

Neoliberal Governmentality and Global Education Reform

Madhu Narayanan
Florida International University

Abstract: The future of education is uncertain, but one thing is sure: it will likely be privatized. The privatization of a social good like education at first seems at odds with Foucault’s haunting vision of a totalizing state. But, instead of relying on immense government bureaucracies to enforce complex regulations and produce compliant subjectivities in schools, a new atomized educational landscape is being constructed dotted with private enterprises, individual entrepreneurs, and replicating corporate franchises, all striving to provide quality education in response to market demands. What is interesting is how privatization embodies the ensemble of techniques Foucault called “governmentality,” bringing his vision of state management of populations to the private sphere.

Foucault coined the term “governmentality” to describe an ensemble of techniques of control and surveillance, where the all-encompassing production of data and state knowledge pushes individuals to discipline themselves (Foucault, 1991). Several scholars have since theorized how this form of governance persists in the current era of privatization and reduced state functions, under what has been termed “neoliberal governmentality” (Ferguson & Gupta, 2002; Lemke, 2001). The shifts have profoundly impacted education, and I describe how the workings of neoliberal governmentality are clearly evident. My purpose is to make concrete what was often vague in Foucault’s initial writings, and what has been difficult to pin down in more recent uses of ‘governmentality’.

I begin by summarizing both Foucault’s concept of governmentality and recent applications of the theory to current schooling under the heading of neoliberal governmentality. Then I describe three sites of neoliberal governmentality in the global education landscape. One is the growing “shadow education” sector (Zhang, 2023) — an ecosystem of private tutors, coaching classes, and specialized workshops designed to prepare students for high-stakes exams. A second site is the proliferation of schools managed fully within the private sphere that target poor communities. This includes charter schools, charter franchises (Hernández, 2022) and the proliferation elsewhere of low-fee private schools (Härmä, 2021, 2), both of which flourish within a suspect discourse of education as “a ticket out of poverty.” Third, I look at digital platformization, which describes how educational organizations increasingly rely on technology platforms managed by large private corporations (Sefton-Greene, 2021). Lastly, I use an example from education in India to illustrate neoliberal governmentality.

What Is Governmentality?

Foucault had been interested in how large populations could be managed and security could be upheld in the absence of overt power. His ideas about governmentality emerged from these interests, but it is helpful to first track his earlier theories. Charting shifts in the use of force from the feudal era through the post-war period, Foucault developed innovative theories of discipline, surveillance, and power, offering insights into how people could come to control themselves when they sensed an ever-present, watchful eye over their actions. Perhaps Foucault’s most original ideas concerned the relation between power and knowledge (Foucault, 1982). Rather than power being the direct control through force, Foucault argued that as governments developed abilities to collect vast quantities of knowledge about their populations in the form of

health metrics, safety data, reports of educational achievements, endless tables of family level demographics, budgetary expenses, etc., governments were able to create policies and make institutional decisions justified by what was now known about the relevant populations. Language was crucial to these developments, but specifically in the form of what Foucault (1972) called “discourse.” By discourse, he meant not just the words or even the writings of policymakers and statesmen, but more generally the field of possibilities from which certain forms of thinking and speaking emerged at the expense of other such forms. Foucault’s writings on discourse lend insight into competing visions of reality, describing the conditions under which contingent truths are produced and accepted (Ball, 2018; Purvis & Hunt, 1993). From this background, a collection of organized practices emerged — certain mentalities, rationalities, and techniques — through which populations could be governed (Foucault, 1991). It is this new collection of techniques that Foucault termed “governmentality,” and although he was brief on specifics, he sought to provide a description of the new practices emerging after the European Enlightenment and coalescing around an “art of government.”

Governmentality fundamentally differs from the juridical concept of sovereignty. Kings, princes, and sovereign feudal lords are typically seen as external to their domains, holding a transcendent and divine position over those they rule. Their main focus is to maintain power and territory. Governmentality, conversely, emphasizes a plurality of internal forms of government and establishes a vertical continuity from state rule, through family management (economy), to self-governance (liberty). The shift from feudal governance was important because the goals of rule were no longer the maintenance of sovereignty but rather “the welfare of the population, the improvement of its condition, the increase of its wealth, longevity, health, etc.” (Foucault, 1991, 100) Unlike discipline, which was a theory about controlling designated groups in confined spaces (e.g., prisons, schools, workplaces, etc.), governmentality is concerned with the well-being of populations at large. This population included a complex composed of men and things, including their relations with wealth, resources, territory, customs, habits, and even accidents like famine or epidemics. Instead of relying on laws and edicts, like traditional sovereignty, governmentality employs multiform techniques to educate desires, configure habits, aspirations, and beliefs, essentially “arranging things so that people, following only their own self-interest, will do as they ought” (Scott, 2005, 33). With self-governance, Foucault connected with his enduring interest in the creation of subjectivities. He argued that the elevation of the individual opened the way for a governmentality that extended beyond the state (Foucault, 1982). The state could define and redefine what fell within its purview, combining public and private spheres. The individual was the hallmark of liberal thinking, an atomized subject who was part of the masses but remained responsible for personal decisions. Connecting state functions of governance and individual responsibility opened the way for an updated concept of neoliberal governmentality.

Neoliberal Governmentality: A Shift in Form

From its initial, brazen uses of power, the state had increasingly adopted more nuanced and indirect forms of governance. Such shifts coincided with the decreased role of the state and the emergence of new private actors (Ferguson & Gupta, 2002), a trend that raises a series of questions: Does governance require a strong state? What happens when there is a reduction in the role of the state? Can less government intervention support a greater degree of governmentality? “Neoliberal governmentality” is essentially a theoretical answer to such questions, building upon Foucault's broader idea of governmentality. Neoliberalism is

characterized by a focus on smaller government, a competitive market logic, and reduced state intervention in the operations of private actors (Lemke, 2001). The core concern of governmentality, including its neoliberal form, is the welfare of populations at large, except now the loci of such techniques are non-state functionaries rather than the state itself. The state's role under neoliberal governmentality is not a "retreat" or "rolling back," but rather a reorganization or restructuring of governmental techniques (Ferguson & Gupta, 2008). Operations formerly managed by the government are transferred to non-state entities. Under the name of empowerment, social and economic risks are shifted to private organizations while individuals are "empowered" to discipline themselves. Social risks like illness, unemployment, and poverty become matters for individuals and collectives, such as families and associations. Neoliberal governmentality profoundly reshapes the understanding of economic rationality and individual subjectivity. Market rationales are transposed into non-economic spheres such as family life, married life, and professional life (Lemke, 2001). This broadens the economic lens to view almost all human action as characterized by the allocation of scarce resources for competing goals. Individuals are redefined as autonomous entrepreneurs responsible for their own actions and bearing the full risk of their decisions.

Three Sites of Neoliberal Governmentality

This section describes three sites of neoliberal governmentality: shadow education, privatized schooling for the marginalized, and digital platformization. The goal is to show how neoliberal governmentality is a concrete part of the everyday institutionalization of schooling.

Shadow Education: The first site of neoliberal governmentality in the global education landscape is the growth of what has been termed "shadow education" (Bray, 2017; Zhang, 2023). Shadow education refers to supplemental learning activities that occur outside of formal schooling structures, such as coaching centers and private tutoring, specifically aimed at improving performance in formal schools. While there are many educational activities that take place outside of school, shadow education is defined by the three characteristics of being private, supplemental to the formal school curriculum, and focused on academics (as opposed to, say, enrichment) (Bray, 2017). Activities in shadow education mimic the shape and movements of formal education, though they may be difficult to observe, hence the "shadow" metaphor.

Shadow education is an example of neoliberal governance because it contributes to the commodification of education, but it is also a site where the desires and aspirations of students are cultivated and constructed along predetermined pathways. As students and parents seek remediation or preparation for high-stakes exams, they become embedded in an institutional arrangement that rewards performance on examinations and markers of status such as diplomas and admissions to prestigious colleges (Baker, 2020). The possible paths for future career development are narrowed, students feel social and cultural pressure to conform to singular ways of schooling, and families feel compelled to invest time and money in a private sphere of education. The academic and future career prospects are, in effect, limited, and so too are future pathways to earn a living wage or a baseline of cultural status (Davies & Mehta, 2013), resulting in a form of "self-governance" reliant on a sort of behaviorist definition of "freedom" along the lines of "non-aversive external control" (Weiss & Knoster, 2008).

The pervasiveness and scale of shadow education are astounding. Participating in shadow education is a standard feature of daily life for millions of families globally. Roughly one-third of 15-year-old students participate in private tuition academic activities cross-nationally, with

rates exceeding 50% in some countries (Byun et al., 2018). Aurini et al. (2013) estimated the global size of the shadow education sector to be at least \$41 billion, which is likely a significant underestimate even when it was made in 2013. For instance, one estimate puts the total shadow education expenditures of families in Japan at approximately \$17 billion, or 2.79% of the national GDP (Yamamoto & Brinton, 2010). In India, the market share has been estimated to be between \$40 billion and \$70 billion (Kumar & Chowdhury, 2021).

The societal impact of shadow education is complex and often ambiguous. Studies of direct academic outcomes are inconclusive (Bray, 2014; Byun et al., 2018). Others have chronicled subtractive impacts resulting from teacher disengagement or student stress (Kumar & Chowdhury, 2021). Many students prioritize private coaching and sometimes opt not to attend their formal schools, viewing them as merely centers for credentialing rather than learning, especially during exam periods (Bhorkar & Bray, 2018). For teachers, shadow education can foster entrepreneurial identities and, in some cases, lead to forced corruption where teachers deliberately reduce teaching quality to encourage private tutoring (Gupta, 2021). A consistent concern is that private tutoring strengthens educational markets and deepens social inequality by pricing out segments of the student population (Bray, 2017; Stevenson & Baker, 1992). Most fundamentally, tying educational quality to purchasing power, Bray and Kwo (2013) argue, undermines the social contract of education as a universal human right and transforms it into an economic commodity. This shift reflects a global institutionalization in which participation in shadow education is becoming perceived as a requirement for academic success.

Privatized Schooling for the Disadvantaged: Multi-decade neoliberal shifts in the public sector have reshaped education. Perhaps one of the most significant changes has been the increasing privatization of schooling. Privatization is used here to describe the management of schooling by private actors, perhaps funded publicly but still freed from much government oversight. With increased autonomy to operate, there is room for innovation and responsiveness to diverse student populations; however, privatization has also brought with it the consequences of greater neoliberal logics. To understand the growth of privatization of schooling, it is first helpful to consider the broader context. Beginning in the mid-1800s, mass education expanded widely across many nations (Ramirez & Boli, 1987). Part of this expansion was fueled by colonial efforts to subdue newly conquered indigenous populations (Narayanan, 2023; Swarz, 2019). Other contributing causes included the swelling of urban populations with immigrants (Tyack, 1974) and state efforts to create a shared national identity (Meyer et al., 2009). Beginning in the 1980s, educators and policymakers highlighted the failure of mass education efforts to reach hundreds of millions of disadvantaged citizens. In the United States, this took the form of narratives of crisis, such as the report *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983), many of which targeted the failure of government-led agencies to provide quality education. Over time, federal policies channeled market ideology and developed guidelines that exchanged greater school-level autonomy for greater accountability.

Charter schools have exemplified shifts towards a policy of supporting privatization of schooling. Perhaps the purest example is the growth of networks of charter schools managed collectively under “Charter Management Organizations” (CMOs). Using a franchise-type model of growth and development, CMOs proliferate through pyramidal growth (Scott & DiMartino, 2010). CMOs are organized to increase management efficiency by controlling operational and instructional aspects of schools. This arrangement allows CMOs to centralize operations, leverage standardized practices, and establish economies of scale. Schools that have shown

success — often narrowly defined as high scores earned on standardized achievement tests — have had their models copied and replicated. An example is the growth of “no-excuses” practices used with low-income students of color, including longer school days/years, intense expectations for teachers/students, and zero-tolerance disciplinary policies. The practices are questionable, as they include teachers working long, demanding hours (Golann, 2021), high rates of teacher turnover (Torres, 2016), and questionable achievement scores resulting from only select students sitting for exams (Hernández, 2022).

Internationally, a similar loss of faith in government centered around the failure of states to provide schooling for hundreds of millions of students. Transnational commissions argued that students denied access to schooling were likely to be left out of the benefits of economic development, improvements in access to health services, and opportunities to participate in social and cultural shifts that brought increased freedom and dignity, particularly for women. National governments joined in making commitments to expanding educational access as part of the Education for All movement. Yet, many governments failed to build institutional capacity to expand access to education. They also failed to allocate the necessary economic funding for the expansion of schooling. With international monitoring in place, schools were unable to meet the agreed-upon goals for increased enrollment (Chabbot, 2013; Mundy & Manion, 2021).

Low-fee private schools (LFPs) emerged in this context as one response to provide educational access to students left out of the efforts to expand education. Often operated by local families and started out of a spare room or extra apartment, LFPs have the promise of providing quality education with low overhead, and, thus, fees that families in poverty can afford (Tooley, 2021). Härmä (2021, 92) has written extensively about LFPs and shown that neoliberal market theories have failed to answer the demands of students in poverty. Parents are ill-equipped to simply choose from competing school offerings and make frictionless transitions, largely because few viable alternatives have existed. LFPs essentially work as a coerced choice for parents who want to avoid sending their children to overcrowded and ineffective government schools. There may be only one private school in their neighborhood. For families in sparsely populated rural areas where it does not make economic sense to operate a school, there may be no other option other than the government school. Furthermore, fees are not really as low as the term “low-fee private school” might imply. Härmä writes that “enrolment is not evidence of affordability.” The cost of school tuition can be 10% of a household’s total expenses, with LFPs likely to increase their fees in response to greater demand or wealthier clientele.

Privatized schooling is an example of neoliberal governmentality because schools operated privately must follow market logics. At the mercy of the market, individual schools and even organizations can grow or fail depending on their ability to sustain themselves. Families that attend these schools then bear the consequences of the schools’ fate, their individual choices bringing the responsibility for their decisions onto them, with little room for a safety net. Schooling thus becomes a commodity for students, and although this is true for students across the socioeconomic spectrum, wealthier clients can afford education with greater prestige and security. The expansion of privatized schooling specifically aimed at marginalized students, meanwhile, is left precarious and with questionable results.

Digital Platformization: A third site for privatized governmentality is the “platformization” of education (UNESCO, 2021), referring to the reliance of educators and educational organizations on digital platforms. Platformization can be defined as “the spread and influence of digital platforms as technologies of control into virtually every aspect of contemporary social life”

(Sefton-Greene, 2021, 899). Like earlier shifts in professional work, such as industrialization and electrification, digital platformization represents a major transformation in how work is conducted in globalized societies. Organizations turn to digital platforms for such elements as data management, content creation, and communication. Van Dijck (2021) conceived of platformization as a massive tree. The roots and trunk of platformization represent extensive, privately managed platforms. At the extremities are the leaves, with education representing one of many different leaves on the tree. Built into this structure are deep power asymmetries in the way teachers interact with various apps; functionalities are vertically integrated, and tech corporations design deeper infrastructure architectures. Meanwhile, teacher and student data flow like oxygen through this ecosystem.

Digital platforms encompass social media networks, cloud-computing resources, artificial intelligence, and other technologies, which are almost all exclusively managed by private companies and sold to organizations serving students. The companies controlling these infrastructures, sometimes referred to as GAFAM (Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple, and Microsoft), prioritize amassing power and profit rather than fulfilling a fundamental social purpose. A fundamental aspect of their platformization is “datafication,” which involves continuously harvesting, storing, aggregating, and analyzing user data to derive insights for future enhancements or developments. In a data-driven ecosystem, technology companies convert human actions and experiences into electronic text and data that can be read, exploited, and commodified (Zuboff, 2019). Powerful technology companies can create unprecedented knowledge of their users; the underlying logic of the platforms ensures that as users engage, data is continuously collected and absorbed, stimulating growth across the platform ecosystem (Akbari & Wood, 2025). This process has led to products being transformed into services that offer digital functionality in exchange for personal information and attention (van Dijck, 2021).

The power concentration inherent in platformization is characterized by three main dynamics: vertical integration, infrastructuralization, and cross-sectorization. Vertical integration refers to platforms extending control over data flows from foundational infrastructure (such as cloud services) upward into sectoral applications. This locks in users and vendors, privatizing data streams and funneling user-generated data into proprietary flows. Infrastructuralization of intermediary platforms occurs when key intermediary platforms, such as social networks, search engines, and app stores, achieve infrastructural status. They become obligatory passage points for digital traffic, enabling their operators to exert broad control over the global information system. Cross-sectorization involves companies expanding their influence across diverse sectors, allowing them to collect and connect personal and behavioral data from multiple domains, combining data flows to fuel algorithmic intelligence and value creation (van Dijck, 2021).

The rise of digital platformization is deeply intertwined with neoliberalism, representing an intensification and evolution of capitalism rather than a fundamental break from it (Akbari & Wood, 2025). The growth of big tech and its monopolistic tendencies were facilitated by government policies, including weak antitrust standards and strong intellectual property standards, over the past 40 years. There is a connection to governmentality, as new disciplinary measures are made possible through a regime of “surveillance capitalism,” with gargantuan user-generated collections of data enabling active monitoring (Zuboff, 2019). At the same time, algorithmic designs coax user behaviors to align with the commercial interests of platform owners, often under the guise of innovation, efficiency, or even empowerment (van Dijck, 2024). Digital platforms are now deeply woven into the basic infrastructure of organizations’ daily

operations and have further transformed how individuals work, communicate, consume, engage politically, and spend their leisure time. The “platformization of education” signifies that digital platforms now mediate a substantial portion of administrative, instructional, and learning activities within schools and universities (Nichols & Dixon-Román, 2024; Sefton-Green, 2021).

Illustrating Neoliberal Governmentality in Education

To illustrate how neoliberal governmentality has come to shape the education landscape, I share an example from a research project I am conducting in India. The study is an ongoing ethnographic exploration of shadow education, conducted through work with an organization called Suraksha¹ operating in a large urban area of western India. Suraksha is an after-school program that serves students primarily from slums in an older section of the city. The parents of the students are mostly daily wage earners and are charged a small tuition fee, though most of the organization’s operating expenses are supported through philanthropy. Suraksha is a site where all three elements of neoliberal governmentality — parasitic schooling, private ownership, and digital-based pedagogy — exist to shape a new type of educational experience.

First, the organization itself is firmly part of the shadow education sector. It is not a formal school, but rather an after-school program. Yet, it is focused exclusively on academic learning, closely following the formal school curriculum and spending time preparing students for important exams. Funded mostly by philanthropic donations Suraksha is also part of the private sector, and although it must follow certain regulations in place for working with children, it nevertheless has latitude in how it designs its program and runs its operations. While Suraksha undoubtedly provides valuable education to students that is currently unavailable in their local schools, what is relevant here is how families feel it is important to send their students to an afterschool program at all. Furthermore, most students attended local government-run schools, spending days in overcrowded classrooms with uninterested teachers and failing to receive adequate instruction. Participation in a shadow education institution feels socially, if not morally obligatory, a necessary part of preparing children for the future, an almost forced choice through which the possibilities of student participation and conduct are limited.

Second, Suraksha is related to the privatization of schooling. Although it is an after-school program and not a low-fee private school, it is very much part of the ecosystem of privatization. Students targeted by Suraksha are those who cannot afford the expense of LFPs, many of which are located within walking distance of the center. LFPs have filtered out students from the private sphere, creating what was to become the client base, the market niche for programs like Suraksha. The private model of school governance is also closely followed by Suraksha, with variable fees for families of different means, and a faculty composed of individuals who are ineligible to be teachers in formal schools. Teachers at Suraksha are often young, still in college, and possess no formal credentials. This is not to suggest they are not effective, but rather that their employment is secured through new marketized arrangements of human capital, including short-term contracts, concrete accountability measures, and regular performance reviews.

Lastly, Suraksha relies heavily on digital platforms for its management and daily operations. Much of the scheduling, roster management, and other operations are managed through extensive use of Google Docs, though recently there was a shift to a third-party vendor that curates data-

¹ The organization’s name has been changed to the Hindi word for the English, ‘protection’.

management services for educational organizations.² Student data, including sensitive “biodata” but also academic data such as reading scores and daily attendance, are all held on private servers now and accessed through online platforms and apps on smartphones. Curriculum resources such as assessments and lesson plans are accessed and organized in cloud-based drives. Staff communications are facilitated through Whatsapp, a massively popular social messaging platform owned by Meta (the parent company of Facebook). Perhaps most interestingly, lesson materials, assessments, staff training plans, and community outreach are all created with the aid of artificial intelligence platforms. To observe the work of Suraksha is to see an organization profoundly reliant on digital platformization.

The three sites of neoliberal governmentality in education that I have been describing in this article — shadow education, privatization of schooling, and digital platformization — are all observable at Suraksha. The work of Suraksha can be interpreted through the lens of governmentality because families are willingly choosing to invest significant time and money to ensure their children participate in an extension of the institution of schooling. That participation is the result of both the retreat and the failure of the state to provide adequate education, even as families feel compelled to make decisions within the confines of the possibilities set by the institution of education. It is an example of neoliberalism because the presence and operations of Suraksha follow market logics, from funding to hiring to determining the choice of services being offered. Examples like Suraksha show how neoliberal governmentality is becoming a defining feature of education, signaling how the control and management of populations have been transformed into a privatized, restrictive, and voluntary endeavor.

Summarizing the Situation

The welfare of the population as an end has long justified regimes of discipline and surveillance (Foucault, 1991). Both functions — discipline and surveillance — have traditionally been the responsibility of state actors, but increasingly are being reconfigured under the management of private actors. The shift has been termed neoliberal governmentality, and I offered a way of organizing the contours of this new regime. I identified three sites through which we can understand the functioning of neoliberal governmentality. I first described how shadow education is a new form of the institution of education, one where private actors create offshoot organizations that mirror the functioning of formal, state-run schools, but do so outside the domain of the state. Shadow education works to commodify education by offering both educational advantages and remediation at a price. These offerings create cultural pressure that limits families’ choices about how to structure children’s time and efforts. Shadow education is increasingly socially obligatory, a required element of the lives of millions of children.

I next described how the privatization of schooling has transferred the responsibilities of education to private actors. Charter schools are one example of this transfer, but CMOs (Charter Management Organizations) are a starker example, as they neatly illustrate the realization of market logics in school management. But it is specifically the increase of LFPs (Low Fee Private schools) that best represents how privatization is a key site of neoliberal governmentality. LFPs are important to understand because they are concrete manifestations of the retreat of the state, or at least the inability of the state to fulfill its agreements to provide quality educational opportunities to its constituents. Lastly, I showed how digital platformization is a third site of

² Suraksha had chosen to use Vedmarg (<https://vedmarg.com/>) to manage its operation, representing a significant investment in digital platformization in hopes that essential functions and data could be more efficiently managed.

neoliberal governmentality. Educational organizations of all types, from shadow education outfits to government-run schools, are increasingly relying on private technology companies to manage their data, create learning materials, and support daily operations. Transferring educational management from systems governed by the state to those run by private companies represents a stunning reorganization of knowledge under a new regime of governmentality. Tech platforms are now in a position to direct education through the creation of digital tools, calibration of algorithms, and design of platform architectures.

Neoliberal governmentality has been explored generally through descriptions of NGOs (Nongovernmental Organizations) focused on health and welfare in shifting economic policy environments (Gupta & Sharma, 2006) and theorizations of new spatial relationships among state and civil society (Ferguson & Gupta, 2008). These developments are examples of grassroots democratic organizing that nevertheless embrace modern techniques of self-discipline (Appadurai, 2001). In education specifically, ethnographic studies have shown how neoliberal governmentality can steer students through the creation of discourse of futurity and aspirations that follow market demands. For example, Mathews (2018) showed how private English-medium schools fulfill students' aspirations for participating in the glitzy consumer economy, leaving free, government-provided vernacular schools viewed as less desirable. Rodríguez-Gómez (2022) studied a rural school in Peru that aimed to develop a spirit of entrepreneurship in students and stave off waves of outmigration. Jeffrey (2010) described how privileged children of landowners were compelled by institutional incentives to engage in "timepass," a prolonged period of waiting for select employment opportunities while denying other responsibilities not deemed market-worthy.

I have extended the exploration of neoliberal governmentality to education by describing three specific sites — shadowing, privatizing, digitizing — where its workings can be observed. Future studies can provide greater depth on each of these sites, each one promising to be a defining feature of a new institutional structure for education in the years to come. There is also a need to explore new sites where the functions of governmentality are enacted by both state institutions and private actors. An open question is whether the public-private dichotomy suggested by the term neoliberal governmentality is even accurate, or whether shifts in governance are, in fact, a reorganization rather than a retreat of state efforts. In postcolonial contexts, neoliberal governmentality does not necessarily lead to a straightforward "end of welfare" but often involves complex continuities and contradictions. The seductive quality of market participation offers the allure of autonomy and freedom, seemingly obviating the need for government regulation. Scholars have an opportunity to continue questioning whether such developments, in fact, bring greater freedom or if they are merely new sites of old relationships of control.

References

- Akbari, A., & Wood, D. M. (2025). Towards a critical political economy of surveillance and digital authoritarianism. *Surveillance & Society*, 23(1), 152-158.
- Appadurai, A. (2001). Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Environment and urbanization*, 13(2), 23-43.
- Aurini, J., Dierkes, J., & Davies, S. (Eds.) (2013). *Out of the shadows: The global intensification of supplementary education*. Bingley, UK: Emerald. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3679\(2013\)22](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3679(2013)22).

- Baker, D. (2020a). *The schooled society: The educational transformation of global culture*. Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804790482>.
- Ball, S.J. (2018). The use and abuse of Michel Foucault in Educational Studies: Thinking about what is true. S.J. Ball (Ed.) *Foucault and Education: Putting Theory to Work* (pp. 1-15). Routledge.
- Bhorkar, S., & Bray, M. (2018). The expansion and roles of private tutoring in India: From supplementation to supplantation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 62, 148-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2018.03.003>.
- Bray, M. (2017). Schooling and its supplements: Changing global patterns and implications for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(3), 469-491.
- Bray, M., & Kwo, O. (2013). Behind the façade of fee-free education: shadow education and its implications for social justice. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(4), 480–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2013.821852>.
- Byun, S.Y., Chung, H.J. & Baker, D.P. (2018). Global patterns of the use of Shadow Education: Student, family, and national influences. In H. Park and G. Kao (Eds.), *Research in the Sociology of Education, Vol 20*, (pp. 71-105). Emerald Publishing Limited: Leeds. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-353920180000020004>.
- Chabbot, C. (2013). *Constructing education for development: International organizations and education for all*. Routledge.
- Davies, S. and Mehta, J. (2018) The deepening interpenetration of education in modern life. in J. Mehta & S. Davies (Eds.) *Education in a new society: Renewing the sociology of education* (pp. 83-114). The University of Chicago Press.
- Ferguson, J., & Gupta, A. (2002). Spatializing states: toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality. *American ethnologist*, 29(4), 981-1002.
- Foucault, M. (1991). “Governmentality.” In Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds.) *The Foucault effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87-104). University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8, 777-795.
- Foucault M (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*. Pantheon Books, New York.
- Gardner, D. P. et al. (April, 1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. An open letter to the American people. A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education*. National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.
- Golann, J. W. (2021). *Scripting the moves: Culture & control in a “no-excuses” charter school*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton.
- Gupta, A. (2021). Teacher-entrepreneurialism: A case of teacher identity formation in neoliberalizing education space in contemporary India. *Critical Studies in Education*, 62(4), 422-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2019.1708765>.
- Jeffrey, C. (2010). *Timepass: Youth, class, and the politics of waiting in India*. Stanford University Press.
- Härmä J. (2021). *Low-fee private schooling and poverty in developing countries*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hernández, L. E. (2022). The importance of being “woke”: Charter management organizations and the growth of social consciousness as a school quality marker. *Educational Policy*, 36(4), 796-821.

- Kumar, I., & Chowdhury, I. R. (2021). Shadow education in India: participation and socioeconomic determinants. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 16(2), 244-272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09731741211032472>.
- Lemke, T. (2001). 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and society*, 30(2), 190-207.
- Mathew, L. (2018). Aspiring and aspiration shaming: Primary schooling, English, and enduring inequalities in liberalizing Kerala (India). *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 49(1), 72-88.
- Meyer, J. W., Krücken, G., & Drori, G. S. (2009). *World society: the writings of John W. Meyer*. Oxford University Press.
- Mundy, K. & Manion, C. (2021). The education for all initiative and the sustainable development goals: Histories and prospects," In T. McCowan & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Education and international development: An introduction* (pp. 57-78). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Narayanan, M. (2023). Educational Myths of an American Empire: Colonial Narratives and The Meriam Report. *Educational Abundance*, 3, 1-16. <https://nysfeajournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/jrn-v-3-full-final.pdf>.
- Nichols, T. P., & Dixon-Román, E. (2024). Platform governance and education policy: Power and politics in emerging edtech ecologies. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 46(2), 309-328.
- Purvis, T., & Hunt, A. (1993). Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology... *British Journal of Sociology*, 473-499.
- Ramirez, F. O., & Boli, J. (1987). The political construction of mass schooling: European origins and worldwide institutionalization. *Sociology of education*, 2-17.
- Rodríguez-Gómez, D. (2022). Disputed futures: rural entrepreneurship and migration in postsecondary trajectories on the Ecuador–Colombia Border. *Ethnography and Education*, 17(3), 314–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2022.2049333>
- Scott, D. (2005). Colonial Governmentality. In J. X. Inda, (Ed.). (2005). *Anthropologies of modernity : Foucault, governmentality, and life politics* (pp. 23-49). Blackwell Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470775875>
- Scott, J. T., & DiMartino, C. (2010). Hybridized, franchised, duplicated, and replicated: Charter schools and management organizations. In C. A. Lubienski & P. C. Weitzel (Eds.), *The charter school experiment: Expectations, evidence, and implications* (pp. 171–196). Harvard Education Press.
- Stevenson, D. L., & Baker, D. P. (1992). Shadow education and allocation in formal schooling: Transition to university in Japan. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), 1639-1657. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229942>.
- Swartz, R. (2019). *Education and empire: Children, race and humanitarianism in the British settler colonies, 1833-1880*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tooley, J. (2021). *Really good schools: Global lessons for high-caliber, low-cost education*. Independent Institute.
- Torres, A. C. (2016). Is this work sustainable? Teacher turnover and perceptions of workload in charter management organizations. *Urban Education*, 51(8), 891-914.
- Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Harvard University Press.

- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education – A tool on whose terms?* Paris: UNESCO.
- Yamamoto, Y., & Brinton, M. C. (2010). Cultural capital in East Asian educational systems: The case of Japan. *Sociology of Education*, 83(1), 67-83.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040709356567>.
- Van Dijck, J. (2024). Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big Data between scientific paradigm and ideology. *Surveillance & Society*, 12(2), 197.
- Weiss, N. R., & Knoster, T. (2008). It May Be Nonaversive, But Is It a Positive Approach? Relevant Questions to Ask Throughout the Process of Behavioral Assessment and Intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(1), 72-78.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300707311389>
- Zhang, W. (2023). *Taming the wild horse of shadow education: The global expansion of private tutoring and regulatory responses*. Taylor & Francis.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: PublicAffairs.