ISSN (Online): 3007-1038 ● Pages: 155–170 ● DOI: 10.62997/rl.2024.31052 ● https://regionallens.com ● © The Author(s) 2024

Comparative Analysis of Educational Quality in Privatized-Public Schools Under the Public-Private Partnership Program and Low-Performing Public Schools in District Gujranwala

Mishal Siyab [1] **Saira** [2] **Muhammad Ghafoor** [3]

Abstract: The study, Comparative Analysis of Educational Quality in Privatized-Public Schools Under the Public-Private Partnership Program and Low-Performing Public Schools in District Gujranwala, examines the effectiveness of the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) initiative in addressing educational challenges in low-performing public schools. Using a mixed-methods approach, data were collected through self-developed instruments, including the Scale for Evaluation of School Performance (SESP) and a checklist for physical facilities, and analyzed using descriptive statistics, t-tests, and qualitative interviews with parents. Quantitative findings revealed that privatized-public schools performed better in assessments, parent-teacher interaction, and co-curricular activities, enhancing students' development and parents' engagement. However, these schools lagged in teacher qualifications compared to low-performing public schools, which excelled in this area but struggled with inadequate infrastructure and resources. Gender parity among teaching staff was observed in both school types, with a higher proportion of female teachers. Qualitative data highlighted that parent of privatized-public school students appreciated financial relief, improved facilities, and increased stakeholder interaction, while parents of students in low-performing public schools expressed concerns about limited teacher engagement and poor communication regarding their children's progress. The findings underscore the strengths and weaknesses of both school types, emphasizing the need for targeted improvements in teacher training, infrastructure development, and community involvement. The study concludes that while PPP programs have made strides in enhancing assessment systems and stakeholder engagement, both privatized-public and low-performing public schools require strategic interventions to elevate overall educational quality.

Key Words: Educational Quality, Privatized-Public School, Public-Private Partnership Program, Low-Performing Public School, Education, Gujranwala

Introduction

The future of individuals and societies is determined by education. The concept of education is undoubtedly very crucial to the development of any nation. Punjab government responded to these challenges through PPP in the education sector with the vision to emphasize the standards of the education system and attain the goal of universal primary education. To improve the quality of education, the government has privatized public schools by working alongside private entities (Public School Support Program (PSSP) the Punjab Education Foundation (PEF). In particular, this initiative is designed to help fill the gaps in performance that are observable in countless public schools (especially in low-performing areas) (Malik, 2010).

This study is warranted due to the increasing significance of these PPP initiatives in enhancing educational outcomes. Although the merits and demerits of PPPs in education have been discussed widely, not much has been said about the impact of such partnerships in the context of Pakistan. The present study aims to analyze the educational

[1] PhD Scholar, Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: mishal.siyab@gmail.com
[2] Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: drsaira.ijaz@uog.edu.pk
[3] PhD Scholar, Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: muhammad.ghafoor@uog.edu.pk

Citation: Siyab, M., Saira., & Ghafoor, M. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Educational Quality in Privatized-Public Schools Under the Public-Private Partnership Program and Low-Performing Public Schools in District Gujranwala. *Regional Lens, 4*(1), 155-170. https://doi.org/10.62997/rl.2024.31052

Corresponding Author: Mishal Siyab (✉ mishal.siyab@gmail.com)

standards in privatized-public school under the Public-Private Partnership program in the District Gujranwala and compare it with low-performance public schools. The concern is to evaluate the extent to which educational quality has increased and what role the public-private partnership policy plays in this process.

The significance of this study, therefore, is that it seeks for the role of PPP in improving education, and whether it has failed or fared. The findings may serve as a framework for guiding future policy choices or offer suggestions for continuation, assessment and improvement of PPP endeavors. Furthermore, it could have its own potential significance in adding to existing literature on education reforms in Pakistan, especially in the context of privatized-public schools and their efficacy in enhancing educational outcomes (Kanwal et al., 2023).

Statement of the Problem

With the rising worldwide demand for quality of education, the government of Punjab has solicited the involvement of private sector organizations and companies in the provision of low-cost quality education and this has been professionally managed under the framework of Public-Private Partnership Program to enhance standards of education in public schools. The question remains whether this partnership has addressed the educational challenges in low-performing public schools. Given the dearth of detailed statistical examination of the outcomes of this policy, it is worth looking closely at its impact on educational quality. The goal of this study was to provide the first independent comparison of educational quality in privatized-public schools versus low performing public schools, in order to assess the extent to which the public-private partnership policy is succeeding in driving the education system towards better performance.

Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted with the following objectives:

1. To study the educational quality of privatized-public schools under Public Private Partnership Program and low achieving public schools.
2. Tout the educational quality of privatized-public schools under Public Private Partnership program as compared to low performing public schools.

Research Questions

The study address the following research questions:

1. what educational level does privatized-public schools operate?
2. How much education do students from low performing public schools receive?

Research Hypothesis

H2o: Growing argument of not much difference in educational quality between privatized-public schools and low performing public schools?

Significance of the Study

The results of this study will therefore contribute to the available evidence concerning the role of the Public-Private Partnership Program in improving quality of education. The findings have the potential to guide policy decisions into the future and provide a platform for additional implementation, evaluation, and refinement of such partnerships. Furthermore, this research will provide to the body of studies available in the academic literature regarding education reforms in Pakistan and offer practical recommendations for better educational outcomes in the schools that are under the public and privatized-public domain.

Scope of the Study

Population of the study was delimited to the identified Privatized-Public Schools at primary level under Public School Support Program (PSSP) model under Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) and their equivalent low performing public schools of tehsil Gujranwala and tehsil Wazirabad, District Gujranwala Punjab, Pakistan.

Review of Related Literature

Educational quality comparison: privatized-public school (for education sector) under PPP (public-private partnership) program vs low-performing public school is an emerging research area, especially in developing countries. The review discusses educational quality, the nature and function of privatized-public schools under their PPP model, and the forces that shaped low-performing public schools. It looks specifically at the effects of these factors on the performance of students, active teaching practices and overall educational outcomes in District Gujranwala, Pakistan.

Educational Quality: Public and private schools

Educational quality is also frequently determined as it relates to student outcomes alone in terms of academic performance, skill acquisition, and overall school achievement (Bibi & Aftab, 2021). As an example, public schools are funded by the government where multiple issues like underfunding, lack of infrastructure as well as inadequate teacher training can be often faced that can lead to adverse impact on the quality of education (Rashid & Mukhtar, 2012). On the other hand, private schools often have better infrastructure, smaller class sizes, and more resources (Ansari, 2021). On the other hand, private schools might be criticized for perpetuating social inequalities, because higher education expenses limit accessibility for low-income students (Parveen et al., 2021).

Public-Private Partnerships Office in Education

Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) have proven to be a viable solution to the issue of insufficient resources in the education sector, especially in developing nations such as Pakistan. Through the PPP model, the government works with the private sector to manage and run schools, with the objective of enhancing the quality of education through improved resource management, curriculum development, and teacher training programs (Kabir, 2023). One of the key institutions managing the PPP program in the Pakistan is the Punjab Education Foundation (PEF), which aims to upsurge the quality of education of government school by associating with the private suppliers (Ansari, 2024). The collaborative efforts have proven helpful in enhancing the enrollment rates of students, teaching techniques and infrastructure (Bano, 2008).

Effect of PPP on Quality of Education

The PPP model has been shown to positively impact upon educational quality in terms of provision of infrastructure and more effective teaching styles. For example, Bibi and Aftab (2021) found that PPP schools in urban Punjab demonstrated much better student performance compared to public schools. These institutions benefited from improved teacher training, updated teaching methodologies, and more effective resource utilization, resulting in increased student engagement and learning outcomes (Kabir, 2023). Yet PPP models have had mixed success: Some PPPFI schools have faced challenges of accountability, teacher turnover and limited community engagement (Ansari, 2021).

Challenges within Low-Performing Public Schools

These schools generally struggle with large class sizes, lack of trained teachers, scarcity of learning resources, and poor infrastructure (Rashid & Mukhtar, 2012). All of these lead to lousy education (e.g., low student achievement, high dropout rates, and low teacher morale). According to Parveen et al. (2021), in low-performing public schools, teachers are often unmotivated with limited training to help create the academic needs of students. Moreover, every other school that faces the above pressures does not have management and accountability structures in the absence of which the challenges multiply (Bano, 2008).

Applying the school-facing data to the national model, while not holding these schools accountable in the same way, can reveal whether or not the PPP schools are generally better or worse than similar public schools. The comparisons between PPP schools and low-performing public schools show a large gap in educational quality. In PPP schools, the added efficiencies of private businesses, better management, and enhanced infrastructure greatly improve quality and tracking, while low-performing public schools show stagnant progress with cyclical issues, including low budgets and poor training for teachers (Bibi & Aftab, 2021). Ansari (2024) also argue that, in recent years, the

implementation of the PPP model in the educational sector has successfully narrowed some of the educational quality gaps, especially in rural and disadvantaged areas by improving access to quality resources and better management practices. Under PPP, schools are now heavily reliant upon the private sector for its functioning, winning their allegiance at the cost of the country's educational policies (for example)' Ansari (2021) further analyzed the sustainability of such schools and their relationship with the overarching educational policies of the government.

The meta-analysis has revealed significant distinctions in educational quality among privatized-public schools under the PPP program and low-performing public schools in District Gujranwala in Pakistan. Although PPP schools do have higher infrastructure, teacher quality, and student performance levels across the board, low-performing public schools still struggle to meet quality education standards. This gives a way to tackle the major concerns in public education regarding the large public sector and financial constraints faced by the public sector and private sector is successful in addressing public education concerns and can promote education.

Research Methodology

In this chapter, the researcher represented the methods used by her to explore the research problem. The intention of the researcher was to evaluate the school performance of privatized-public schools in comparison with low performing public schools. The study is conducted using mixed methods approach. The paradigm of the study is mixed methods research following embedded research design. Evaluation of schools involve three factors: educational equity, quality and social accountability. For this purpose, three instruments were developed and administrated by the researcher herself. These instruments include scale for evaluation of school performance, checklist for the availability and status of physical facilities provided to students from school along with interview protocols as qualitative part to know the opinion of school council members and parents about the performance of concerned school as representative of community. This chapter includes research design, population of the study, research sample, sampling technique, instrumentation and instrument validation, reliability of the scale, data collection and data analysis.

Research Design

The paradigm of the study is mixed methods research and conducted using mixed methods approach. Quan-qual model was followed using the embedded design. Study was based on the factors related to educational equity, quality and social accountability. These factors were further divided into sub-factors. Educational equity includes gender parity among students, gender parity among teachers and inclusiveness. Educational quality includes availability of physical facilities, qualification of teachers, quality of assessment and teachers' training workshops. Social accountability includes school council and monitoring mechanism. All the factors and sub factors were collected using quantitative paradigm through scale for evaluation of school performance and checklist while opinion of the sub factor of physical facilities was designed to gather information qualitatively through observation in order to remove any biasness at the behalf of respondents and ensuring transparency.

Population

The population of the study was all privatized public schools and low performing public schools of tehsil Wazirabad, tehsil city and tehsil saddar of Gujranwala district. Where privatized-public schools include those schools working under public school Support program (PSSP) initiated by Punjab Education Foundation (PEF). In 2018, PSSP was evolved as Punjab Education Initiative and Management Authority (PEIMA). The number of privatized-public schools in above mentioned tehsiles is 78. So, the population falls under the privatized-public schools' category is also 78. Whereas low performing public schools are those schools which are categorized on the basis of poor performance in the 5th grade PEC result of the year 2014.Here poor result means schools having at least one fail student or at least one student passed in the exam with *. The low performing public school's category has a population of 34 schools. Collectively

both categories contain 112 schools in the respective area. No. of schools against each category has been mentioned in the table given below.

Table 1

Population of the Study

S. No.	Schools	Population
1	No. of Privatized-public schools	78
2.	No. of low performing primary schools	34

Source: School education department, Gujranwala district

Research Sample

The sample of the study was 19 privatized-public schools falls in the category of public- private partnership program under the umbrella of Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) in Gujranwala district, Punjab Pakistan and 19 low performing public schools. The sample of 19 schools was selected with the help of purposive sampling technique and maintains equal number of 19 against each category for comparison purpose. Respondents were head teachers at each school. No. of schools against each category has been mentioned in the table given below:

Table 2

Sample of the Study

S. No.	Schools	Sample
1	No. of Privatized-public schools	19
2.	No. of low performing primary schools	19

Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling technique was used by the researcher to select the sample. There were 34 low performing public schools among which 19 schools were selected. Researcher has selected this number using a criterion. This criterion includes schools having 5 or more than 5 students with * in the 5th grade result of PEC for the year 2014. The researcher has also selected 19 schools using purposive sampling in the other category of privatized-public schools to maintain equal number for comparison purpose.

Instrumentation

The researcher has used two types of instruments to gather information regarding the topic. Instruments include "Scale for Evaluation of School Performance" (SESP) and a checklist to measure the availability & status of physical facilities in the relevant schools. Both of the instruments were developed by the researcher herself with the help of literature and in the guidance of supervisor. English language was used in both tools. Statements were made precise, simple and easy to comprehend for the respondents. Expert opinion was taken to validate the instruments.

Scale for Evaluation of School Performance

A questionnaire initially consisted of 41 statements was developed by researcher. After expert opinion it was finally merged into 38 statements along with demographic information. Questionnaire was named as scale for evaluation of school performance. Statements were followed by 4-point Likert type scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). It comprised of total 3 factors and 8 sub-factors; two of the sub-factors are included as demographic information to ultimately find out the gender parity among students and gender parity among teachers according to the formula of gender parity index given by UNESCO. Statements were prepared following remaining 6 factors. Details of the instrument are given in the following table:

Table 3

Details of Scale for Evaluation of School Performance

Factors	Sub-factors	No of items	Sample Items
Educational quality	Qualification of teachers	4	B.Ed. is compulsory for teachers' induction at your school.
	Quality of assessment	6	Teachers actively supervise daily classroom activities of students.
	Teachers' training work shops	5	Teachers' attendance at in-service training workshops is ensured.

Checklist for Physical Facilities

Researcher developed a checklist to quantitatively assess the availability and status of physical facilities through observation in the relevant school. Availability of physical facilities is a sub factor of educational quality. The checklist was divided into two categories namely, infrastructure facilities and support facilities. Each category has items followed by a status range from 1 to 3; Where 1 for not available, 2 for insufficient and 3 for Sufficient. Format of the checklist is given below.

Table 4

Checklist for Physical Facilities

Types of Facilities	No. of items
Infrastructure facilities	13
Support facilities	13

Instrument Validation

In order to measure the validity of both instruments' researcher requested the panel of experts for their valuable opinion. The consent of the respected experts was taken. Content validity ratio (CVR) was calculated against each item of questionnaire to decide about the retention of items. Necessary changes were made by researcher in the light of feedback given by experts. Initially 41 items were made which were then merged into 38 and several were rephrased. Checklist was initially comprising of two options (not available, available) for status against each item which was later expanded into three (not available, insufficient and sufficient).

According to Lawshe's one Tailed test table, 0.75 is the acceptable value of CVR according to 8 panelists (Allahyari et al., 2010). The highlighted statements in the table from item no. 18 to 21 were merged in a single statement against scale of frequency as per guided by supervisor and experts where scale of frequency includes.

i. Annually =1
ii. Biannually =2
iii. Quarterly =3
iv. Monthly =4

Following the criterion provided by Lawshe in 1975, the researcher accepted the statements undoubtedly having CVR above than or equal to 0.75. For those statements having CVR value less than 0.75 the researcher shifted towards mean value. Hence statement number 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34,35 and 38 were accepted undoubtedly based on their CVR value. While for statement number 4, 5, 9, 15, 26, 36 and 37 researchers shifted towards the mean values which were equal to or above than 1.5. Therefore, total number of statements retained as 38.

CVI= 31.25/38 = 0.82

The content validity index of the questionnaire is 0.82, according to Lynn it is excellent (Lynn).

Piloting of the Instrument

The researcher has piloted the questionnaire on ten schools; five were selected from privatized-public schools and five from low performing public schools. Respondents were head teachers at the respective schools. The researcher has computed the mean, standard deviation and Cronbach alpha coefficient against each factor and that of overall instrument to ensure the reliability of the instrument. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of SESP was .85 that ensured the reliability of the instrument because the satisfactory value of reliability coefficient is 0.50.

Data Collection

Data were collected from 19 privatized-public schools and 19 low performing public schools of tehsil Wazirabad, tehsil city and tehsil saddar of Gujranwala district. Data were collected using two instruments which includes a questionnaire to be filled by the head teachers at the respective schools and a checklist to be filled by the researcher herself through observation. Research ethics were maintained by the researcher. Consent of the head teachers was taken. Privacy was maintained. Necessary information was given to the respondents. All the schools included in the sample were visited by the researcher herself. The data collection process was continued for a time period of five months because of unfavorable conditions owing to covid-19 scenario and frequent closure of schools by government of Punjab.

Scoring Procedure

As, researcher has developed two instruments, so the scoring criteria of both instruments differ which is explained below.

Scoring Procedure of SESP

Scales for evaluation of school performance was developed on four-point Likert scale ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Here,

1. Strongly disagree (SD) is for 1point.
2. Disagree (D) for 2 points.
3. Agree (A) for 3 points.
4. And strongly agree (SA) for 4 points

Scoring Procedure for Checklist

Checklist developed by researcher was divided into two categories: infrastructure facilities and support facilities. Each category contains 13 items, and each item was followed by three options for evaluating the status of physical facilities. For scoring the availability of items, status ranges from not available to sufficient as.

1. Not available = 1
2. Insufficient = 2
3. Sufficient = 3

Data Analysis

Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the data collected with the help of both instruments. To find out the answers to research questions descriptive and inferential statistics were applied. In order to measure the level of school performance in terms of educational equity, educational quality and social accountability at the schools of both categories mean and standard deviation was calculated. Moreover, independent sample t-test was applied to compare the performance of schools regarding respective factors and sub-factors.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

In this chapter, data collection and interpretation on the basis of the data collected will be discussed by researcher. The research analyzed the school performance of privatized-public schools and how they compared with low performing public schools. Two self-developed instruments developed by the researcher were used for the process of data

collection in order to accomplish the research objective. These instruments are Scale for Evaluation of school Performance (SESP) and checklist for availability of physical facilities.

Statistical Tests Conducted for Research Queries

SPSS software was used to analyze the date obtained from both instruments by researcher. The statistical tests performed for each research question and research objectives are provided below:

Table 5

Research Questions and their Relevant Statistical Tests

Research Objectives	Research Questions	Statistical Tests
3-To examine the educational quality in privatized-public schools under Public Private Partnership Program and low performing public schools.	What is the extent of educational quality in privatized-public schools?	Mean and standard deviation.
	What is the extent of educational quality at low performing public schools?	Mean and standard deviation.
4-To compare the educational quality of privatized-public schools under Public Private Partnership program against low performing public schools.	H2o: There is no significant difference in educational quality at privatized-public schools and low performing public schools?	Independent sample t-test.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Data analysis according to research questions is given below.

Research Objective 03: To examine the educational quality in privatized-public schools under Public Private Partnership Program and low performing public schools.

Research Question No. 03: What is the extent of educational quality in privatized-public schools?

Table 6

Educational Quality at Privatized-Public Schools

Educational Quality	N	Mean	S. D
Qualification of teachers	19	1.76	0.88
Quality of assessment	19	3.20	0.42
Teachers' training workshops	19	2.63	0.34
Quality of physical infrastructure	19	1.92	0.27
	19	2.18	0.21

Table 6 demonstrated the descriptive statistics of educational equity at privatized-public schools. Showed the number of respondents was 19 and the factors of educational equity were 4. The minimum value was 1.76 and the maximum value was 3.20. Mean of qualification of teachers (M = 1.76, S.D = 0.88), quality of assessment (M = 3.20, S.D = 0.42), teachers' training workshops (M = 2.63, S.D = 0.34), quality of physical infrastructure (M = 1.92, S.D = 0.27). So, it was concluded that the educational quality was average in privatized-public schools.

Table 7

Gender Parity among Teachers at Privatized-Public Schools

Educational equity	Net Female Employs	Net Male Employs	Gender Parity Index
Gender Parity among teachers	56	22	2.54

Table 7 shows that gender parity index of teachers at privatized-public school is 2.54 which indicate gender parity in favor of female teachers as it is greater than 1.

Research Question No. 04: What is the extent of educational quality at low performing public schools?

Table 8

Educational Quality at Low Performing Public Schools

Educational Quality		N	Mean	S. D
Qualification of teachers		19	3.92	0.25
Quality of assessment		19	3.50	0.28
Teachers' training workshops		19	2.85	0.35
Quality of physical infrastructure	Infrastructure facilities	19	1.65	0.23
	Support facilities	19	2.25	0.18

Table 8 demonstrated the descriptive statistics of educational equity at low performing public schools. Showed the number of respondents was 19 and the factors of educational equity were 5. The minimum value was 1.65 and the maximum value was 3.92. Mean of qualification of teachers (M = 1.3.92, S.D = 0.25), quality of assessment (M = 3.50, S.D = 0.28), teachers' training workshops (M = 2.85, S.D = 0.35), infrastructure facilities (M = 1.65, S.D = 0.23), support facilities (M = 2.25, SD = 0.18). So, it was concluded that the educational quality was average in low performing public schools.

Table 9

Gender Parity among Teachers at Low Performing Public Schools

Educational Equity	Net Female Employs	Net Male Employs	Gender Parity Index
Gender Parity among teachers	44	21	2.09

Table 9 shows that gender parity index of teachers at low performing public school is 2.09 which indicate gender parity in favor of female teachers as it is greater than 1.

Research Objective 04: To compare the educational quality of privatized-public schools under Public Private Partnership program against low performing public schools.

Hypothesis 02 (H2o): There is no significant difference in educational quality at privatized-public schools and low performing public schools?

Table 10

Comparison of Educational Quality in Privatized-Public Schools and Low Performing Public Schools

Educational Quality	N		Mean		S.D.		M.D.	Df	T-Value	Sig (2 Tailed)	Eta2
	PPS	LPPS	PPS	LPPS	PPS	LPPS					
Qualification of teacher	19	19	1.76	3.92	.887	.250	-2.16	36	.10.19	.000	0.74
Quality of assessment	19	19	3.20	3.50	.425	.285	-0.3	36	-2.162	.014	0.11
Teachers' training workshops	19	19	2.63	2.85	.348	.351	-0.22	36	-1.947	.059	0.09

Table 10 shows that an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the educational quality in privatized-public schools and low performing public schools. There was no significant difference in qualification of teachers scores from privatized-public schools (M = 1.76, SD = .887) and low performing public schools (M = 3.92, SD = .250) t = .10.19, p < .001, (two tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means of privatized public schools and low performing public schools was -2.16. The eta squared static (0.74) indicated a large effect size. There was no significant difference in quality of assessment scores from privatized-public schools (M = 3.20, SD = .425) and low performing public schools (M = 3.50, SD = .285) t = -2.162, p < .001, (two tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the

means of privatized public schools and low performing public schools was -0.3. The eta squared static (0.11) indicated a large effect size. There was no significant difference in teachers' training workshops scores from privatized-public schools (M = 2.63, SD = .348) and low performing public schools (M = 2.85, SD = .351) t = -1.947, p < .001, (two tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means of privatized public schools and low performing public schools was -0.22. The eta squared static (0.09) indicated a large effect size.

By comparing table 7 and 8, we came to know that both offers gender parity in favor of female teachers. The value is slightly greater at privatized-public schools. Hence privatized-public schools offer more women empowerment as employs as compared to low performing public schools.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Interview protocol Social Accountability "A": For Parents of those studying at Privatized-Public Schools

Interview Question 1: How was your experience regarding your child at Privatized Public School?

The emergent themes for interview question 1 were that parents responded that we were much worried about our children; no educational institute was there before in the vicinity where they can send their child the one which was available has no teaching staff and lacks proper academics but now, we can freely interact with staff at privatized-public schools. These schools ease their financial burden.

As one of the parents responded.

"We were much worried to drop our children at schools far away in this way our livelihood disturbs, and we can't afford these expenses, so we prefer to take our child along with us to Bricks Company for work but now we can easily send our child to school where he gets free education and facilities like free books and stationery etc. Now we are free of financial burden."

Another mother responded that:

"Before, this the old school has only one teacher so children lack proper attention. This forces me to take my elder child to another school but now my two daughters are attending privatized public school in our village they have proper teaching staff. I'm easy and feel free to interact with staff members at any time and regarding any issue."

A few parents responded:

"We are happy to have such opportunity at our doorstep. It's make easy and safe for our children to attend school safely and economically"

Table 11

Experience of Parents Regarding their Child at Privatized-Public Schools

Themes	Frequency
Free education and educational facilities	3
Relaxation of financial burden	4
Proper teaching staff	3
Parent-teacher interaction	3
Safe and economical	2

Table 11 shows that highest frequency was of the parents how report that privatized-public schools ease their financial burden. Majority reports their experience of proper staff and interaction with stakeholders and a few reports it as safe and economic opportunity.

Interview Question 2: Does privatize public school affects your child performance? How is performance affected?

The emergent themes for interview question 2 were that parents responded that privatized-public schools offer parent-teacher meeting frequently, so they are satisfied and aware of their child activities and school performance. Their schools organize co-curricular activities which enhances child physical development. School administration invites parents at

different ceremonies which develops their interest in school and child as well. School arranges Celebration of traditional events, and we are happy to see these efforts, this also helps gain good marks. A very few parents were illiterate and unaware of their child performance. As one of the parents responded:

"I know nothing; I am illiterate. I just send my child to school at morning and went for livelihood. All is known by the teacher and the child."

Another parent responded:

"I personally visit school every month and I'm happy with the staff for reporting the performance of my child properly. Games and events organized by school help in the physical development of my child."

A few parents responded:

"School calls proper parent-teacher meeting and reports grades of my child."

Table 12

Effects On Child Performance at Privatized-Public Schools

Themes	Frequency
Awareness of children activities	4
Physical development	2
Parents interest	3
Knowledge of traditions	2
Good grades	2
Unaware	2

Table 12 shows that highest frequency was of the parents who were aware of their child performance at schools. Most of the parents reported increased interaction of parents and teachers this enhances good grades. Majority reported physical and cognitive development due to curricular and co-curricular activities. Whereas just two parents reports that they are unaware being illiterate.

Interview protocol Social Accountability "B": For Parents of those studying at Low Performing Public schools.

Interview Question 1: How was your experience regarding your child at Public School?

The emergent themes for interview question 1 were that parents responded that although there is no fee in the school but only one to two teachers are available. Education at public schools is economical but lacks attention.

Few parents responded:

"There is no fee. We have no financial burden; the school is at our doorstep."

One of the fathers responded:

"There is no interaction between parents and teachers. This adds to unawareness."

One of the mothers responded:

"Just two teachers are there for the whole, who engage students for their households."

Table 13

Experience of Parents Regarding their Child at Low Performing Public Schools

Themes	Frequency
Free education	4
Relaxation of financial burden	4
Less teaching staff	3
Low parent-teacher interaction	3
Economical	2

Above mentioned table 13 shows that education is free and easy to gain at low performing public schools but teaching staff is low in number and mostly parents report low interaction between parents and teachers.

Interview Question 2: Does public school affect your child performance? How is performance affected?
Emergent themes from question no. 2 are unawareness of parents about their child activities. Parents reported that no formative assessment is reported which ultimately causes lack of interest in parents. No one is accountable and responsible.
A few reported:
"We just send our children to school, there teachers know their academics."
One of the parents reported.
"No one is accountable and responsible; teachers and students can off from school whenever they want. How we know about our child performance if there is zero interaction of parents and teachers."
A mother responded:
"Result is reported just annually, and we came to know that our child is promoted to next grade."

Table 14

Effects on Child Performance at Low Performing Public Schools

Themes	Frequency
Unawareness of children activities	4
Annual reporting	4
Lack of parent's interest	2
Teachers' dependency	2
Lack of Physical Activities	2
Low attendance	1

Table 14 shows that highest frequency was of the parents who were unaware of formative assessment; this causes lack of interest in parents. Total teachers' dependency was reported by most of the parents. A very few parents report Low attendance.

Comparison of Interview protocol Social Accountability "A" and "B"

By comparing the results of interview protocol containing experience of parents regarding their child at privatized-public schools and low performing public schools we came to know that privatized-public schools are performing better in terms of parent-teacher interaction, formative assessment and co-curricular activities which enhances students' development and parents' interest.

Findings

Quantitative Findings

- There was no significant difference in qualification of teachers scores from privatized-public schools ($M = 1.76$, $SD = .887$) and low performing public schools ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .250$) $t = .10.19$, $p < .001$, (two tailed). There was no significant difference in quality of assessment scores from privatized-public schools ($M = 3.20$, $SD = .425$) and low performing public schools ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .285$) $t = -2.162$, $p < .001$, (two tailed). There was no significant difference in teachers' training workshops scores from privatized-public schools ($M = 2.63$, $SD = .348$) and low performing public schools ($M = 2.85$, $SD = .351$) $t = -1.947$, $p < .001$, (two tailed).

Qualitative Findings

- The highest frequency was of the parents how report that privatized-public schools ease their financial burden. Majority reports their experience of proper staff and interaction with stakeholders and a few reports it as safe and economic opportunity. The highest frequency was of the parents who were aware of their child performance at

schools. Most of the parents reported increased interaction of parents and teachers this enhances good grades. Majority reported physical and cognitive development due to curricular and co-curricular activities. Whereas just two parents report that they are unaware being illiterate.

- Education is free and easy to gain at low performing public schools but teaching staff is low in number and mostly parents report low interaction between parents and teachers.
- The highest frequency was of the parents who were unaware of formative assessment; this causes lack of interest in parents. Total teachers' dependency was reported by most of the parents. A very few parents report Low attendance.
- By comparing the results of interview protocol containing experience of parents regarding their child at privatized-public schools and low performing public schools we came to know that privatized-public schools are performing better in terms of parent-teacher interaction, formative assessment and co-curricular activities which enhances students' development and parents' interest.

Discussion

The focus of the current study was to assess the performance of this type of institution on school delivery in terms of the level of education (quality of educational offering) as well as the adequacy of physical facilities in comparison to low-performing public schools. The data was collected using a combination of self-developed instrumentation such as: Scale for Evaluation of School Performance (SESP) and a checklist prepared for the availability of physical facilities. SPSS software was used to perform the analyses, which included descriptive statistics and independent-samples t-test. Next, we discuss the findings based on the quantitative and qualitative data analyses.

The initial focus of the research objectives was to investigate educational quality in the privatized-public schools operating under the auspices of the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) program and low-performing public schools. Table 4.4 details that the overall educational quality in public schools that were privatized was around the average level, with classroom teacher qualification ($M = 1.76$, $SD = 0.88$) as the factor considered the lowest. However, both the property budget and teacher quality (mean = 3.20, $SD = 0.42$) were rated a step higher, indicating that like resources and the description process, the assessment process in privatized-public schools is established compared to other measures such as teacher qualifications or physical infrastructure. Similar studies have found that privatized schools tend to have more structured assessment procedures, but some have also struggled with teacher qualifications and infrastructure (Languille, 2017; Kumari, 2016)

However, comparing educational quality between privatized-public schools and low-performing public schools, the results further show that the quality of private-public schools was also average at low-performing public schools. Particularly, qualification of teachers ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.25$) was significantly higher than privatized-public schools. The only item that scored poorly was infrastructure quality ($M = 1.65$, $SD = 0.23$), which is a common challenge in poorly funded public schools (Tarabini, 2010). It seems clear that even though low-performing public schools may have access to a greater concentration of qualified teaching professionals, their overall educational experience may be severely hindered by a lack of resources, facilities and staff.

One of the most interesting findings from this study is the gender balance of teaching staff at both types of the schools. I was 2.54 at privatized-public schools (Table 7) and 2.09 at low-performing public schools (Table 8). Both types of schools employ more female teachers than male teachers according to these indices, though privatized-public schools are slightly less skewed in terms of gender balance. Related with recent studies showing greater participation of women in some states of the education sectors of developing countries (Le & Nguyen, 2021). Moreover, the results illustrate the possibilities for women's empowerment of women in the education system, especially in privatized-public schools.

With respect to hypothesis related to the quality of education between privatized-public schools and low performing public schools The results show in (table 10) an independent-samples t-test that there were significant

differences between the two school types with regard the teacher qualifications, the quality of assessment and teachers training workshops. 厨棍- Specifically, privatized-public schools (M = 1.76, SD = 0.88) offered significantly less qualified teachers than low-performing public schools (M = 3.92, SD = 0.25); the implication here is that the privatizing process may not guarantee per se qualified teachers are working in these types of institutions. However, privatized-public schools (M = 3.20, SD = 0.42) seemed to perform equally well as low-performing public schools (M = 3.50, SD = 0.28), meaning that assessment systems had strengths across both school types, but privatized-public institutions typically have a better-defined system for assessment.

The public schools with poor performance, on the other hand, performed better in teacher training workshops (M = 2.85, SD = 0.35), demonstrating a greater emphasis on professional development. However, the quality of education in both school types was negatively impacted by poor infrastructure and resource availability, which is still a major issue for both school sectors (Chaudhury et al., 2021). The Alternate Reality of Public Education: Privatized-Public Schools vs. Low Performing Public Schools This is a Dual-Lens Perspective of What Happens when Parents Take the Bull by the Horns and Lead the Way Unlike School Reformers Who Depoliticized Education.

Qualitative data, collected from parents in interviews yielded important observations and lessons learned to inform parents who had land in the privatized-public or low-performing public school system. As shown in Table 13, in the case of privatized-public schools, many parents experienced that they were offered to free of cost education, good educational facilities, and improved parent-teacher contact. A common theme was when financial burdens were alleviated; parents enjoyed free books, stationary and going to school nearby. This is consistent with what we observe from past studies which highlight that PPP programs reduce the expenditure on education for families with low-income (Languille, 2017; Kumari, 2016).

Parents of kids in low-performing public schools, meanwhile, expressed concerns about not having teachers engage with their children enough or that their children might be being taught by too few teachers. Such disengagement between the parent, and the teachers resulted in a gap for the parents in terms of knowing their child's academic performance. The interviews suggested that beyond the end of year report, many parents were unable to ascertain their children's progress (Table 13), echoing findings on the nature of communication and accountability in the public school system (Tarabini, 2010). These results underscore the fact that it is not always straightforward to compare privatized-public schools to low-performing public schools. This includes privatized-public schools that boast superior infrastructure and systems of assessment, which still fail in terms of factors such as teacher qualifications and infrastructure. Low-performing public schools, on the other hand, can have high-quality teachers who are extremely well qualified but are starved for other resources and parent-teacher carryover. The results indicated that both categories of educational institutions possess their unique strengths and disadvantages, and additional efforts in the areas of teacher training, infrastructure development, and community involvement are necessary to improve education standards in both sectors.

Conclusion

These results lend important insight into the educational quality of not only privatized-public schools but also low-performing public schools. Interestingly, there were pronounced differences between the two school types in terms of different factors associated with the quality of education.

The research revealed that assessment represents the highest quality of education in privatized-public schools, followed by teachers' training workshops and infrastructure quality. At the same time, teacher qualifications received a lower score, indicating that there is still space for better teacher education and development. Interestingly, this gender parity was weighted towards female teachers, meaning there are fewer male than female teachers in the workforce.

On the other hand, low-achieving public schools showed another picture of educational quality. Major strengths identified in the study were teacher quality and assessment practices. Participants rated both as high scoring. Moderate strengths fell under teacher training workshops and support facilities available to students. Still, infrastructure facilities in these schools were not on a par, which is the most critical area for improvement. Like the private-public schools,

the NPS schools had a gender balance among teachers biased toward females, a finding that echoed across school types.

Several recommendations can be put forward based on these conclusions. First, we need to focus on raising the quality of teachers in both privatized-public and low-performing public schools to raise the education standard generally. Infrastructure: Although infrastructure was a key theme for lower-performing public schools, boosting investment in school infrastructure and support services will help create ideal teaching and learning conditions. Teacher training workshops should also be a priority so that both teachers and school administration staff can receive professional updates on a regular basis. Lastly, keeping gender parity for educators should always be a concern to keep our education system equal and diverse.

References

Ansari, A. (2021). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Punjab's Public Private Partnership Programmes in Education* (Doctoral dissertation).

Ansari, A. H. (2024). Bridging the gap? Evaluating the effectiveness of Punjab's public–private partnership programmes in education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *125*(102325), 102325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102325

Bano, M. (2008). Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) as 'anchor'of educational reforms: lessons from Pakistan. *Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2009*.

Bibi, M., & Aftab, R. (2021). Comparative analysis of public and private schools in the perspective of quality education. *International Journal of Policy Studies*, *1*(1). https://www.ijpstudies.com/index.php/ijps/article/view/14

Chaudhury, N., Hammer, J. S., Kremer, M., Muralidharan, K., & Rogers, F. H. (2021). *Missing in action: Teacher and health worker absence in developing countries*. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 35*(3), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.35.3.1

Kabir, M. (2023). *Public-Private Partnership Schools in Punjab: Is there a Learning Premium that can be Explained by Management Practices?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto (Canada)).

Kanwal, A., Kamran, F., & Rafiq, S. (2023). Perceptions of teachers on government school privatization in Punjab, Pakistan. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *39*(4), 404-419. https://doi.org/10.51380/gujr-39-04-02

Kumari, J. (2016). Public–private partnerships in education: An analysis with special reference to Indian school education system. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *47*, 47-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.11.017

Languille, S. (2017). Public Private partnerships in education and health in the global South: a literature review. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, *33*(2), 142-165. https://doi.org/10.1080/21699763.2017.1307779

Le, K., & Nguyen, M. (2021). How education empowers women in developing countries. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, *21*(2), 511-536. https://doi.org/10.1515/bejeap-2020-0046

Malik, A. B. (2010). *Public-private partnerships in Education: Lessons learned from the Punjab Education Foundation* (Vol. 309). Asian Development Bank.

Parveen, K., Phuc, T. Q. B., Shafiq, M., & Wei, T. X. (2021). Identifying the administrative challenges encountered by the principals in low-performing public secondary schools of Faisalabad District, Pakistan. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, *4*(1), 5-16. http://www.humanistudies.com/ijhi/article/download/101/84

Rashid, K., & Mukhtar, S. (2012). Education in Pakistan: Problems and their solutions. *International journal of academic research in business and social sciences*, *2*(11), 332-343.

Tarabini, A. (2010). Education and poverty in the global development agenda: Emergence, evolution and consolidation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *30*(2), 204–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2009.04.009