




An Institutional Framework for Assessing Neoliberal Transformations in Indian Public Education: Governance, Privatization, and Learning Outcome Dynamics

 Dr. Andi Prasetyo

Faculty of Economics and Business Jakarta Global University Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The transformation of public education in India under neoliberal policy regimes has generated complex institutional shifts in governance structures, schooling access, and learning outcome distribution. This study develops an institutional analytical framework to examine how neoliberal rationalities reshape public education through decentralization, privatization, and performative accountability mechanisms. Drawing upon critical education policy scholarship, the paper interrogates the intersection of state withdrawal, market-led schooling expansion, and governance-by-indicators that increasingly define educational decision-making. The study synthesizes empirical and theoretical insights from key works in education policy, political economy, and sociology of education to construct a multidimensional framework that captures institutional restructuring across macro, meso, and micro levels. The analysis reveals that neoliberal reforms have reconfigured the public education system into hybrid governance arrangements characterized by weakened state accountability, strengthened private actors, and intensified inequalities in access and learning outcomes. The paper argues that these transformations are not merely administrative adjustments but represent a deeper ideological shift in the purpose of education—from a public good to a commodified service. The study contributes to policy discourse by offering a structured framework for evaluating institutional change and its implications for equity, democratic governance, and educational justice in India.

Keywords: Neoliberalism, Public Education, Institutional Framework, Privatization, Governance, Learning Outcomes, India, Education Policy, Equity, School Reform

INTRODUCTION

Public education in India has undergone significant restructuring over the past three decades, particularly under the influence of neoliberal policy reforms emphasizing market efficiency, decentralization, and accountability-based governance. These transformations have fundamentally altered the institutional architecture of schooling systems, shifting responsibility from the state toward private actors, local bodies, and market-driven mechanisms. Scholars

have long argued that such reforms are not neutral administrative improvements but reflect deeper ideological commitments that redefine education as a competitive service rather than a constitutional entitlement (Jha, 2005; Joseph, 2007).

At the core of these changes lies a persistent tension between equity-oriented public schooling and market-oriented reform agendas. The neoliberal restructuring of education governance has resulted in increasing privatization, both formal and informal, alongside the expansion of low-fee private schooling and public-private partnerships. This shift has raised critical concerns regarding access, quality, and democratic accountability in education systems (Tilak, 2012; Velaskar, 2010).

The problem becomes particularly acute when viewed through the lens of institutional fragmentation. Public education systems in India now operate through overlapping governance regimes, where state institutions, private providers, and quasi-market mechanisms interact in complex and often contradictory ways. This institutional hybridity complicates accountability structures and weakens the coherence of public education policy.

Scholars such as Ball (2003) highlight how performativity regimes—based on measurement, ranking, and output monitoring—have transformed teacher subjectivities and institutional priorities. Similarly, Apple and Jungck (1990) demonstrate how technology, gender, and pedagogical restructuring intersect with broader political-economic forces shaping schooling practices. These insights provide a critical foundation for understanding how neoliberalism operates not only at policy level but also within classroom dynamics.

In the Indian context, Nambissan and Ball (2010) emphasize the role of advocacy networks and parental choice in shaping private schooling demand among disadvantaged groups, revealing how neoliberal logics penetrate even marginalized educational spaces through aspirations and perceived quality differentials. Their analysis underscores how market-based schooling choice is not simply imposed but socially mediated through networks of influence, aspiration, and policy discourse.

The objective of this paper is to develop an institutional framework that systematically assesses these neoliberal transformations in Indian public education. Specifically, the study aims to (i) map governance restructuring across institutional levels, (ii) analyze privatization processes and their policy drivers, and (iii) evaluate learning outcome dynamics within restructured schooling systems.

The significance of this research lies in its attempt to bridge macro-level policy analysis with meso-level institutional change and micro-level learning outcomes. By doing so, it contributes to a more integrated understanding of how neoliberal reforms reshape education systems in developing democracies.

2. Literature Review

The literature on neoliberalism and education reform provides a rich theoretical foundation for analyzing institutional transformation in public schooling systems. Across global and Indian contexts, scholars have identified key mechanisms through which neoliberal governance reshapes education: privatization, decentralization, accountability regimes, and marketization of schooling.

Ball (2003) conceptualizes performativity as a central feature of neoliberal education systems, where teachers and institutions are subjected to constant evaluation based on measurable outputs. This results in a shift from pedagogical autonomy to compliance-oriented teaching practices, fundamentally altering the professional identity of educators. Similarly, Apple and Jungck (1990) highlight how educational technologies and institutional structures embed broader social inequalities, particularly around gender and labor relations in schooling environments.

In the Indian context, Kumar (2011) critiques the neoliberal state's redefinition of teaching as a performative and managerial activity, arguing that this undermines the intellectual and ethical dimensions of education. Kumar, Priyam, and Saxena (2001) further demonstrate how centrally sponsored programs such as DPEP reflect a technocratic approach to schooling that prioritizes measurable outputs over substantive educational quality.

Jha (2005) and Joseph (2007) extend this critique by examining how neoliberal reforms weaken state commitments to public education while simultaneously expanding regulatory frameworks that favor market participation. These dynamics illustrate a paradox in neoliberal governance: while the state withdraws from direct provisioning, it strengthens its role in monitoring and standardizing outcomes.

Velaskar (2010) emphasizes the persistence of inequality within Indian education systems, arguing that neoliberal reforms often exacerbate existing disparities by reinforcing differential access to quality schooling. Tilak (2012) similarly highlights the uneven expansion of higher education under market-oriented reforms, where privatization leads to stratified institutional hierarchies.

Rudolph and Rudolph (1972) provide a foundational political analysis of education systems in India, demonstrating how educational institutions are deeply embedded in broader political structures. Their work remains relevant in understanding how contemporary reforms intersect with state-building processes.

Nambissan and Ball (2010) offer a particularly important contribution by analyzing advocacy networks and private schooling among the poor. They demonstrate that parental choice is often mediated by social networks and policy narratives that construct private schooling as inherently superior. This finding is crucial for understanding how neoliberal ideology becomes normalized in everyday educational decision-making. Their work explicitly shows that market-based schooling expansion is not merely structural but also discursive, shaped by perceptions of quality and aspiration (Nambissan & Ball, 2010). This insight is central to understanding the internalization of neoliberal logics within marginalized communities (Nambissan & Ball, 2010).

Mooij and Jalal (2009) further illustrate governance failure in public schooling systems, where privatization emerges as a default outcome of weak state capacity rather than explicit policy intent. Similarly, Nalini (2005) and Menon (2014) highlight how legal and institutional frameworks facilitate the expansion of elite schooling spaces, often at the expense of equitable access.

The literature collectively indicates that neoliberal transformations in education are multi-layered processes involving policy restructuring, institutional fragmentation, and ideological shifts. However, there remains a gap in integrating these dimensions into a unified analytical framework capable of systematically assessing institutional change across governance,

privatization, and learning outcomes. This paper addresses this gap by proposing such a framework in the following section.

3. Methodology and Institutional Framework Development

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual research design grounded in institutional analysis and critical policy studies. The methodological approach is interpretive and synthetic, drawing exclusively on secondary literature to construct a theoretical framework for assessing neoliberal transformations in Indian public education.

The analytical framework is structured across three interconnected institutional dimensions: governance architecture, privatization dynamics, and learning outcome systems. Each dimension operates at multiple levels—macro (state policy), meso (institutional structures), and micro (school/classroom practices).

3.1 Governance Architecture Dimension

The governance dimension examines how authority and decision-making power are redistributed under neoliberal reforms. This includes decentralization policies, school autonomy frameworks, and the rise of performance-based accountability systems. The framework conceptualizes governance not merely as administrative structure but as a network of power relations that shape educational priorities and institutional behavior (Ball, 2003; Jha, 2005).

At the macro level, state withdrawal from direct provisioning is accompanied by increased regulatory oversight through standardized assessments. At the meso level, school management committees and local governance bodies assume greater responsibility without corresponding resource enhancement. At the micro level, teachers experience intensified performativity pressures, reshaping classroom practices.

3.2 Privatization Dynamics Dimension

Privatization is analyzed as a multi-form process involving expansion of private schools, public-private partnerships, and informal marketization of education. Rather than treating privatization as a binary shift, the framework conceptualizes it as a continuum of institutional arrangements.

Kumar (2010) and Velaskar (2010) highlight how privatization deepens inequality by stratifying access to educational resources. Nambissan and Ball (2010) further demonstrate how parental choice mechanisms reinforce privatization trends even among low-income groups through aspirational schooling behavior. Their analysis reveals that privatization is socially embedded and mediated through networks of information and perception (Nambissan & Ball, 2010).

3.3 Learning Outcome Dynamics Dimension

The learning outcome dimension focuses on how educational performance is defined, measured, and interpreted under neoliberal regimes. Standardized testing and outcome-based accountability systems increasingly define institutional success, often reducing education to measurable cognitive outputs.

This dimension draws on Ball's (2003) concept of performativity and Kumar's (2011) critique of teaching under neoliberal conditions. The framework examines how learning outcomes are shaped by institutional pressures rather than purely pedagogical processes.

4. Results / Findings

The application of the institutional framework to the Indian public education system reveals three dominant patterns: (i) systematic restructuring of governance through performative accountability, (ii) deepening and normalization of privatization across schooling tiers, and (iii) increasing disjuncture between learning outcomes and equity-oriented educational goals.

4.1 Governance Restructuring and Performative Accountability

The analysis indicates that governance in Indian public education has shifted from welfare-oriented provisioning to outcome-driven regulatory oversight. This transition reflects a broader neoliberal reconfiguration in which the state simultaneously withdraws from direct service delivery while intensifying its role in monitoring performance indicators (Ball, 2003; Jha, 2005).

At the institutional level, schools increasingly operate under audit-like regimes where performance is measured through standardized testing, enrollment ratios, and infrastructure compliance metrics. This has produced a culture of performativity where institutional legitimacy depends on measurable outputs rather than pedagogical depth. Teachers are particularly affected, as their professional identity becomes aligned with accountability targets rather than educational innovation (Kumar, 2011).

Empirical patterns from the literature suggest that decentralized governance structures, such as school management committees, have not led to genuine empowerment. Instead, they often function as administrative extensions of state policy rather than autonomous governance bodies (Mooij & Jalal, 2009). This creates what can be described as "responsibilized decentralization," where accountability is devolved without corresponding authority or resources.

4.2 Expansion and Normalization of Privatization

The findings demonstrate that privatization is not merely an alternative provision mechanism but a structural feature embedded within the public education ecosystem. Low-fee private schools, informal tutoring markets, and public-private partnerships collectively contribute to a hybrid education economy.

A key insight from the analysis is that privatization operates through both supply-side expansion and demand-side normalization. Supply-side dynamics involve the rapid growth of private institutions in response to perceived inefficiencies in public schooling. Demand-side dynamics are shaped by parental aspirations and perceptions of quality differentials, often reinforced by advocacy networks and social narratives (Nambissan & Ball, 2010).

This dual mechanism results in a self-reinforcing cycle: declining confidence in public schools increases private enrollment, which in turn reduces political pressure for public school improvement. Consequently, public education systems increasingly serve marginalized populations, while middle and upper-income groups migrate to private institutions (Velaskar, 2010).

Case-based evidence from urban schooling contexts indicates that privatization is also facilitated by regulatory ambiguities in land use, school recognition, and fee structures (Nalini,

2005). This regulatory flexibility enables private actors to expand rapidly, often without robust quality assurance mechanisms.

4.3 Learning Outcomes and Structural Inequality

The analysis of learning outcomes reveals persistent and widening disparities between public and private schooling systems. However, these disparities cannot be understood solely in terms of institutional type; they are deeply embedded in socio-economic stratification and governance asymmetries.

Standardized learning assessments, while intended to improve accountability, often fail to capture contextual factors influencing educational achievement. Instead, they tend to reinforce deficit narratives about public schooling systems without addressing structural constraints such as teacher shortages, infrastructure gaps, and socio-economic deprivation (Banerji, 1997; Kumar et al., 2001).

Importantly, the framework highlights that learning outcomes are increasingly decoupled from educational equity objectives. The emphasis on measurable performance has shifted policy focus away from inclusion and toward competitiveness. This shift aligns with neoliberal rationalities that prioritize efficiency over redistribution (Tilak, 2012).

The analysis also indicates that learning disparities are reproduced through institutional mechanisms such as differential access to resources, teacher quality variation, and curricular segmentation. These mechanisms collectively produce stratified learning trajectories that reflect broader social inequalities rather than purely educational factors.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study highlight the deep structural transformation of Indian public education under neoliberal governance regimes. These transformations are not merely administrative reforms but represent a fundamental reconfiguration of the purpose, structure, and functioning of education systems.

5.1 Theoretical Implications: Institutional Hybridization

One of the central theoretical contributions of this study is the identification of “institutional hybridization” as a defining characteristic of neoliberal education systems. Public education in India no longer operates as a unified state-led system but as a fragmented assemblage of public, private, and quasi-private actors.

This hybridization produces governance complexity, where accountability is diffused across multiple institutional layers. As Ball (2003) argues, such systems are characterized by performative contradictions: institutions are simultaneously autonomous and tightly regulated. This paradox generates systemic instability and policy incoherence.

The framework also extends the work of Apple and Jungck (1990) by demonstrating that institutional restructuring is inseparable from broader socio-political transformations, including labor relations, technological integration, and gendered dimensions of schooling.

5.2 Privatization as Structural Dependency

A key insight from the analysis is that privatization in Indian education is not an external addition but a structurally embedded dependency within the system. The reliance on private schooling emerges from systemic underinvestment in public education, regulatory fragmentation, and socio-cultural perceptions of quality.

Nambissan and Ball (2010) emphasize that parental choice is not purely rational but socially constructed through networks of information and aspiration. This insight is critical for understanding how privatization becomes normalized even among disadvantaged populations. Their work demonstrates that educational choice is mediated by advocacy networks that shape perceptions of institutional quality (Nambissan & Ball, 2010).

This structural dependency creates a policy paradox: while public policy rhetorically supports universal public education, actual system dynamics increasingly rely on private provisioning.

5.3 Trade-offs and Policy Contradictions

The study identifies several contradictions inherent in neoliberal education reforms. First, decentralization intended to enhance efficiency often results in fragmented accountability structures. Second, privatization intended to improve quality frequently exacerbates inequality. Third, outcome-based accountability systems intended to improve performance often narrow the educational experience.

These contradictions reflect what Joseph (2007) describes as the tension between neoliberal reform and democratic governance. Similarly, Kumar (2010) argues that neoliberal reforms in education often undermine the redistributive function of the state while strengthening market logics.

5.4 Limitations of the Framework

While the institutional framework developed in this study provides a structured approach to analyzing neoliberal transformations, it has certain limitations. First, the reliance on secondary literature restricts empirical validation. Second, the framework does not fully incorporate longitudinal data that could capture temporal dynamics of reform. Third, regional variations within India are not exhaustively addressed, limiting contextual specificity.

Despite these limitations, the framework provides a robust conceptual tool for comparative analysis and future empirical research.

6. Conclusion

This study developed an institutional framework for assessing neoliberal transformations in Indian public education, focusing on governance restructuring, privatization dynamics, and learning outcome systems. The analysis demonstrates that neoliberal reforms have fundamentally reconfigured the architecture of public education by introducing hybrid governance models, expanding privatization pathways, and reshaping learning evaluation systems.

The findings suggest that these transformations are not isolated policy changes but represent a systemic shift in the ideological foundation of education—from a public good model to a market-oriented service model. This shift has significant implications for equity, democratic governance, and social justice in education.

A key contribution of this study is the conceptualization of institutional hybridization as a central feature of neoliberal education systems. This framework enables a more integrated understanding of how governance, privatization, and learning outcomes interact in shaping educational trajectories.

Future research should focus on empirical validation of this framework using longitudinal and mixed-methods approaches, as well as comparative studies across different Indian states and global contexts. Additionally, further investigation is needed into resistance mechanisms and alternative education models that challenge neoliberal restructuring.

Ultimately, addressing the challenges identified in this study requires reimagining public education not as a competitive marketplace but as a foundational democratic institution committed to equity and inclusion.

REFERENCES

1. Apple, M. W., & Jungck, S. (1990). "You Don't Have to Be a Teacher to Teach This Unit:" Teaching, Technology, and Gender in the Classroom.' *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(2), 227–251.
2. Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215–228.
3. Banerji, R. (1997). 'Why Don't Children Complete Primary School? A Case Study of a Low-Income Neighbourhood in Delhi'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32(32), 2053–2063.
4. Davies, E., & Falletti, T. G. (2017). Poor People's Participation: Neoliberal Institutions or Left Turn? *Comparative Political Studies*, 50(12), 1699–1731.
5. Farooqui, A. (1998). How the City Devours Its Children. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33(7), 328–330.
6. Iyengar, R., & Surianarain, S. (2008). Education Policy and Practice: Case Studies from Delhi and Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(38), 63–69.
7. Jha, P. (2005). 'Withering Commitments and Weakening Progress: State and Education in the Era of Neoliberal Reforms.' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(33).
8. Joseph, S. (2007). 'Neoliberal Reforms and Democracy in India'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(31).
9. Kumar, K. (2011). 'Teaching and the Neoliberal State.' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(21).
10. Kumar, K., Priyam, M., & Saxena, S. (2001). Looking beyond the smokescreen: DPEP and primary education in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36(7), 560–568.
11. Kumar, R. (2010). 'Education and the Politics of Capital: Perspective and Agenda for Resistance against Neoliberalism'. *Social Scientist*, 38(9/12).
12. Laporte, R. (2002). "Governance – A Global Perspective," Paper presented at South Asia Regional Conference, Kathmandu (Nepal), February 20.

13. Manjrekar, N. (2013). 'Women School Teachers in New Times: Some Preliminary Reflections'. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 20(2), 335–356.
14. Menon, R. (2014). 'Caught between 'Neglect' and a Private 'Makeover': Government Schools in Delhi', in Kumar, R. (Ed.) *Education, State and Market: Anatomy of Neoliberal Impact*. Aakar: India.
15. Mooij, J. E., & Jalal, J. (2009). *Primary Education in Delhi, Hyderabad and Kolkata: Governance by Resignation, Privatisation by Default*. In ISS Staff Group 2: *States, Societies and World Development*. Routledge.
16. Nalini, J. (2005). 'Exclusive Schools in Delhi: Their Land and the Law'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(33), 3685–3690.
17. Nambissan, G. B., & Ball, S. J. (2010). *Advocacy Networks, Choice and Private Schooling of the Poor in India*. *Global Networks*, 10(3).
18. Patnaik, P. (2013). 'On the Political Economy of Educational 'Reforms''. *Social Scientist*, 41(7/8), Special Issue: *The Four Year Undergraduate Programme in Delhi University*.
19. Rudolph, S. H., & Rudolph, L. I. (Eds.). (1972). *Education and Politics in India: Studies in Organization, Society and Policy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
20. Sadgopal, A. (2010). *Right to Education versus Right to Education Act*. Vol. 38/ Nos 9-12.
21. Tilak, J. B. G. (2012). 'Higher Education Policy in India in Transition'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(13).
22. Velaskar, P. (2010). 'Quality and Inequality in Indian Education: Some Critical Policy Concerns.' *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 7, 58–93.
23. Weiler, H. N. (1990). 'Why Reforms fail: the politics of education in France and the Federal Republic of Germany.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(4), 433–448.