Dr. Aamir Saeed
Miss Mahpara Shah
Mr. Ghalib Ata

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION REFORMS

Abstract

This article adopts a critical approach to analyze the higher eduction reforms in Pakistan. This is a comparative case study which selects one public and one private university and compares it with reference to three dimensions i.e. curriculum, faculty and research. Seen through the lens of isomorphism, it is found that public universities adopt those reforms either coercively and normatively while private universities adopt those reforms to gain legitimacy and sometimes justdue to competition pressures.However social construction theory enlightens us that these reforms are introduced by the IFIs to promote and globalize western capitalist ideology in rest of the world.

Introduction

The last quarter of twentieth century has seen exceptional propagation of globalization, triggered by the dominance of world capitalist system in the economic, administrative, cultural, political and intellectual demesne in most of the countries around the world. Purpose of globalization is to have identical rules and regulations across the institutions of the world so that institutions may benefit from the experiences of each other. It has been observed that most reforms first take place in developed societies after which they are adopted by the developing countries who simply learn from the lessons learnt by their developed counterparts. Reforms in developing countries are reflected in their contemporary restructurings adopted under the influence of globalization. It was further armored by the unseen pressures of advanced capitalist states, bourgeoisie market ideology and re-enforcement by the donor institutions like World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

Key ingredients of these reforms were enhancement of private sector, facilitation of market forces and encouragement of cross-national mobility of private capital. These reforms further encouraged developing countries to restructure their administrative systems into

more developmental oriented approach which ultimately gave birth to "developmental administration" (Haq,1996). This was further perpetuated through the provision of technical assistance, international experts, foreign trainings, administrative reforms and higher education by the institutions like World Bank, Inter-American Developmental Bank and international lender organizations (Mollis, 2001).The global agenda represents one of the prime features of the so-called "institutional globalization".

The Asiancountries whose ideology was hitherto based oncollectivism, and development were forced to adopt more business friendly policies, pro market ideology and neo-liberal mode of governance. This ideological shift has resulted in myriad of reform agendas, privatization, deregulation, public and private partnership, restricting the role of government and diversion of commercial role towards business fraternity and market forces.

According to (Rawat, 2009), the need to reform higher education became priority for policy makers in order to promote the concepts of market economy and neo-liberal economy. The growing essentials of neo liberal principles and suggestions made by WTO require a stringent configuration in every sector likewise of higher education programs that support welfare of society and economic production. According to World Bank, higher education went through remarkable reform agenda for finance and management of universities and other institutions with five themes: hegemony in demand of higher education, market orientation, fiscal pressures, demand for efficiency and quality, and demand for greater accountability (Johnstone, 1999).Many writings have been steered to gauge impression of so-called "international agenda for the internationalization and modernization of the higher education system" (Mollis & Tyler, 1997).

Study of higher education can be assayed from formulation to implementation at different levels. The analysis can be made either on the basis of global context of higher education and its influence on the recipients; or at the national levelwhere one can evaluate how education reform policies are perceived, formulated and implemented in public versus private universities,while these were taken, constructed and reformulated by different beneficiaries (stakeholders) at the institutional level (Silvestere, 2008).Different reforms were congregated in mission of adjusting national higher education systems to the requirements of worldwide economy and ultimately they replicated the reproduction of international capitalist agenda (Morrow&Torres, 1995).

Dynamics of higher education reforms implemented in different countries are undergoing the transition from a command to a market economy and from more socialistic to democratic government. These transitions in education sector have been fueled by political, social, and economic pressures. Education sector in developing countries are also influenced by the structural adjustment policies that emphasize on efficiency and effectiveness of education through decentralization, privatization, autonomy and deregulation.According to World Bank report, Higher Education in Developing countries has gone through three distinct phases: Expansion, Differentiation, and Knowledge Revolution.This 'knowledge revolution'became the instigator for educational reforms worldwide. Further universities were granted with structural autonomy and more efficient financial responsibility after the advent of the concept of New Public Management (NPM).NPM has inspired structural changes in university governance in many wayse.g. universities have started behaving as corporate bodies and facing competitive pressures for funding (Neave, 1997); universities have become more adaptive, entrepreneurial and innovative; and affiliation form of universities has been changing.

Public sector reforms, around the world, under so called New Public Management (NPM) are widespread and have much camaraderie throughout. These reforms were initiated from Anglo-American countries and being implemented by international organizations like (World Bank, UNDP, and IMF).These reforms portray different models, some are plagiarized and some are indigenously revealed. NPM, as major driver of these reforms was originated from convergence of two streams: managerialism and new institutional economics (Zia & Khan, 2012).These reforms under NPM started in Pakistan in 1990's and was voiced by 'Washington Consensus' of privatization, decentralization, autonomy and liberalization. A recent wave of these reforms focused on policy execution as a mean of socio-economic development. Subsequently, many agencies like NDMA (National Disaster Management Authority) and HEC (Higher Education Commission) have been created to enhance professionalism and efficiency.

Reforms, either governance or administrative, have to go through various modifications and adaptations in different eras and political regimes. University governance also went through various reforms throughout and went over period of *state-controlled governance, state-supervised governance and market oriented/entrepreneurial governance*. Soon after independence in

Pakistan,universities inherited colonial model in which university management was state-controlled. Post dependence model saw a mixture of colonial and bureaucratic characteristics. In late 1970's,universities also adopted political model, while from 1990's onwards, market oriented model was adopted by public and specifically private universities.Currently universities are following *competitive enterprising model*,where they are either adopting or adapting the amalgamation of collegial bureaucratic, political and enterprising models.

Zia & Khan (2012) is of the view that the reform effort in Pakistan was derailed because government's strategy of reforms offer false cures by merely playing the number games and just focusing on swanky things like digital libraries, virtual learning and internet access etc. It is crucial to discard the numerical games that have brought such praise to the Higher Education Commission. Governments should stop opening useless private institutions, stop rewarding worthless research and dishing out inoperable PhD's (Hoodbhoy, 2006).The task of university reforms has not actually instigated. There is need for genuine and not imported restructurings, with a strong political commitment, in administrative and organizational reforms(Virk, 1998). The dilemma with our reforms initiatives, by different governments are, that those reforms are originated through foreign agendas and adopted blindly through political and financial pressures. This notion is captured by researcher and explained through isomorphism and social construction theory. Study would focus on ideology and philosophy behind these reforms, and it would be explained through social construction theory more meritoriously.

Relevant Literature

There is a discernable shift in the ideology of Asian countries from collectivism, and developmentalism to more business friendly policies, pro market ideology and neo-liberal mode of governance which was impacted by various IFIs including IMF, World Bank etc. This ideological shift has resulted privatization, deregulation, public and private partnership, in restricting role of government and diversion of role towards business fraternity and market forces. In Asia, the pattern of governance has echoed the western model of university governance because of colonialism, as Pakistani universities inherited colonial model of governance (Altbach, 1998).According to Peterson, "the management of many institutions todayengross transforming accessible structures and procedure or mounting new ones to handle problems of institutional transformation and modernism, excellence

and value, and decline and fairness" (Peterson & Mets, 1987).While on the other hand, the forces of global internationalization, materialism, global ranking, capitalism, and consumerism have subjugated university autonomy and academic freedom. Publications and research are promoted by the universities just for sole reason of gaining global ranking and nothing else.NPM stimulated university governance reforms towards new horizon. Universities have become more flexible and changed to the entities that are more adaptive, innovative and entrepreneurial (Clark, 1998).Universities are more or less acting like corporate bodies and they have to compete for funds and better ratings(Neave, 1994).NPM reforms are seen to introduce more service and consumer orientation (Christensen, 2011), and resulted in greater percieved autonomy but at a price of increased social inequality and limited actual autonomy.Lastly,advent of greater autonomy and de-regulation has actually resulted in greater checks being imposed on universityin the name of quality assurance as happening in most public and private universities.

Local universities took cues from changes in international environment, but universities could have implemented those reforms which were analogous to historical, cultural and administrative context of the aforementioned universities.It is felt by the researcher that theory of evolution should be used to describe vigor and advent of this construct.The evolutionary approach holds that institutions face changes on a regular basis. These changes are *variations* that trigger deviation from normal routine which ultimately transformsthe conventional ways of handling processes. These variations then need to be *selected* through certain selection procedures. Selected variations are then implemented, which is stated as *retention*. For the understanding of variation, selection and retention, researcher has adopted institutional approach. Reforms travel from developed countries to developing ones.J.DiMaggio&W.Powell (1983). This phrasediscerns three reasons why organizations adopt changes (reforms). First of all, sometimes, organizations are formed to adopt prevailing recipes through law or regulations. This is *"coercive adoption"*. The second is *"normative coercion"*,which refer to the adoption of common norms, values, and networks as consequence of common professional groupings. The third one is *"mimetic adoption"*, whichrefers to a situation of great uncertainty when organizations try to emulate others, who are perceived to be prestigious and successful. This adoption is usually without much calculation. Adoption of any of these changes does not necessarily mean that it has been implemented properly.

Bureaucracies select these reforms due to pressures of funding and regulatory agencies and ultimately force universities to adopt these reforms. This is the selection criteria of a reform in most of the developing countries and is also the case in Pakistan as well. Subsequently, universities adopt these reforms that correspond with cultural, social and historical values, which are conferred by *retention*. This phenomenon is summarized as:

Theoretical Model: University governance Model

Reforms	Appliance of NPM transformed the way universities were being managed. It encouraged the percept of autonomy and efficient governance of universities. *(Formation of Rationalized Myths)*
Reforms Introduced at national level	Pressures from American government US-AID,UN,World Bank, and IMF pushed Pakistan to introduce university governance reforms echoing international educational trends.*(Contextualization and De-contextualization)*
Reforms adopted at organizational level	Pakistani academics were inspired by changed international trends. Pressures from foreign agencies pushed Pakistan to adopt these reforms. Pakistan introduced university governance reforms and HEC led and facilitated this process. Greater autonomy and subsidized control was witnessed by Pakistani universities.*(Coercive isomorphism, Mimetic isomorphism, and Normative isomorphism)*
Retention	Reforms were met with different responses during the course of implementation. Universities adopted those reforms which were in line with their administrative purposes and adapted them by their evolution.*(new institutionalism: Decoupling and path dependency)*

To observe and explain implementation of these reforms through isomorphism would be myopic.So, researcher is going to explore philosophy and reality of these reforms through social constructionist perspective as well.

Alternate Approach

Social constructionism is defined as some sort of radical anti-realism about reality (Mallon, 2007).The move to radical anti-realism is the central idea behind constructionism perspective-that human decisions and human culture wield insightful and unnoticed influence.

Whenever there is change, it is influenced by social constructionism, based on theme that reality is socially constructed through what powerful people say and do together. It challenges the assumption that changes in social arena naturally occur as are assumed to occur in natural arena. It identifies stark variation between social and natural phenomenon. The basis of difference lies in the various of characteristics and values of the objects in both arena. Natural phenomena like wood, metal, stars, magnetic field etc. have fixed, predictable characteristics/ values which are context free. On the contrary, the objects of social arena are humans, who are thinking beings, have intentions, values, emotions, which are not value/context free. One's freedom fighter is other's traitor; norms, values, believes, culture may vary (Bishop, 2003).Thus, as Focault () observes that, at one particular point in time, in certain space, there must be some culture which would be dominated and structured by the powerful to achieve its interests. That culture would be based on certain believes, ethical values/standards and unique assumptions different from other variations.So according to this point of view, same is the case with reforms based on free market ideology which originated in a specific time and space contextand were later exported to developing countries. International university governance reforms movement also left its impression on Pakistani universities as well. Local universities took cues from changes in international environment, but universities could implement those reforms which were corresponding with historical, cultural and administrative context of these local universities**.** These reforms originated with an ideology of capitalist agenda.This ideological shift has resulted in privatization, deregulation, public and private partnership, andin restricting the role of government and diversion of role towards business fraternity and market forces.Reform agenda was based on pre-planned strategy and basically was a foreign agenda which was enforced through donor agencies. Under these reforms, higher education commissions were formed in many countries including Pakistan in 2002.

For many decades, Pakistani educational policy planners recognized the necessity for reforms and announced splendid plans that came to nix at the end. Initially in 1980's, reform efforts by Dr.MuhammadAfzal did not materialize due to the red tape. In 2003, another feeble effort was made by Musharraf's government which transmuted in Model University Ordinance 2003. Finally in 2003, Higher Education Commission was formed under the chairmanship of Dr.Atta-ur-Rehman, after which education reforms were implemented seriously.Unfortunately,these reforms were muddled by large number

of worthless universities, fake degrees, fabrication of sloppy PhD's and spending on wasteful and plagiarized research projects. These are some of the bequests gifted by HEC(Hoodbhoy, 2006).

Research Methodology

Research Study and Rationale

The study is focused on assessing "similarities and differences in academic governance model among public and private universities in Pakistan. It's a retrospective research strategy. The "comparative case study method" is being adopted to assess those dimensions of academic governance model which are either similar or different in public and private universities.The rationale of research study is to assess the degree to which new academic governance model is being practiced in public and private universities and to gauge ideology and philosophy behind these reforms through "social construction theory" by using "comparative case study" method.

Population

Population of this research include university experts working in administration and examination sections, university teachers, and those experts who are coordinating with higher education commission on behalf of the universities being examined.

All the previous education policies, reports, and proceedings are studied and analyzed by the researcher for this study. Public and private universities which are located in Lahore and which have been awarded charter from the government of Punjab in period of (2000-2012) are observed as population for this research study.

Sample and Sampling Technique

"Purposive Sampling Technique" is being used for selection of sample of study. Among available categories of non-probability sampling, a sample comprising the most relevant respondent is selected i.e. Rector, Research Associates, HEC's Coordinators, Directors of the Departments and Deans of Faculties.

Respondents

Ten to twelve interviews were carried out .The interviewees were Deans of faculties, Director of departments, two Registrars, two Professors, one Assistant Registrar, and one Executive Director.

Other Sources of Information

After going through the related literature, consisting of books, official documents, reports, policies, plans and proceedings of competent authorities' handling issues of academic council, the researcher arranged interviews and prepared questionnaire.

Data Presentation

The task of university reforms has not actually instigated. There is a need for genuine and not imported restructurings, administrative and organizational reforms, with a strong political commitment. The dilemma with our reforms initiatives by different governments are that those reforms are originated through foreign agendas and adopted blindly through political and financial pressures.

For this study, two universities one from private sector, University of Central Punjab (UCP) and other from public sector Lahore College for Women University(LCWU) are selected as sample. Academic Governance model of Higher Education Commission, implemented in both universities would be analyzed through comparative case study method. Three dimensions namely curriculum, faculty and research have been identified by researcher to study academic governance model of both universities. Researcher has compared HEC model of academic governance and then equated it with the reality existed in private and public sector university, to assess how this model is either being adopted or adapted. Either university adopts only those transformations which are in line with traditional contexts as determined by their chronological origins? Are all public and private universities isomorphic in adoption of Higher education commission's academic governance model or these changes are socially constructed by external forces having some set agenda.

HEC model of Academic Governance

Dimension
Instrument

1. Curriculum

- Development of new programs
  Participation

and review of existing programs

- Implementation
  Inducement

2. Faculty

- Eligibility Criteria Coercion
- Implementation Coercion
- Training and DevelopmentDevelopment and Capacity Building
- Evaluation Development and Capacity Building

3. Research

- Research Training Development and Capacity Building/Inducement
- Research Quality Development and Capacity Building/Inducement
- Research Ethics Development and Capacity Building/Monitoring
- Research Incentive Inducement

University of Central Punjab (UCP)

Internally, UCP is centralized in certain things, but autonomy is given to respective faculties to run their own academic matters, and if something needs to be discussed and talked about jointly, these things are discussed in Deans' committee meetings. Deans' meetings are held on weekly basis where many common issues among faculties are discussed including admission time, criteria of admission for different faculties, review and repercussions of any new HEC policies and procedures, and need to make any changes regarding curriculum are inculcated in their academic governance model.

Curriculum

"In UCP, Curriculum Review Committee works for curriculum development, Implementation and evaluation. Head of the departments implement curriculum and keep on making changes in curriculum after approval from Board of Studies. Curriculum development and implementation is a participative process where executive, academic council, board of studies and board of faculty work together to make changes and implement them. Curriculum Review Committee also examines the need of a new course as demanded by the students, and for that matter they conduct different

market surveys and design the contents of that course to be added to the curriculum. Looking at prospects, industry council trends and market demands, different courses have been introduced, re-designed and even dropped from curriculum. Any decision regarding curriculum or inclusion of a new course needs consultation from different committees. Any decision regarding regulation and policies of curriculum is being taken in Deans' meeting and then executive committee approves any decision regarding student's evaluation, academic calendar, and fee structure after consulting Deans' committee, but definitelyminimum semester's guidelines are being specified and implemented by HEC.

Faculty

Recruitments and selection issues based on qualitative factors require experience and may be open to any personal biases, therefore HEC has made necessary to follow minimum requirements on qualitative factors such as length of service, minimum qualification and member of publication. As one faculty's Dean shared…..HEC has already listed comprehensive criteria for appointment to a post, but universities are also encouraged to develop criteria for appointment for a faculty post based on research contribution, teaching effectiveness and service to professional fraternity which he/she belongs. He added, in spite of implementing minimum guidelines prescribed by HEC, UCP has its own criteria for faculty hiring and have raised standards, and our Board of Faculty have autonomy that they may hire their own faculties and we observe "Open merit policy".

In UCP, good teachers are thoroughly encouraged or being rewarded by respective faculty. But still, faculty members don't see a clear relationship between performance and rewards offered. As one faculty member added…….. "There are pressures of course load, working hours, student's evaluation and extra-curricular assignments throughout the year, but we are given increment based on percentage of our current salary, once in a year. There should be more rewards throughout (during) the year.

The pattern of promotions and increments are established and written in policies; and it was prescribed by board of governors, and is based on pattern typical to other private educational institutes. Every faculty is endowed with performance appraisal forms, that tracks their major competencies and they are being evaluated annually.

This shows that UCP has its own mechanism for increments and promotions, and there is evidence that UCP is free to make

decisions about salary raises and increments without any external interference.

Research

UCP has formulated statutory body with the name of "Board of Advance Study and Research" to promote advanced level research among scholars. One ofan active members of (BAS&R) shared:…….. "(BAS&R advises university authorities to connect with promotion of research and research publication in university, and make decisions regarding research degrees and proposes regulations regarding research degrees. BAS&R recommendsresearch supervisors, panels, examiners for evaluation of research examinations, approves research titles, and finalizes and approves the synopsis and dissertations.UCP is following HEC's minimum guideline for research.

Two non-statutory committees "Doctor Program Committee (DPC)" and "Graduate Program Committee (GPC)" are working to ensure integrity and quality of thesis proposal defense, comprehensive examination of research work and oral examination of research degree candidates. At each faculty level, graduate program committee (GPC) works to assure quality of research work within each faculty". UCP has made number of efforts to ensure that research done by scholars are genuine and quality.

University of Central Punjab also offers better increment, assistance for higher studies, recognition and improved prospects for research career, rapid promotions, and scholarships for those faculty members who are actively involved in research. This shows that UCP has its own system, policies and procedures to run the institute. UCP follow HEC's minimum guidelines in black and white, but university is autonomous to make decisions regarding academic affairs.

Lahore College for Women University (LCWU)

Control and autonomy of an institute could be eagerlygauged through an analysis of its independence in academic, human resources, management and financial domains. LCWU, being public university follows "Hybrid Model" of governance. University has to face restrictions of provincial government and HEC in financial and academic matters.

Curriculum

LCWU also enjoys academic autonomy regarding new courses which are in line with dictates of semester system. Introducing new

courses, developing course outlines, and dropping previous courses have become important concerns. LCWU enjoys autonomy on this account. It is university`s internal matter to launch new course or degree programs. They just need to pursue minimum guidelines of provincial government, HEC and professional organizations, in case if they are launching professional and technical degrees.

Historically, LCWU enjoyed little autonomy in the past, as it was an affiliated college with University of the Punjab at graduate level and was affiliated with Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education, Lahore. LCWU had to follow guidelines of these two bodies for making important academic decisions. One of the respondents captured this in these words, "Before de-centralization, there was Board of Intermediate Studies and some of our professors were also part of that. They are the ones, who would make course outlines and decideabout the policies relating to curriculums, which were subsequently adopted by Lahore College at that time. At graduate level, every matter was decided by University of the Punjab (PU). Whatever was decided by University of the Punjab's board of studies, it was adopted by us without caring if it was feasible for us or not. When we wanted to launch a new program, a proposal was to be prepared and presented to PU. Their affiliation committee used to work on it and then they gave us permission or deny us to start those programs".

After de-Nationalization, LCWU experienced increased autonomy. This new philosophy of NPM of giving administrative autonomy to LCWU paved the way of elevating the college status of Lahore College to university. One respondent added, "When we were given charter and were elevated to status of university in August 2002, we were given the autonomy to launch new degree programs if there was a need for it in the competitive environment". When LCWU has to launch a new degree program it has to follow certain procedures. Every faculty at LCWU has its own board of studies, so if a faculty decides to launch any degree or want to make changes in existing ones, it needs approval from the respective faculty`s board of studies. After this approval, the suggestion is forwarded to academic council for further approval and after that it is forwarded to syndicate meeting for final approval.

Faculty

Unlike public universities, LCWU has considerable autonomy in hiring faculty for different academic positions, but it still has to

follow certain regulations depicted by provincial government, Public Service Commission and HEC.

One of respondent from LCWU added, "There is a lot of politics involved in hiring Vice Chancellor, registrar, controller of examination and treasurer." LCWU has four faculties and four institutes and hiring and selection of people at LCWU is carried out in same way as in any public university. Employees from grade one to sixteen are approved and appointed by Vice Chancellor of the university, while positions from seventeenthgrade andupwards are hired through stipulated procedures.At LCWU, finance and planning committee creates positions according to budget feasibility, and if some vacancy needs to be filled, it is announced either openly in newspapers or search committees are formed to find suitable candidates. After initial scrutiny, shortlisted applicants are presented into selection board, and they are further presented before syndicate for final approval. Hiring of Deans of faculties and Directors of institutes is more or less based on length of service.

Research

InLCWU,there are two non-statutory operational bodies, one for carrying out effective research with the name of "Directorate of Research" and other for promotion of research with the name of ORIC. These bodies have M.S. Coordinators and Ph.D. Coordinators, who look after different research activities at different departmental levels.LCWU promotes research by providing favorable environment to research scholars and to the faculty members. Those faculty members who are on T.T.S (Tenure Track System), they are more performance oriented and are more active in research as they need continuous advancement in performance to sustain growth. Those on BPS (Basic Pay Scale) may engage in research due to their personal reasons and preferences. University supports them by providing an encouraging environment to them but they are not given any relaxations in teaching or any concessions in number of courses allotted to them.

It can be concluded here that LCWU enjoys considerable freedom in curriculum matters, after being elevated to the university level. Approval of new courses, decisions about degrees, and dropping of old courses follows a collegial setup, where discussions and dialogues amongst academia community is encouraged. Economic feasibility and market considerations are also taken into account whenever curriculum matters are decided at LCWU.

Whenever reforms travel from developed countries to developing ones, international agencies with globalization agenda influence them and the governments of developing countries adopt those reforms without having a knowledge or urge to know that it would fit in the host organization or not. Policy makers of host country would force concerned institutes to push those reforms in their concerned departments. Pakistan government used its coercive power for triggering educational reforms in its universities. Higher education sector reform program, university grant commission, promulgation of university governance model and the formation of Higher Education Commission in 2002 as regulatory authority are important trends in this regard. HEC uses its vested powers to regulate universities and force them to adopt many reforms.

Analysis

It was normatively assumed that universities should be free from political influence, and granting them autonomy may uplift education standard and may eliminate many politically created complications in governance structure of universities.Keeping in view this need, universities were de-nationalized and given autonomy especially in the governance of academic matters.The research findings have suggested that public universities adopt those reforms either coercively and normatively while private universities adopt those reforms to gain legitimacy (normative) and sometimes justdue to competition pressures (mimetic). So, thisresearcher has come to the conclusion that these reforms which travelled to developing countries are subject to selection criterion of coercive, normative and mimetic adoption. These reforms are like rational solutions (rationalized myths) and these myths are transferred to developing countries (through de-contextualization), where relevant governments ensure their subsequent implementation in the institutions (adoption).In case of universities they either adopt or adapt after making certain changes according to prevailing social set of values.

This notion is captured by researcher and explained through isomorphismwhich is based on the assumption that social actions occur naturally, without the involvement of any objective, interest or intention of any human (Kazmi, 2012). Isomorphism is a tool to implement reform agenda but it does not take into account origin and context of these reforms. It's important to understand the philosophy and origin of these reforms while isomorphism is a myopic and parochial phenomenon which offers biased thinking of protagonists of these reforms and it serves as a tool of status quo to implementers.All

changes (reforms) have origins and are based on certain ideology.In order to gauge transformation and its execution, it is important to understand the origin of the reform and its philosophy and ideology behind these changes. This phenomenon could bebetter explained through Social Constructionist Perspective. For critical theory, Social Construction tries to uncover the context of reforms, from where these reforms originate and to which direction they would ultimate lead.

According to social constructionism, current globalization scheme is characterized by capitalist systems,including neo-liberal governments, neo-managerial administrative systems, hegemonic market ideology and bourgeois networks.The role of governments and bureaucracies has changed from collectivism to more individualistic. The role of state is more towards facilitation of market forces, expansion of foreign capital, hegemony of private sector, and enhancement of public and private partnership(Haque, 1998).

The early colonial and post- colonial phases of globalization affected the role of state but after de-colonization, most of countries adopted western model of governance, not only due to the bequests but also due to the influences of capitalist nations that were responsible for financial assistance to these poor countries, as is the case of Pakistan.

According to Zia & Khan (2012) the bourgeoisie market ideology, dominated by the replacement ofstate planning with naturally occuring market forces; encouragement of free cross-mobility of private capital and prescription of the pro-capital and anti-socialists alternatives, were being publicized and sold to developing countries through international donor agencies-IMF, WB, ASDB, USAID etc.

Asian countries shifted their dancing from old tunes of development, hierarchy, bigger government bestowed on them by the Western societies on to new tunes of efficiency, effectiveness, economy again advocated by the West after the competing ideology of communism was buried in the treacherous, barren, mountaniousvallies of Afghanistan in the 80s. That is the reason that the role of government has weakened overall and has also shifted in favor of market forces. Institutes have been granted more autonomy to run their own affairs, as universities are being privatized. Privatization, deregulation, devolution and liberalization are the so-called gifts of capitalist ideology. Reforms were exported from these capitalist hegemonies towards developing countries and are being implemented forcefully through donor agencies and these reforms were adopted by respective institutes for number of reasons(Haque, 1998).Pakistani

academics also got inspirations from these changinginternational trends. Pressures from foreign agencies pushed Pakistan to adopt these reforms. Pakistan introduced university governance reforms and HEC facilitated this process. Greater autonomy and less control were witnessed by Pakistani universities.

According to NPM, it has become common to use terms "customer" and "clients" rather than "citizens" in defining recipients of services, as after privatization, potential students are also considered as clients of educational institutes. Customer orientation is also stimulating public-private partnership. This expanding alliance with private sector has gone too far that the concern has shifted from serving common public disregarding their financial situation to affluent customers.

These contemporary reforms, under the influence of pro-capitalist globalization, have worsened the life of low-income families while expanding wealth of affluent class. Same is happening with education reforms in our country. Imported education reform agenda was implemented according to well-planned conspiracy by the forces at the helm of affairs.

Above case studies arealso portraying these portents including how foreign university governance reforms were introduced by Higher Education Commission in Pakistan and how these reforms are being implemented and enforced on our universities through HEC. The academic governance model in UCP shows that the university is following minimum guidelines of regulatory authority, HEC, and has sheer autonomy to run its own affairs. Under the reforms, universities are granted more autonomy and control of state has weakened and diverged, which is being as supported by above mentioned literature. Private universities are pursuing market ideology, selling what customers (students) are buying while public universities have to follow those reforms and policies initiated by HEC, because of its dependence on government for funds and finances. LCWU is following policies of higher education commission regarding curriculum, faculty and research for purpose of legitimacy and acceptability.

Before privatization, LCWU was under control of government`s restrictions, but after privatization, LCWU is enjoying autonomy in governance of academic matters. Other public universities like LCWU are enjoying considerable autonomy in adoption of these reforms. Private universities like UCP have to adopt those reforms due to coercive pressure of HEC and due to gaining legitimacy. As

supported by previous literature, private universities also have to follow "competitive enterprising" model and have to offer what customers demand and what others are offering. After the advent of NPM, both public and private institutes are given autonomy by the government. The extent of retention of these reforms varies.Private institutes do more decoupling and they have modified these reforms more than their public counterparts.

Summary and Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, these HEC reforms were designed by western scholars who were not fully cognizant of the demands and realities of most of the developing countries. These were attached with the loans sought by Government of Pakistan as conditionalities and were forcibily enforced on public academic institutions in a bid to align Pakistan's curriculum with that of US such that local believes, values, norms are replaced by those of west and western culture be adopted as the only universally accepted culture by the rest of the world. Private universities are the main beneficiaries of these reforms are built on *lassez Faire* principle which seeks minimum role of government in the running of the economy. With such kind of control, capitalists proliferate. However education is not a luxurious commodity which may be sold in the market. It is a basic need accepted by Human Rights Charter and constitution of the country; moreover education is a tool which builds society on its believes, norms, values, vision, and needs which are agree upon in a society; binds it with its common shared values and then builds it as a unified nation. If this tool is handed over to the private sector, what kind of a nation one may expect when it will sell only what customers want, and that necessity is provided to only those who can affort to pay? Educational reforms were adopted by the universities of Pakistan, ignoring their administrative, cultural and institutional settings. Administrative, cultural and institutional context of public and private universities is disparate. Both have different goals to achieve and different values to pursue. Now the question arises that how same reform agenda can be enforced on public and private universities alike?Usually private institutes adopt these reforms merely as a "window dressing" and in reality these reforms get "decoupled" and only those reforms are retained or adopted which are in-line with cultural roots and historical context (Tom Charistensen, 2007).Due to this "path dependency", organizations partially retain reform effort. As mentioned before, organizations usually adopt governance reforms in an attempt to seek legitimacy from surroundings, instead of getting real benefit of those structural reforms (Tom Charistensen, 2007).This is the

reason that reforms efforts in Pakistan, was a fruitless activity. These reforms were adopted blindly due to external pressures, and flouting cultural, administrative and institutional realties of the host country.

Public universities adopt reforms either coercively and normatively while private universities adopt those reforms to gain legitimacy (normative) and sometimes just for the sake that their other counterparts (competitors) are adopting those reforms (mimetic). So, researchers have come to the point that these reforms were exported to developing countries subject to selection criterion of coercive, normative and mimetic adoption.Universities either public or private adapt reforms due to autonomy and de-regulation, inspired by NPM, but the level of adaption varies.

Public universities are not in a position to adapt or do window-dressing of these reforms beyond certain limit, due to bureaucratic paradigm, while private universities can adapt and decouple these changes more spontaneously.This is one perspective to look at reforms but it's quite prejudiced and biased perspective ignoring origin and context of those reforms and leaving many questions unanswered related to philosophy and ideology of those reforms and it's just a tool to maintain status quo of implementers. All changes are not for the good. It's important to understand the ideology and philosophy behind these reforms and where they would lead. The process of multi-dimensional globalization gave birth to market ideology, neo-managerial administrative systems, and hegemony of private sector. Process of colonization resulted in western intervention in economic, political, administrative institutions of developing countries. Advanced capital nations encouraged developing countries to restructure their administrative system into more development-oriented institutes and initiated so-called reforms under NPM and managerialism(Haq, 1996 (a)).

The HEC has initiated reforms in all aspects of higher education including academic governance. Though learning from abroad is universal but the outcomes of reform varies from country to country. The success of reforms depends on how the reforms are structured and implemented. Blind and untruthful adoption of foreign model often results in failure. In order to achieve the best results of reforms, it is advised to creatively adopt a change after it has been translated into local initiatives.

Bibliography

Altbach, P. G. (1998). *Comparative Higher Education.* United State of America: Greenwood.

Andreson, K. (2000). SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM AND BELIEF CAUSATION. *New York University*.

Boghossian, P. A. (2001). WHAT IS SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION?

Christensen, T. (2011). Comparative Governance and Public Mangement Reform:Perspective, Experience and Challenges. *Institute of Administrative Sciences.* Lahore.

Haq, S. u. (1996 (a)). The contextless anture of public administration in third world countries. *International Review of Administrative Siences*.

Haque, M. (1998). Impacts of Globalization on the Role of the State and Bureacracy in Asia. *Administrative theory and Praxis*, 439-451.

Hoodbhoy, P. (2006). Education Reforms in Pakistan-Changes and Prospects. 18-28.

Johnstone, D. (1999). "Higher Education under Conditions of Transition to a Market Economy".

Kazmi, S. F. (2012). University Governance Model:Does Context Matters? *Unpublished Thesis,Institute of Administrative Sciences,University of the Punjab*.

Mallon, R. (2007). A Field Guide to Social Construction. *Blackwell Publishing*.

Martin, B. (1993). *In the public interest?: privatization and public sector reform.* London: Zed Books Ltd.

Mollis, M., & Tyler, L. (1997). *Higher Education in Latin America.* New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Myers, P., Hulks, S., & Wiggins, L. (2012). *Organization Change:perspective on theory and practice.* United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Neave, G. (1994). *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents: The Winds of Change.* Paris, France: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Peterson, & Mets. (1987). Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management, and Leadership. *An evolutionary perspective on governance, management and leadership*.

Rawat, D. K. (2009). Higher Education in Pakistan: A Comparative Study of the Neo-Marxist and Neo-liberal Stance on Higher Education. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 11-23.

Silvestere, G. J. (2008). A case study of the tensions Between Policy-Making and Implementation of Higher Education Reforms Policies That Affect The Professoriate at Two Argentinean Universities. *Unpublished thesis*.

Virk, D. M. (1998). *Universities of pakistan.* University Grants Commission.

Zia, Y. A., & Khan, M. Z. (2012). Drivers of Public Sector Reforms in Pakistan:A Comparison of NPM with Alternative Reform Drivers. 453-459.