens 2004:31).


\textsuperscript{22} See Clemens (2004)
Nevertheless, a third wave of international targets on education, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which Clemens (2004:9) describes as ‘the latest avatar’ followed. Thus in the year 2000, the world’s governments adopted the eight Millennium Development Goals and also adopted the six Education for All (EFA) goals, the two most important frameworks in the field of education23 as follows:

**Millennium Development Goals;**

Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger  
Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education  
Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women  
Goal 4: Reduce child mortality  
Goal 5: Improve maternal health  
Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases  
Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability  
Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

**Education for All Goals;**

Goal 1: Expand early childhood care and education  
Goal 2: Provide free and compulsory primary education for all  
Goal 3: Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults  
Goal 4: Increase adult literacy  
Goal 5: Achieve gender parity  
Goal 6: Improve the quality of education

The ultimate goal of Education for All is sustainable development. The EFA goals and MDGs are therefore said to be complementary: ‘When you fund education, you are securing progress towards all the Millennium Development Goals.’24 The two sets of goals are an ambitious roadmap for the global community to follow. They offer a long-term vision of reduced poverty and hunger, better health and education, sustainable lifestyles, strong partnerships and shared commitments. The education priorities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are shaped by these objectives25

In order to achieve the EFA goals and the MDGs, national governments are tasked to take actions that start by making education a priority in the national agenda. Along with abolishing school fees; building classrooms; introducing mother-tongue teaching; organizing community campaigns; setting up scholarships to encourage girls’ schooling; and mobilize community and religious leaders around education. Above all, they should hire, train and retain teachers, as an additional 10.3 million of them will be needed to

---

reach the 2015 international targets. The EFA goals and MDGs further call for national governments to take the following actions:

- Redress inequalities in education across all six EFA goals;
- Expand non-formal education in order to provide educational opportunities to those who drop out or never had access to education;
- Improve educational quality in general, notably through teachers (training, deployment, recruitment, etc.), better learning environment (e.g. learning and teaching materials, school infrastructure, etc.) and relevant curriculum;
- Increase funding for education (increase national spending on education and aid disbursements), improve the delivery of aid, and develop innovative financing modalities to mobilize additional resources;
- Enhance linkages between education and other development areas (health, nutrition, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, etc.);
- Foster increased dialogue and collaboration between national governments, civil society organizations and the private sector;
- Raise the profile of education on the global policy agenda through increased and wide advocacy;

According to World Bank (2000a) as cited in Clemens (2004:9) achieving these new goals is unquestioningly taken to be a matter of ‘getting serious’. The standard World Bank view is that to achieve universal primary education by 2015 the most important actors are clearly the governments by which to Fredrksen 2002:4) means that ‘government must give high budgetary priority to education’ (Cited in Clemens 2004:31), to be understood as a combination of ‘financial assistance’ from donors and ‘political commitment’ from developing-country leaders (Devarajan et al. 2002) cited in Clemens (2004:9).

It is thus clear that national governments were given a ‘huge’ responsibility of taking several actions that aim at achieving the EFA goals and the MDGs. The actions as seen are expensive and also demand for some serious reforms in the public sector, and as well as the education sector. The reforms have various forms of privatization embedded in them, and hence appear in the education sub-sector. In section 2 I have shown how the various forms of privatization have appeared in the Malawian education system under the auspices of international targets. Thus Malawi government has taken such reforms through the NESP and ESIP as a commitment towards achieving the EFA goals and MDGs.

---

26 www.un.org/globalissues/briefingpapers/efa
27 See www.un.org/globalissues/briefingpapers/efa
2.3 International donors/actors on education: the case of Word Bank and IMF

Privatization tendencies are most evident in the highly industrialized nations and the English speaking nations in particular. It is often the case that the fullest range of privatization tendencies, including endogenous and exogenous forms, are evident in these nations and that these are places where new privatization tendencies are developed, from where they are exported, and where the most of the advocates and promoters of privatization are located. These are often sites places where privatization tendencies are so most normalized, that is they have become to be considered at standard (Ball and Youdell 2007:36-37). The transfer of privatization tendencies from the highly industrialized nations to the newly industrialized and developing world is closely inter-related to and is a feature of a broader process of globalization—one might say "westernization" (Ball and Youdell 2007:36; 2008:48).

However, despite the fact that patterns of privatization are also heavily influenced by the particulars of the specific national context (Path-dependencies) such as the political structures and culture of the nation state; traditions of democratic, dispersed or centralized government; traditions of welfare provision; the extent of existing education provision; and degree reliance on aide and/ or loans for education provision (Ball and Youdell 2007:36; 2008:44). There are also significant and influential national and international governments, NGO and private bodies that strongly advocate privatization. They promote reforms that include privatizing effects as ‘solutions’ to problems, ‘necessary’ changes in existing public education system, or conditions for the development or expansion of such systems (Ball and Youdell 2007:41). ‘Hidden’ forms of privatization in education as well as more explicit forms of privatization of education are strongly advocated by many multi-lateral agencies like World Bank, OECD, IMF, WTO (Ball and Youdell 2008:43). These trends are embedded in the political agenda of a wide variety of organizations and parties across the political spectrum. They are supported by Think Tanks, Research Centre’s and Private Foundations, as well as by business lobbies (Ball and Youdell 2008:43). Furthermore, management consultants are increasingly used as advisers and report writers to influence and design public sector education at various levels (Ball and Youdell 2007:36).

In many developing nations, privatization tendencies are most prominent in newly established, often World Bank or aid funded, education projects (Ball and Youdell 2007:37). Thus ‘public sector reform and privatization constitute of the Worlds Bank’s lending and technical assistance’ (World Bank 2002). For instance, in 2002, the World Bank Group launched Private Sector Development (PSD) Strategy that aims to expand the provision of educational services by private firms and non-governmental organizations (Alexander 2002:5). The PSD strategy aims for private sector participation in 40 percent of its loans to the poorest countries. (Emmett 2006 cited Ball and Youdell 2008:53). Apart from the PSD strategy, the World Bank ‘privatization toolkit’
which explain how governments can privatize and regulate infrastructure services to open up opportunities for private sector investment, improve access, and protect consumers (Ball and Youdell 2008:76). The World Bank Group furthermore has an online Education Investment service, (EdInvest), which guides investors to profitable ventures in the education sector (Alexander 2002:11). This is a forum for individuals, corporations and other institutions interested in investing in education in developing countries and provides for making private investment in education possible on global scale. (Ball and Youdell 2008:78).

Furthermore, through its commercial arm, the IFC (International Finance Corporation), the World Bank offers financial support to companies wanting to start-up or expand their activities in public service markets (e.g., Investing in Private Education, IFC 2001) (Ball and Youdell 2008:78). The IFC (International Finance Corporation) and the World Banks Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), together with the export credit agencies of rich countries, are also encouraging private sectors to get involved in services by promising firms compensation for loss if the poor country government councils contracts (Emmett 2006 cited Ball and Youdell 2008:53). The World Bank and its commercial arm are promoting privatization tendencies and patterns that many developing governments have to adopt, and these have promoted various forms of privatization in the education sector.

The World Bank itself has worked in the sector since 1962. For the first eighteen years (1962-1980), the Bank’s goal was to support construction and equipment for technical, vocational and secondary education in order to meet man power needs. However, 1980 was a pivotal year. From 1980 onward, the Bank-financed education operations were often undertaken in the context of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) . (Alexander 2002:31). The Bank has five major policy prescriptions for the educational challenges of borrowing countries: privatize; recover cost through user fees; implement demand-side financing and decentralize; transfer subsidies from higher education to basic education (Alexander 2002:19). The Bank packages such products in adjustment loans or project loans. For instance, in order to improve resource mobilization, the Bank request is that the borrowing government should: decentralize by establishing school-based management; offer families a choice of schools; involve the private sector in financing and service delivery; increase class size; provide incentives for teacher achievement; and monitor educational outcomes and achievement (Alexander

Note: Due to the controversies and unpopularity of structural adjustment programmes, the IMF and World Bank are expunging the term “adjustment” from their lexicon. At present, many World Bank adjustment loans to low-income countries are now called “Poverty Reduction Support Credits (PRSCs); IMF loans to poor countries are called “Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) Arrangements. World Bank adjustment loans to middle income countries are being called “Development Support Loans” (DSLs). However, these are “name games” are cosmetic; they are not accompanied by any change in the institutions policy prescriptions (Alexander 2002:13)
2002:19). As it can seen these are various forms of privatization of and in education, and hence adopting the World Bank condition means adopting privatization.

These policy prescriptions have been adopted by various African governments which depend on aid and loans from the World Bank and IMF; just as they have been adopted by Malawi government through the NESP statement. It is thus clear that the World Bank and IMF involvement in the education sector is highly promoting privatization of and in education. Privatization as a condition guaranteeing aid and loan becomes imperative for developing countries to adopt. A 2006 study of 20 countries receiving World Bank and IMF loans found that privatization was a condition in 18 of them, an increase compared from the previous year (Emmett 2006 cited Ball and Youdell 2008:53). Debt relief has been suspended for many countries participating in the Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) initiative (Nicaragua, Benin, Mali, Chad, and Nigeria) because, among other things, they failed to expedite privatization processes (Alexander 2002:34).

On the other hand, the IMF is head of a creditor "cartel" and in this capacity, it judges the policy performance of borrowing governments. Those governments that obey IMF dictates usually obtain its "seal of approval" If a government loses its seal of approval it risks loses access to all external assistance since most other creditors and donors follow the lead of IMF:. By providing or withholding the "seal" the IMF modulates a government's access to official development assistance and private capital flows. Bilateral donor governments, which provide 75% of official development assistance, rely heavily on IMF's signals (Alexander 2002:34-35; Action Aid Kenya 2009: 13-14). Conditions of the IMF include reforms such as privatization, in these circumstances governments are in a fix except obeying the IMF dictates in order to get development loans and aid. Thus, the conditions set by World Bank and IMF as basis for disbursement of development aid and adjustment loans to developing countries influence the countries to adopt some form of privatization. For instance, adjustment loans offered by World Bank for the education sector may attempt to privatize and decentralize education while recovering costs through user fees. They also reorient spending from secondary and higher education to basic (Alexander 200:7). Thus the Banks recipes for reform are often standardized and simplistic: privatize, decentralize, recover costs, and transfer resources from higher to primary education. Since these recipes are viewed as "goods" then it is often assumed that there is a linear relationship between the recipe and the outcome (e.g. if some decentralization is good, then more must be better) (Alexander 200:18).
Section 3

STRUCTURE AND PRACTICE IN AFRICA; THE CASE OF MALAWI

This section gives an analysis of how international donors/actors and targets have influenced privatization of and in education in Africa vis-à-vis Malawi, and how privatization appear in Africa. However, before an analysis of Malawi, the section first highlights the overview on the structure and practice of privatization in and of education in Africa. In trying to explain how education privatization is practiced in Malawi, and how the international targets and donors are influencing it, the section has first analyzed education policies in Malawi to show how they have adopted the framework of the international targets and donors.

3.1 An overview of Africa: the dawning and stabilization

Privatization of and in education in Africa is fast growing and is evident in basic/primary, secondary and higher education. It has taken both the endogenous and exogenous structures of privatization as described by Ball and Youdell (2007) and it include Public Private Partnership programmes in education, private tutoring, contracting out education services, running private schools, and integrating New Public Management strategies in the running of public schools.

However, as regards to privatization of higher education in Africa, Osokoya (2007:1) argues that it is fast growing because of the inability of the public sector to satisfy the growing social demand for higher education, hence the need for the private sector to expand students access to higher education; the de-regulation policies of the governments on the provision of education and thus giving adequate opportunities for private participation in education; the failure of public universities to respond to the demand for employment oriented courses and subjects which makes it imperative for

---


31 This is even true for The University of Malawi, before late 1990s, the University directly enrolled qualified students into its five constituent colleges without trimming the number of qualified students. However, at present a majority of deserving secondary graduates who qualify for University education in the public universities are not enrolled because the University of Malawi does not have the capacity to accommodate the growing number of students qualifying for university education. The students sit for University Entrance Exams, which at the end makes a majority of them to be left out. The students who are left out enroll into private universities and colleges which are fast growing in Malawi.

32 The de-regulation polices were part of the structural adjustment programmes initiated by the World Bank.
private sector to increase; and the inefficiency associated with public education while the private sector is increasingly promoted for its efficiency.

The emergency of private sector in higher education however, is traced to the dawning of independence movements in Africa (Patil 2011:65). At the time of independence movements, education in general, and particularly higher education was expected to play a central role in the national project of social progress (Osokuya 2007:2). Thus issues about the philosophy and goals of education during the post-colonial period were viewed within the broader framework of political ideologies spanning from pro-western liberal ideology and capitalist systems to African socialism.\textsuperscript{33} Regardless of their ideological and political choices, all African governments conceived higher education as an important agent of development with the mission of formulating relevant programmes as well as providing high level man-power for the actualization of the governments project of national development (Osokuya 2007:2). During the period before and shortly after independence, universities had a near monopoly in providing higher education in Africa. However, with the market friendly reforms initiated under the structural adjustment programme (SAP), the de-regulation policies, and the financial crisis in the African states, there opened an encouraging environment for the emergence of private higher education in Africa (Osokuya 2007:2; UNESCO and IIEP 2006:19).

However, this was further strengthened by some legislative measures enacted by the various national governments providing grounds for establishing private institutions of higher education (Osokuya 2007:2). Today Africa can boast of a large number of private higher institutions, even though the private sector accounts for a small percentage of enrolment in higher education. Privatization has therefore become a fast expanding segment of higher education in Africa (Varghese 2004a cited in Osokuya 2007:2). In the 1990s, countries such as Nigeria, the government enacted laws to give room for private universalities, between 1990 and 2005, 20 privately owned universities were granted license by the Federal Government of Nigeria through the National Universities Commission (NUC). Similarly, in some other African nations such as Uganda, Cameroon, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe, the legislative measures on private higher education institutions got momentum in the 1990s and more private universities have been established since then (Varghese 2004a cited in Osokoya 2007:3).

This privatization as seen has been much under the influence of World Bank and IMF adjustment policies. For instance, Varghese (2004b) cited in Osokoya 2007:2) submitted that some foreign international bodies influenced the proliferation of private

\textsuperscript{33} According to Assie-Lumumba (2004) cited in Osokoya (2007) these political ideologies were evident in Bostswana, Niger, Cote d’Ivoire (liberal and capitalist); Benin and Zimbabwe (Marxist-Leninist/Socialist); and Mali and Tanzania (African Socialism).
institution of higher education in Africa. In 1991 for example, the government of Kenya in her bid to obtain the World Bank credit assistance, was made to restrict the growth of enrolment in public universities. Such restriction no doubt promoted the establishment of a large number of private universities and institutions in Kenya.

Privatization has also not spared primary and secondary education. In Malawi, two-thirds of primary schools are owned and managed by the Church.³⁴ In sub-Saharan Africa, Uganda and Malawi inclusive, private schools have mushroomed due to the poor quality of government primary schools (Rose 2002; 2003 cited in Tooley and Dixon 2006:444).

In Nigeria, unapproved private schools are providing schooling opportunities to a significant number of children, particularly in urban and peri-urban areas (Adelabu and Rose 2004 cited in Tooley and Dixon 2006:444). In order to show that privatization in primary and secondary education is live and mushrooming in Africa, I have borrowed statistics from Tooley and Dixon (2006:450) indicating number and proportion of schools, by school type and pupil enrolment for Ga in Ghana and Lagos in State, Nigeria to support my case. This data is for both governments; private aided; private (unaided) unrecognized/unregistered; and private (unaided) recognized/registered as presented in table 3 below:

**Table 3: Number and proportion of schools, by school type and pupil enrolment**³⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ga, Ghana</th>
<th>Lagos State, Nigeria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Schools</td>
<td>% Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private aided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (unaided) unrecognized/unregistered</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (unaided) recognized/registered</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen from the table, the number, and percentage average of private schools is much higher than those managed by the government, the same as with pupil enrolment for Ga, Ghana and Lagos State, Nigeria. The mushrooming of private secondary schools in Africa is therefore an indication on the prevalence and

³⁵ The data as presented in Tooley and Dixon (2006:450) show statistics that include Hyderabad and Mahbubnagar in India, but for the purpose of this study, the author has only adopted the statistics for Africa to illustrate his argument.
stabilization of privatization of and in public education in Africa. The dawning of privatization in basic/primary and secondary education is also attributed to the de-regulation polices (SAPs) that were imposed to Africa by the World Bank and IMF. Aid dependency syndrome has therefore promoted the emergency and stabilization of privatization in African public sector-including education.

3.2 The pattern and trend of education privatization in Malawi: policy and practice

In many developing nations mass education has not been fully established and continues to be worked under international development agreements (Ball and Youdell 2007:37). Therefore making sense of privatization in developing countries requires an understanding of the histories of education provision in these nations, current patterns of provision, and international and as well as national policy frameworks and trajectories (Ball and Youdell 2008:46). In this regard, I have given a historical overview of education (policies) management before NESP (2008-2027) and ESIP (2009-2013) in order to have a clear picture of how education polices in Malawi have been influenced by international targets/agreements and donors/actors. The NESP and ESIP as current education policies/action plans, and these have been analyzed against EFA goals, and MDGs, and donor (World Bank and IMF) education programmes.

3.2.1 National education (management) policies

It is argued that formal Education in Malawi begun in 1875 by missionaries. The main focus of education then was reading, writing and arithmetic. In 1926, the Department of Education was formed by the government of Malawi (Chavuta et al. 2008:11). The beginning of education planning in Malawi however, dates back to 1964, at independence, when the Government of Malawi contacted the American Council of Education to conduct a survey and there after advance approaches (Plans) for attaining certain targets besides stating financial commitments and new projects. The surveys main objective was to determine Malawi’s education needs for social and economic progress. The survey which assessed all levels of formal education, influenced the development of Malawi from 1964 until 1972 and subsequent planning exercises up to 1994 (NESP 2008:2).

Since 1972, Formal Education Plans emerged as follows:

a) 1973-1980: The First Formal Education Plan

The first formal education plan (1973-1980) was intended to provide guidelines for education development on primary, secondary and teacher education although an addendum on technical and vocational training came forth in 1976 (NESP 2008:2). Despite not incorporating the all the sub-sectors of the formal education system it provided first real attempt at planning for the evolution of education system since the
introduction of formal education in Malawi during the last quarter of the 19th Century. Among other objectives, this plan aimed at: basing educational development, in particular post-primary education, on the needs of labour market; align curricula relevance socio-economic and environment needs; maximize utilization efficiency resources and facilities; and equitably distribute education facilities and resources (NESP 2008:2).

b) 1985-1995: The Second Education Plan

The second education sector plan (1985-1995) incorporated all levels of formal education as well as various parastatal organizations associated with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology at that time (NESP 2008:2). The overall objective of this plan was to consolidate policies so that a proper balance is maintained in the levels of physical and human resources allocated to all of education system. Precisely the plan aimed at: equalizing educational opportunities; promoting education systems efficiency; improving physical and human resources; judiciously utilizing the limited resources to the education sector (NESP 2008:2).

c) 1995-2005: The Policy Investment Framework

From 1995-2005, the Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) has guided the education sector development and Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). Specifically the PIF aimed at: increasing access to educational opportunities for all Malawians at all levels of the system; ensuring that Malawi’s education system does not intensify existing inequalities across social groups and regions; maintaining and improving the quality and relevance of education, developing an institutional and financial framework that will sustain Malawian schools and students into the future, and intensifying financing pathways and strengthening of financial managerial capacity within the education sector and at all levels (NESP 2008:2-3).

As seen, the first two stated education plans were responding to the Development Policies which the Government of Malawi was pursuing between 1964 and 1994. They also focused on aligning education curriculum to the development needs of the state, thus to address the socio-economic and labour market needs in order to contribute to the state development agenda. On the other hand, the first PIF (1995-2005) was more of people oriented and improvement of the education sector, thus it focused on reducing inequalities in the education system, and improving delivery and management of the education sector. However, this document was reviewed and led to the development of the new/revised PIF (2001-2012).
d) 2001-2012: Policy Investment Framework (Revised)

In light of the emerging issues during the PIF implementation, the document was reviewed in 2001. This led to re-strategizing and the introduction of new policy direction to address the emergent issues. The PIF has been implemented in line with national development directions in both Mid-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), and The Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy (MPRS)\textsuperscript{36}. The PIF set-out long term development strategy and a systematic approach for investment into the education sector (up to 2012). The PIF point out that the "broad policy of Malawi Government is to alleviate poverty" The PIF made clear that investment in education yields "broad economic and social benefits" and states that: "Government further recognizes that education is an important ingredient in the development and nurturing of an educated leadership and effective governance. It is a catalyst for the raising of national consciousness, group solidarity and social cohesion\textsuperscript{37}"

The Malawi PIF articulated specific targets, strategies and the policy framework for the education sector. The framework incorporated the international commitments in education, to which Malawi is signatory: the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All. The PIF 2001 amongst other things calls for inclusive classrooms, and specifies the country's commitment to quality education for all. The PIF document states that Malawi will commit reducing inequalities in the schools across social groups and regions by providing bursary schemes, increasing school enrollment of female learner, increasing community in management of local and provision of enabling environments for learners including those with Special Education Needs (SEN) by 2012 (PIF 2001; Chavuta et al. 2008:13-14). These efforts demonstrate the country's cognizance of the need to create an inclusive society and achieve international targets such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) of universal primary education and Education for All (EFA) goals by 2015 (Chavuta et al. 2008:13-14).

e) 2008-2017 National Education Sector Plan (NESP):

National Education Sector Plan (NESP) 2008-2017 draws on the first, PIF and the Long Term Development Perspective for Malawi (Vision 2020). Subsequent to these development policies, it is also drawn from the current medium-term national development strategy (Malawí Growth and Development Strategy ïMGDS). Furthermore, the NESP reflects the Government of Malawi's commitment to both regional (Southern Africa Development Community and the African Union) and international (the Millennium Development Goals) targets and priorities, and it

\textsuperscript{36} See NESP (2008:3)
\textsuperscript{37} See PIF (2001)
incorporates the ideals Education for All (EFA) National Plan of Action in order to respond to the Fast Track Initiative\(^\text{38}\). Consistent to the above and based on the Paris declaration on donor assistance, the NESP paves the way towards a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) to panning, development and financing of the education sector. In essence, the detailed NESP is the long term programme from which MTEFs, District Education Plans (DEPs) and Annual Implementation Plans (AIP) will be drawn (NESP 2008).

The NESP operationalizes the MGDS broad educational development priorities, which recognizes education as a catalyst for socio-economic development, industrial growth and an instrument for empowering the poor, the weak, and the voiceless. Precisely the broad national goals in the MGDS are; to equip student with basic knowledge and skills to enable them to function as competent and productive citizens in a free society; students with disabilities are able to live an independent and comfortable life; to provide the academic basis for gainful employment in the informal, private and public sector; and provide high quality professionals in all fields (NESP 2008; MGDS 2006).

A careful examination of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) broad educational development (objectives) priorities show that they have adopted the framework of EFA goals and MDGs, and hence responding to the call for national action as spelt out by the EFA goals. For instance, the ultimate goal of Education for All is sustainable development, and they are said to be complementary to the MDG, and that the two goals sets a roadmap for the global community to follow by offering a long-term vision of reduced poverty and hunger, better health and education, sustainable lifestyles, strong partnerships and shared commitments. The EFA goals thus amongst others call for National Governments to “enhance linkages between education and other development areas (health, nutrition, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, etc.),” “to redress inequalities in education across all six EFA goals” and to improve educational quality in general notably through teachers (training, deployment and recruitment, etc)”. These are no far from the priorities of the MDGS; they are therefore national programmes that are responding to the international targets by adopting the guidelines of the call for national action to reflect its development agenda in education.

Nevertheless, the rational for development of the NESP include\(^\text{39}\):

- To consolidate education sector plan development strategies and their policies into one implementable output and results based framework with linkages to existing financing mechanisms and allowance for future reviews of the same. To this effect, the NESP provides a strong basis for a SWAp.

\(^{38}\) See NESP (2008)

\(^{39}\) Adopted from NESP (2008) document
The NESP is comprehensive in scope, as it does cover all levels of education and sub-sectors therein for a ten year period (2008-2027).

The NESP provides opportunities for facilitating life-long learning (continuous education).

The NESP provides a holistic coverage on dimensions and implementation of international covenants, agreements and protocols on education; to which the Republic of Malawi has adopted through ratification or by virtue of being part of the global economy and international socio-political landscape.

The NESP articulates and ensures the necessary leadership and ownership of and by the Government of Malawi in developing the education sector between 2008 and 2017.

The NESP thus, fits into the vision and mission of the Ministry of Education: The vision for the education sector is to be the catalyst for socio-economic development, industrial growth and instrument for empowering the poor, the weak and voiceless. Education enhances group solidarity, national consciousness and tolerance of diversity (MGDs 2006:50). In essence, the education sector wishes to ensure better access and equity, relevance and quality, and good governance and management in all institutions from basic education to higher education (NESP 2008). The mission of education is to provide quality and relevant education to the Malawian nation. Such education should enable people to acquire relevant knowledge, skills, expertise and competencies to perform effectively as citizens, workforce, and as leaders of Malawi, thereby reduce poverty amongst the people of Malawi (NESP 2008).

In implementing the Vision and Mission, Malawi will its main Strategic Priority the improvement of equality, equity, relevance, access and efficiency in Basic Education working to meet the Education for All goals and Millennium Development Goals. Complementing this main priority, Secondary Education will double enrollment during the ten years, while focusing on upgrading quality, and on retention of girls. Access to Technical and Vocational Education will expand, and the colleges will be rehabilitated. At the Higher Education level, enrollment in existing public universities will double in ten years, with significantly increased efficiency to minimize costs to the budget, complemented by expansion of private tertiary education. Overall Special Needs Education programmes will feature prominently and HIV/AIDS mitigation and gender equity will be a cross cutting interventions at all levels/sub-sectors during this plan period (2008-2017)\textsuperscript{40}.

\textsuperscript{40} See NESP (2008)
To realize the vision and its mission, and in accordance with these strategic priorities, the education sector defined three thematic areas of interventions for the NESP during its ten year period (2008-2017), namely41:

1. Expand equitable access to education to enable all benefit
2. Improve quality and relevance of education to reduce drop-out and repletion and promote effective learning
3. Improve governance and management of the system to enable more effective and efficient delivery of services.

The National Education Sector Plan (NESP) responds to the three thematic areas through calling for improvements in Early Childhood Development, non-formal education (out-of school youth and adult literacy) formal education (primary, secondary, technical and vocational- tertiary and higher education)42. Such an approach implies that the plan has to reflect subsume participation of public organization which are responsible for various domains namely; Ministries of Women and Child Development, Youth Development and Sports and Education, Science and Technology, statutory bodies (Malawi Institute of Education, Malawi Library Service, National Examinations Board, and the Universities), Technical, Entrepreneurial, and Vocational Education Training Authority (TEVETA), and the non-public and/or private organizations in education. District Assemblies, as service providers at the local level have a significant role in accordance with the 1998 Local Government Act and Decentralization Policy in translating and delivery of education services at local level43.

In order to achieve the three thematic objectives (equity and access, quality and relevance, governance and manage) in the five sub-sectors; The Ministry of Education strategic priorities and activities for NESP include the following44:

- Establishment of an effective mechanism for the enhancement of the decentralization process;
- Strengthening leadership, organizational culture, management systems, and practices at all level;
- Development of a robust system for collecting human resource performance information;

---

41 Adopted from NESP (2008);
42 See NESP (2008)
43 NESP (2008)
44 See ESIP (2009:23); However, carefully examined, it can be noted that these three thematic areas are no far from the Dakar Framework which identifies strategies for achieving Education For All which include developing responsive, participatory, and accountable systems of educational governance and management, amongst many others.
• Strengthening utilization of transparent and efficient management support systems in financial management, procurement, information and reporting systems and infrastructure management;
• Strengthening the management and coordination of the implementation of ESIP with all parties, including Development Partners;
• Strengthen institutional and policy linkages and coordination;
• Reorientation of the sector budget to the financing of core functions and better integration of Government budget resources and donor support;

The strategic priorities set up for the NESP by the Ministry of Education are no far from the strategies of achieving Education for All goals as provided in The Dakar Framework for Action. For instance, the Dakar Framework request national governments to develop, participatory and accountable systems of educational governance, and this is not limited to decentralization, private participation, and New Public Management techniques which are reflected in the NESP priorities. The NESP statement is therefore largely a model of the Dakar Framework Plan of Action for national governments towards the attainment of the EFA.

**f) 2009-2013 Education Sector Implementation Plan (ESIP)**

The Education Sector Implementation Plan (ESIP) 2009-2013 serves as a guide for the articulation of the broad development objective of NESP 2008-2018. Thus the ESIP is an operational tool for all managers and implementers at every level of the education system. The ESIP responds to critical issues identified in most recent sector analyses, especially the Country Status Report, 2009 (CSR): it indicates major policy reforms, sets clear priorities for each sub-sector by NESP and Education for All goal and presents realistic and sustainable budget options.\(^{45}\)

The objective of ESIP is to provide details of the activities that each education sub-sector will undertake in the four year period 2009-2013 in order to fulfill the strategies to achieve NESP goals. The ESIP sets the following priorities: basic education (early childhood development, primary education, out of school children and youth, and adult literacy), secondary education, teacher education, technical, entrepreneurial and vocational education, and higher education respectively. Within basic education primary education is accorded the highest priority, followed by early childhood development (ECD), out of school children and youth and adult literacy. The ESIP organizes these priorities into three thematic areas, as; access and equity; quality and relevance; and governance and management.\(^{46}\) The government intends to settle these issues through a “business unusual approach” guided by the local (decentralized) responses that follow.

---

\(^{45}\) See ESIP (2009)

\(^{46}\) ESIP (2009:2)
both local and internationally agreed priorities set forth in the framework of Millennium Development Goals and the Dakar World Education Forum of Action, promoting Education for All by 2015\(^\text{47}\).

In order to achieve the three thematic objectives (quality and relevance; access and equity; and governance and management) the Ministry of Education therefore set out the following policy reform agenda (priorities) in the NESP and ESIP:

**Table 4: Policy Reform Agenda\(^{48}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goals</th>
<th>Policy Targets</th>
<th>Priority Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and Access:</strong></td>
<td>• Construction and Rehabilitation of infrastructure</td>
<td>• Infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced primary GERs and increased NERs (towards 100%)</td>
<td>• Complementary schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender parity in primary and secondary school enrolment</td>
<td>• Incentive schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roll out mother groups in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve retention of girls in standards 6-8 and transition of girls into secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase recruitment and training of female teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality and Relevance:</strong></td>
<td>• Reduced Pupil: Teacher Ratios in primary schools (especially in standards 1-3)</td>
<td>• Teacher professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measurement and monitoring of learning outcomes</td>
<td>• Curricula Reform and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Systematic and regular inspection of all institutions</td>
<td>• Providing Teaching and Learning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce standardized testing to measure and monitor quality of learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{47}\) ESIP (2009:25)  
\(^{48}\) See ESIP (2009:25-29). The action plan also provides specific/project based activities for the five year period at various levels but this paper has only concentrated on strategic objectives and activities because the analysis is at national policy level.
It is clear that the policy reform agenda for the NESP statement vis-à-vis the Ministry of Education has much emphasis on EFA goals and MDGs, and hence they have adopted The Dakar Framework strategies for achieving EFA goals and MDGs, this has therefore provided a platform for privatization tendencies to emerge in the Malawian education system. For instance, by calling for the participation of private sector in the provision and management of the education system, the NESP statement is therefore in the realm of exogenous privatization. However, in the following sub-sections I have provided detailed explanations on how the NESP and ESIP are opening for privatization of and in education with the patronage of EFA goals and MDGs.

### 3.2.2 The character of privatization in Malawian education system

Having analyzed the key education polices/plans in Malawi (PIF, NESP and ESIP), it is clear that the statements sets out the government of Malawi’s education sector goals, objectives and proposals on how such goals and objectives will be realized for a decade (2008-2017). The goals and objectives relate to expanded Equitable Access to education, improved Quality and Relevant education, and improved Governance and Management of education system. As seen from the analysis of EFA goals and MDGs,
it is clear that these NESP objectives fall within the broader framework of MDGs and Education for All goals. The policy statements have therefore adopted the framework of these international targets. The targets have thus influenced the rational of the NESP by having it align its strategic objectives to the EFA goals and MDGs, thus adopting the Dakar Framework of Plan of Action for national governments.

This has however; made the NESP and ESIP statement to open up for privatization (adopted some form of privatization) as one way of achieving the policy objectives. The statements have adopted education reform agenda that include decentralization-devolution, Public Private Partnerships, private sector supply of education services, and New Public Management techniques. This is also evident in the strategic objectives of the NESP statement. For instance, in order to improve quality and relevance in the five education sub-sector, the Ministry of Education through NESP call for the introduction of measurement and monitoring of learning outcomes; systematic and regular inspection of all institutions; development of a robust system for collecting human resource performance information; strengthening utilization of transparent and efficient management support systems in financial management, procurement, information and reporting systems and infrastructure management; and strengthening of leadership, organizational culture, management systems, and practices at all levels of the education system. Amongst other forms of privatization, these actions form part of information sharing-which is an element of decentralization. Furthermore, the action entails bringing aspects of New Public Management into public education. For instance, measurement and monitoring of learning outcomes is an element of performance management, and accountability, which Ball and Youdell (2007) describes as endogenous; thus "Privatization in Public Education" It is therefore clear that the NESP statement has adopted and provided a platform for privatization of and in education.

The NESP further call for those involved in the education sector (irrespective of their institutional set up) including private institutions and individuals, and civil society organizations to operate as a cluster and one force addressing a common challenge and responding to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy and related international protocols such as Education for All and Millennium Development Goals. Thus, it is expected that coming together of all key players in the education sector will create a synergy which will make a significant difference in Malawi and thereby responding to national and international educational aspirations and expectations during the given decade (2008-2017). The bringing together of different players in the education sector as NESP demand implies a platform or some form of privatization. For instance, this would mean decentralization (where you have School Management Committees, Parents and Teachers Association, and the community at large being
involved in the direct management of schools; and Public Private Partnership). In fact, in order to improve governance and management of education system (schools), the NESP calls for decentralization and Public Private Partnership. The government of Malawi also through the Ministry of Education developed National Community Participation Strategy in Management of Primary Schools (NCPSMPS) as one way of improving school governance and management. These activities are forms of Privatization of Public Education where you have private stakeholders taking part in the management of schools (Ball and Youdell (2007)).

Furthermore, the Dakar Framework of Action and the World Bank suggest that in order to achieve the EFA goals and MDGs; thus universal primary education by 2015, national governments have to prioritize basic/primary education. This is both in terms of expenditure and programmes in to improve governance and management, and hence increased enrollment ratios. This has also been seen in the NESP and ESIP statements. The government of Malawi has prioritized basic education. It has allocated more resources towards basic and primary education, and it has decentralized the management of primary education from central government to local government, and further to district and community level through the use of District Education Manager (DEM), School Management Committees (SMCs), and Parents and Teachers Association (PTSs). The Table 5 below show how the Malawi government has allocated resources in the education sub-sector for the period of 5 years (2009-2013);

**Table 5: Summary of Total Required Resources by Sub-sector 2009-2013**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Sub-sector</th>
<th>Annual Financial Projections (MK000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>28,747,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Youth</td>
<td>472, 964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>71,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
<td>219,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>27,984,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>7,689,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>4,018,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and Vocational Training</td>
<td>584,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>7,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Support</td>
<td>1,250,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>49,675,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 indicates that basic education takes the largest share of required total resources of 57.8% in the 2009/2010 financial year and grows to 65.8% over the implementation. A great part of this goes to the primary education in the form of

---

49 Adopted from ESIP (2009:87), and these are resource requirement projections for the five year period, and hence they can increase or decrease depending with the economic situation.
personal emoluments (PE) and capital investment (construction of classrooms) (NESP 2009:87). This expenditure shows the Malawi government commitment towards the attainment of universal primary education as propagated by World Bank in the name of achieving MDGs and EFA goals. However, behind this justification are various forms of privatization that comes as support from development partners. In fact, the Malawi government puts it clear in the ESIP statement that it does not have resources to achieve the goals and targets set out in both NESP and ESIP, and hence the need for support from development partners and the participation of private sector. There is a financing gap that is increasing from year 2009-2013, and this needs a bail out from donors.

3.2.2.1 Forms of privatizations in Malawian education system

The Policy Reform Agenda described in the NESP, and ESIP policy statements, has provided a platform for various forms of privatization to emerge in public education (institutions/schools), and they have not excluded the following:

a) Private sector supply of education services: the cases of UNIMA and MZUNI

The University of Malawi (UNIMA) has so far contracted out catering, security, and landscaping services. Prior to this the University use to manage the services through its fulltime personnel. UNIMA has also outsourced the Management of University Student’s Loan scheme to Malawi Savings Bank (MSB).

Mzuzu University (a public university) has also left the management of student’s loan scheme with Malawi Savings Bank (MSB) as one way of improving management.

b) Policy Consultation: the case of NESP

As argued by Ball and Youdell (2007) that it is not only education and education services that are subject to forms of privatization but also education policy itself- through advice, consultation, research, evaluations, and forms of influence- is being privatized. Private sector organizations and NGOs are increasingly involved in both policy development and policy implementation. This has been witnessed in the development of NESP. The NESP statement was developed through a participatory approach and its production was made possible through consultations with number of bodies including the civil society and stakeholders in education such as Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE), Development Aid from People to People (DAPP), Forum for African Women Educationalist in Malawi (FAWEMA), Private Schools Association

---

50 See ESIP (2009:90-91). However, page 40 provides a detailed analysis of the annual financing gap.
of Malawi (PRISAM), Teachers Union of Malawi (TUM), and Malawi National Commission for UNESCO, LEG and many others.

c) Private Schools/Institutions: the emergence of private primary and secondary schools, and colleges and universities

Since the dawning of de-regulation policies, Malawi has seen the emergence of private primary and secondary schools, and as well as private colleges and universities, though some are not yet fully accredited by government, these institutions are present and they are being managed by various private entities. However, of interest is the influx of private universities and colleges which is occurring at rapid rate. Though majority of the universities and colleges awaits government accreditation, they are in operation and they include those managed by Faith Based/Religious Institutions (e.g Catholic University of Malawi-recognized and accredited; Exploits University-recognized and accredited, Adventist University-recognized, and University of Livingstonia-recognised but partially accredited) and those managed by business Individuals/organizations (e.g Blantyre International University-recognized and accredited, and Share World Open University-recognized and accredited).

d) Community Participation: the case of Blantyre urban schools

In an effort to improve the quality of primary education; The District Education Management (DEM) of Blantyre Urban, with the technical assistance from Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) developed, a District Education Plan (DEP) that is calling for community participation in school management through “Adopt a School” campaign that is derived from the theme ųquality education, a responsibility for all”. The aim is institutionalizing planning and implementation of development activities at the Blantyre District level in line with decentralization. Thus the government cannot support many schools hence the call for community participation in resource mobilization, provision and their management51.

e) Public Private Partnership

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) as promoted by the NESP statement have also not spared the education sector. A number of private organizations continue to implement joint education programmes with the government of Malawi. One of the recent biggest education projects is the construction of Law School (2011) at the University of Malawi Chancellor College campus by the European Union.

51 The Daily Times, Tuesday, September 18, 2012.
The National Bank of Malawi also contributed to the furnishing of the library at the Law School with books, and other library equipment. These are just a few of the many forms of privatization in and of education in Malawi. These cases give an indication that as the country continues to implement the NESP statement for the next remaining six years, more forms of privatization in and of education would have emerged.

3.2.3 How international targets and donors influence privatization in and of education

3.2.3.1 International targets

As earlier stated that in many developing nations mass education has not been fully established and continues to be worked under international development agreements (Ball and Youdell 2007:37). Contemporary education policies across the developing world are framed in particular by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Millennium Development Goals as well as United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Education for All declaration and framework. These place obligations for education provision on all nations and set out broad approaches to achieving these goals. The MDG and EFA goals then have the potential to facilitate and constraint the approaches to education, including privatization, taken within the developing world (Ball and Youdell 2008:49). In this regard, international targets on education vis-a-vis EFA goals and MDGs influence privatization of and in education by determining National Education (Policy) Agenda of national governments.

Thus by adopting the EFA goals and MDGs, national governments are set to adopt the Dakar Framework Plan of Action/Strategies for achieving the EFA goals, which are embedded with various forms of privatization. This equally means that the EFA goals and MDGs have been embedded with both exogenous and endogenous forms of privatization (Ball and Youdell 2008:50). The two goals give a lot of responsibilities to national governments which cannot be single handled; this in turn calls for assistance that includes various form of privatization. For instance, Article 6 of Education for All (Strengthening Partnerships) says "national, regional and local education authorities have a unique obligation to provide basic education for all, but they cannot be expected to supply every human, financial or organizational requirement for this task. New and revitalized partnerships at all levels will be necessary; partnerships among all sub-sectors and forms of education, recognizing the special role of teachers and that of administrators and other education personnel; partnership between education and other government departments, including planning finance, labour communications and other social sectors; partnerships between government non-governmental organizations, the private sector, local communities religious groups, and families".
Again as seen in the EFA and MDG goals outlined earlier on, they call for national
governments to abolish school fees; building classrooms; introduce mother-tongue
teaching; organizing community campaigns; setting up scholarships to encourage girls’
schooling; and mobilize community and religious leaders around education. Above all,
they should improve the delivery of aid, and develop innovative financing modalities to
mobilize additional resources; enhance linkages between education and other
development areas (health, nutrition, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability,
etc.); foster increased dialogue and collaboration between national governments, civil
society organizations and the private sector; raise the profile of education on the global
policy agenda through increased and wide advocacy. These actions carry with them
various forms of privatization that include opening public education for the participation
of private sector—thus calling for decentralization-devolution type rather. In this regard,
“Education for All suggests that going outside the nation state for human and
organizational as well as financial resources is not only desirable but essential. And it
lists a range of groups and organizations with whom partnerships are necessary; listing
private sector alongside NGOs, communities, families, and religious groups. In this way
the private sector is made equivalent to not-for-profit and civil society organizations and
the take up of endogenous and exogenous of forms of privatization is advocated and
normalized (Ball and Youdell 2008:51). Privatization is therefore viewed as one of the
strategies of achieving the Education for All goals.

Furthermore, as in the Education for All declaration, in the Dakar Framework the private
sector is presented alongside along range of other funding sources and while a
preference grant and concessional aid is expressed, loans and private sector funding
are also identified. Exogenous privatization can therefore been seen as a necessary evil for the attainment of the international targets on education, as Ball and Youdell
(2008:52) puts it “exogenous privatization can be seen as a fundamental feature of
international education policy for the developing world. Indeed, private finance is
frequently presented as an inevitable necessity if the MDGs and EFA goals are to be
realized in the world. For instance, Devarajan et al. (2002 cited in Clemens 2004:9)
take the average cost of educating a primary school student in developing countries
($111) and multiply it by the number of children not in school to get a cost of meeting
the second MDG ($11.4 billion). This is too huge for most developing countries
states are incapacitated to achieve these targets alone (Belfield and Laving: 2002).
Privatization as promoted by global actors has therefore become one of the possible
solutions.

52 www.un.org/globalissues/briefingpapers/efa
53 See also Ball and Youdell (2008:51)
54 Ibid.
This therefore means that by adopting EFA goals and MDGs, national governments are adopting various forms/tendencies of privatization which are embedded in the two international targets. The case of Malawi is one of the many good examples. It shows that through NESP and ESIP statements, the government has adopted the framework and structure of EFA goals and MDGs, as prescribed in The Dakar Framework; strategies for achieving EFA goals and MDGs through adoption of a policy reform agenda aimed at influencing *equity and access, quality and relevance, and improved governance and management* by amongst others devolution of the education system at all levels, and opening up the education sector for Public Private Partnership. Furthermore, the content of the NESP and ESIP statements is often referred to EFA goals and MDGs; it is thus the emanating point of national education policy. This means that Malawian national education policy is largely influenced by international targets.

### 3.2.3.2 International donors/actors

It may be that as interested parties internationally escalate and export privatization tendencies, these become increasingly *common sense* or orthodoxy. They are taken up as default policies and may seem to be unordered and even unintentional. However, the overall trend which privileges privatization as public policy is clearly the result of deliberate promotion and advocacy by key actors and agencies (Ball and Youdell 2007:35). This has been witnessed in the African context, the adoption of privatization has been perceived as a necessary evil but the true picture is that it has been largely under the influence of international donors-World Bank and IMF policies through the prescribing of privatization as condition for aid and loans. For instance, like what happened in Kenya in 1991, where the World Bank prescribed privatization as a condition for the Kenyan government to obtain credit facility from the Bank; the Bank proposed restriction of enrolment in public universities, and hence a boom of private universities—thus exogenous privatization. Similar cases include those of suspending debt relief for many countries participating in the Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) initiative (Nicaragua, Benin, Mali, Chad, and Nigeria) because, among other things, they failed to expedite privatization processes (Alexander 2002:34). The point is that most African governments do not have strong economies to sustain national development programmes, hence largely depend on aid and loans from global actors-IMF and World Bank. This is where they meet privatization in order to get budget support, thus they are forced to adopt some form of privatization. For instance, for Malawi government to achieve the targets set out in ESIP (2009-2013), it needs a grand total of MK 57,294,176 billion. However, just in the first year of implementation (2009/2010) there was a financing gap of MK 4.15 billion (US$29.6 million) from the total resources that development partners committed. The finance gap is estimated at MK 1.8 billion.

---

(US$84.4million) in 2012/2013\textsuperscript{56}. Furthermore, there also annual financing (Table 5) gaps, that the Malawi government is waiting for donors/global actors to finance in order for it to achieve the NESP and ESIP targets.

**Table 5 below give the total annual financing gap for ESIP\textsuperscript{57}:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Sub-sector</th>
<th>2009/2010 (MK000)</th>
<th>2010/2011 (MK000)</th>
<th>2011/2012 (MK000)</th>
<th>2012/2013 (MK000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding Available</td>
<td>47,473,035.98</td>
<td>47,473,035.98</td>
<td>47,473,035.98</td>
<td>47,473,035.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Financial Resources Required</td>
<td>49,675,967.66</td>
<td>52,806,308.94</td>
<td>56,344,897.18</td>
<td>57,294,176.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Gap</strong></td>
<td>(4,202,931.68)</td>
<td>(7,333,272.96)</td>
<td>(10,871,861.20)</td>
<td>(11,821,140.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implication of the above annual financing gaps is that the Malawi government does not have sufficient funds to implement its own development agenda on education, and hence it is forced to look for support (aid and loans) from donors/development partners. This is where it ends up meeting privatization terms from IMF and World Bank, and other global actors. In this case, governments have limited options but to adopt some form of privatization in order to obtain budget support. I therefore argue that such privatization is not automatic (moving with the time) but it is influenced by development partners as condition for aid and loans. Indeed global actors have various factors and reasons for advocating privatization, but for developing countries it is a strategy for obtaining development support. As Clemens (2004:11) rightly puts it “poor government’s countries ask for massive aid flows in exchange for the promise of universal schooling. Such promises have to appear in the national policies. However, the situation is ‘give and take’ thus the logic is that ‘no reform, no aid’ and in the process developing countries are influenced to adopt privatization. This brings the question of who benefits the most. Initiatives to privatize education are being taken without regard for the needs and preferences of citizens in borrowing countries. Indeed, the IMF and World Bank are suspending debt relief for several countries due to their inadequate progress in privatization. Such coercive tactics subvert efforts by citizens in borrowing countries to shape their own future through national planning process [e.g., the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process] (Alexander 200:11).

\textsuperscript{56} See ESIP (2009:90)  
\textsuperscript{57} Adopted from ESIP (2009:91)
4.1 Summary of the Study

From the literature reviewed in sections 1, 2 and 3, there appears to be wide acceptance on the prevalence of privatization of and in education in Africa, including Malawi. There also appears to be a wide consensus that privatization in Africa is traced to the post-independence period due to IMF and World Bank structural adjustment programmes that embedded privatization with them. The reviewed literature further highlights that privatization in and of public education has taken two major forms namely; endogenous and exogenous. In endogenous the public sector is asked to behave like the private sector through adoption of market based management techniques vis-à-vis New Public Management. On the other hand, in exogenous form, the private sector is given a platform to participate in the public sector through various means such as Public Private Partnership. The study has also established that several factors such as globalization and Path-dependencies influence privatization of and in education in Africa. Such Path-dependencies include the political structures and culture of the nation state; traditions of democratic, dispersed or centralized government; traditions of welfare provision; the extent of existing education provision; and degree reliance on aide and/ or loans for education provision (Ball and Youdell 2007:36; 2008:44).

Nevertheless, for this study, the aim was to assess how international targets and donors influence privatization of and in education. In order to achieve this, international targets on education (EFA goals and MDGs) and global actors/donors (IMF and World Bank) education programmes were evaluated against national education polices of Malawi, thus the NESP (2008-2017) and ESIP (2009-2013). From this analysis the study has established the following:

- That international targets (EFA goals and MDGs) influence national education policy for national governments. Thus national governments translate these international targets into development programmes at national level and by doing so they adopt various forms of privatization that are embedded in the EFA goals and MDGs. Malawi is a good case study, through the NESP and ESIP statements, the government of Malawi is implementing education policy reform agenda that include decentralization, community support to education programme, reducing inequalities in education, and information sharing under the influence of EFA goals and MDGs. This is said to improve equity and access, quality and relevance, and governance and management.
The study has also established that privatization is also largely influenced by global actors/donors such as World Bank and IMF through prescription of reform policies (SAPs) that are attached with privatization tendencies. The argument raised is that developing countries as witnessed by the Malawi government are incapacitated to finance national development programmes, and hence the need for aid and loan from development partners, and these partners recommend them to adopt various policy reforms that include privatization.

The study therefore concludes that privatization in and of education is not automatic but it is a result of deliberate policy reforms influenced by global actors and international targets in the education sector. This therefore, brings several questions for further research; is privatization good for developing countries? Should it be promoted or banned? Who is benefiting the most between recipients (developing countries) and advocates (global actors/donors)?

4.2 Implications of privatization on EFA goals and MDGs; the post 2015 agenda

When studying privatization in the education sector, key questions include assessing whether privatization promote quality, efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery and management of the education system. This leads to a key debate as to whether privatization should be promoted or not. Indeed this argument has several perspectives because "the implications of building forms of privatization into the establishment of education services in the developing world are yet to be fully understood" (Ball and Youdell 2007:37). To this study however, the significance is to determine the implications of privatization on EFA goals and MDGs. Thus having analyzed the various forms of privatization, it is also important to assess if privatization is contributing to the attainment of EFA goals and MDGs. Are we going to achieve universal primary education through privatization? Indeed the implications are many, but it has been established that privatization is part and parcel of the structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) initiated by the World Bank and IMF. SAPs aim at liberalizing and privatizing the economies in the context of strict budget discipline (Action Aid International Kenya 2009:15). In the education sector (sector adjustment programmes), the adjustment loans often attempt to privatize and decentralize education while recouping costs through various means, including user fees (Alexander 2002:13). In selected instances this approach may have merit. In general, however, the Strategy endangers educational progress because it expands ignore the lessons of experience. Among other things, the Strategy ignores the fact that when educational services are provided at cost, they will not reach poor populations even when subsidy schemes are employed (Alexander 2002:5).
User fees are argued to have negative implications on enrollment and retention of students in school. They commercialize education and make it preserve for those who can afford it (Action Aid International Kenya (2009:27). Thus user charges continue to be a major deterrent to poor children attending school and to young people and adults in need of non-formal learning. In some countries, passing the cost burden on to poor parents has had a devastating impact on enrolment and retention (Dakar Framework for Action, Senegal, 2000 cited in Ball and Youdell 2008:55). Furthermore, on top of the user fees are many other costs that parents have to pay, for example books, stationary and basic equipment, admission fees, exam fees, PTA fees, and uniforms. These costs add up, to become significant obstacles to children from poor families across Africa, Asia, and Latin America- who are less likely to enroll and complete primary school because of the associated costs (Action Aid, Archer et al 2002 cited in Ball and Youdell 2008:56). Though the Dakar Framework for Action (2009) call for free, quality basic education so that no child will be denied access because of inability to pay parents are still making major financial contributions even where primary education is free, some of which are effectively compulsory while others are supposedly voluntary, but are requested with considerable social pressure. Non-payment of even apparently voluntary costs can lead to victimization, stigmatization, or even exclusion (Action Aid, Archer et al 2002 cited in Ball and Youdell 2008:56).

In Kenya, user fees led to a significant drop in primary school enrolment and dropout rates as the majority of the poor could not manage user fees. Thus, according to Action Aid International Kenya (2009:23), in 1991 the Government of Kenya implemented a cost-sharing policy proposed by The Kamunge Report. This led to the steady decline of pupils in enrolment in primary school as the 1974 decree of Free Primary Education was scrapped off and parents were now required to cater for tuition and maintenance fees. They also had to purchase textbooks, stationery, school uniforms, as well as contribute to construction and maintenance of school buildings. Enrolment at primary level declined from 95.4% in 1998 to 87.6% in 2000. Massive dropout rates were also recorded during that period. This therefore means that privatization (user fees) is a limiting factor towards the attainment of universal primary education, and EFA goals- gender parity. Thus in the African context, where parents prefer sending a male child to school than a female child due to cultural believes, user fees therefore put the female child at a disadvantage of enrolling and completing primary education. Privatization is therefore seen as promoting inequalities in education.

Furthermore, in addition to influencing the incomes of households and the cost of education, SAPs attempt to reduce the budget deficits of borrowing governments. Since education budgets usually constitute a significant portion of the federal budget, SAPs often change the level or composition of education spending. Such changes affect many aspects of school systems, such as school construction, administration and
maintenance, teacher salaries and benefits, and educational materials (Alexander 2002:7). This was evident in Kenya, where SAPs led to freezing on the employment of more teachers; poor quality of education; rationalized expenditure on education by spending less on teachers’ salaries resulting in poor pay for teachers; and commercialization of education: dual track, private sponsored students. (Action Aid International Kenya 2009:23). This contradicts the EFA goals and MDGs which recommends the recruitment of more teachers in order to meet the expected demand for free primary education. In this regard, attainment of universal primary education is challenged. Thus less teacher employment would mean high pupil teacher ratios and hence poor quality education. This was also experienced in Kenya; in 2003 the government implemented the Free Primary Education (FPE) reversing the cost sharing policy. The number of children who enrolled in Primary Schools rose from 5.9million to 7.2million pupils. In spite of this development, the Ministry of Education could not employ more teachers partly due to employment freeze. The freeze also meant that teachers who were no longer in service either due to retirement or death were not replaced (Action Aid International Kenya 2009:27-28).

Again privatization is expensive to implement. It brings with it several restructuring processes/activities that cost national governments billions. Amongst others privatization comes with the need for Technical Assistance such as training, scholarships, studies and technical advisors to help in the restructuring, designing and implementation of adjustment programmes. Aid money that comes to drive the process of privatization/SAPs is highly spent on paying for technical assistance instead of direct costs in the provision of education. In some countries, 100 days of consultancy bills cost the same as paying 100 teachers’ salaries for a year or keeping 5,000 children in school (Emmett 2005:75 cited in Ball and Youdell 2008:54). A study of Technical Assistance in Mozambique found that rich countries were spending a total of $350million per year on 3,500 technical experts, while 100,000 Mozambican public sector workers were paid a total of just $75million (Emmett 2005:75 cited in Ball and Youdell 2008:54). This means that education projects and services such as construction of school blocks are delayed; teachers’ salaries are low, and hence leading to low quality of education. Such circumstances implies a challenge to the attainment of EFA goals and MDGs in the African context where the need is construction of more school blocks, recruitment of more teachers, good teacher salaries, (not technical assistance) in order to retain students. Thus diverting the focus of resources to technical assistance (policy programmes) means reduced enrolment and high dropout rates due to poor quality of education services. In Malawi, for instance, pupils fail to enroll in education system because schools are not located in their nearest areas. Often girls easily dropout of
primary school because of the long distance to schools. It even becomes difficult to build more schools when there are fewer teachers.\footnote{See Malawi Government (2008:110-115) Karonga District; Socio-Economic Profile}
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