Research Article

Educational
Administration
Theory and Practice

Administrative Intensification and the Global Decline of Teacher Autonomy: Emerging Empirical Patterns across Contexts

Dr Ramandeep Singh[1*], Dr Kiranpreet Kaur[2]

[1*]Assistant Professor, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Email: ramandeeps.khosa@gmail.com
Orcid Id: 0009-0005-7493-7386
[2]Guest Faculty on Contract, NIT, Jalandhar. Orcid Id: 0009-0002-2453-3306

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Teacher autonomy has become increasingly constrained across diverse education systems, reshaped by expanding administrative demands, curricular standardization, digital monitoring infrastructures, assessment pressures, and shifts in the employment structures globally. This paper examines the empirical evidence of this decline by synthesizing evidence from international surveys and research, national reports, and qualitative research. After examining these, the analysis highlights how teachers' decision-making space has been progressively reorganized and constrained by systemic and constant demands for documentation, pacing fidelity, measurable performance, and data visibility. Thus, teachers frequently describe their work as shifting from meaningful instructional engagement toward routine compliance, a sentiment that reflects deeper organizational changes in schooling taking place. Also, empirical studies from varied contexts, including large international datasets, national reviews, and school-level investigations, indicate that these transformations are neither isolated nor temporally brief but part of a sustained restructuring of teachers' work. This section outlines these evolving pressures and their effects on professional judgment, laying the foundation for subsequent theoretical and structural analysis. **Keywords:** Administrative Intensification, Teacher Autonomy, Pedagogical Choice, Datafication, Curriculum Flexibility

Section I
Empirical Evidence of Declining Teacher Autonomy across Global Contexts

The Teacher autonomy has become a central point of concern in contemporary educational debates, not because it has appear suddenly, but because evidence from multiple countries reveals a long, accumulating erosion of teachers' decision-making power across administrative, pedagogical, and relational domains. Hence, although policy documents often claim to support teacher agency, the empirical reality suggests a markedly different scenario, one in which teachers' professional judgment is shaped, constrained, and frequently overridden by systemic demands for standardization, documentation, and visibility by bureaucratic logic. This section synthesizes diverse strands of global and Indian evidence to show how administrative intensification, curricular scripting, surveillance infrastructures, assessment pressures, and also employment precarity converge to restrict teachers' autonomy in educational practice. So next, we will highlight how teacher autonomy becomes limited through various demands and tasks required to be performed by teachers.

1.1 Administrative Intensification: Growing Documentation and Non-Instructional Work
Empirical research consistently shows that the administrative burden is one of the most significant constraints on teacher autonomy. Many large-scale international surveys, such as OECD TALIS, report that teachers spend increasing proportions of their contracted time on administrative or compliance-related tasks—often exceeding the time spent on planning for teaching or professional development (OECD, 2020). Thus, teachers frequently express that they are "spending more time reporting learning than enabling it," a phrase that captures the growing disconnect between instructional intention and administrative demand.

Studies in the United States, England, Australia, and Singapore all report similar trends: rising documentation requirements, constant updates to digital platforms, and a proliferation of mandatory reports tied to accountability regimes (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2017; Sahlberg, 2016). In England, for example, the intensification of administrative performance management is closely tied to the "audit culture" that redefines teachers' work around evidence of compliance rather than pedagogical responsiveness (Ball, 2015).

This is not just a global trend, as Indian evidence aligns closely with these global findings. Ramachandran et al.'s landmark nine-state study demonstrates that teachers are required to maintain multiple registers, compile data for various government-run educational schemes, prepare midday meal reports, complete school infrastructure audits, and respond to frequent monitoring by district officials. Many teachers in this report express that administrative expectations have become so extensive and time-consuming that "teaching is what we do after we finish the paperwork," a striking inversion of the professional purpose of teaching.

Administrative intensification systematically reduces autonomy by consuming the discretionary time teachers need for planning, adaptation, and reflective practice. Documentation tasks fragment the whole school day, narrowing the space for pedagogical decision-making. This restructuring of labour transforms teaching from a primarily intellectual activity into a compliance-oriented role, diminishing teachers' sense of ownership over their instructional work (Apple, 2021).

1.2 Tight Coupling Curriculum: Standardized and Restricted Pedagogical Choice

Administrative tasks not only rob teachers of their autonomy but also rob them of the pedagogical freedom they once enjoyed. Much empirical evidence points to curriculum prescription as a driver of autonomy loss. Standardized curriculum frameworks—often presented as tools for ensuring equity and quality—frequently restrict teachers' capacity to adapt content, pacing, and instructional method to diverse learning needs. Research across the globe, like in Chile, South Korea, England, and South Africa, shows that teachers feel compelled to follow pacing guides closely to avoid being marked as "underperforming" or "off-track," even when student readiness varies (Schmidt et al., 2017).

In India, curriculum prescription is reinforced by textbook-centric teaching, mandated learning outcomes, constant administratively assigned tests, and grade-level pacing requirements. Ramachandran et al. note that teachers often feel bound to complete the textbook in a linear manner and express concerns that deviating from the prescribed curriculum "attracts unnecessary questions and scrutiny from supervisors". The structure of syllabi, periodic tests, and learning outcome monitoring thus creates strong incentives for uniform delivery. Thus, in organizational terms, curricular prescription relocates decision-making authority from classrooms to administrative bodies, and this led to ideological control of the teaching-learning process.

1.3 Surveillance, Datafication, and the Transformation of Teacher Visibility

The surveillance has become a defining empirical trend in the transformation of teacher autonomy. Schools now deploy multi-layered monitoring technologies—including classroom observations, appraisal frameworks, digital lesson logs, and platform-based analytics. These monitoring systems are often framed as quality assurance tools, but research shows they produce environments in which teachers feel continuously visible, evaluated, compared, and thus feared.

Teachers often say, "Everything we do is watched" or "We plan for the observer, not the learner." Such expressions reflect deeper shifts documented by empirical studies examining how surveillance becomes internalized as self-regulation. Research by Perryman et al. demonstrates that policy translation in schools encourages teachers to subject themselves to continuous appraisal. So, teachers "work on themselves," adjusting behavior to meet institutional expectations and internalizing the evaluative gaze of administrators.

The recent push towards digital datafication deepens this effect. Evidence from multiple countries indicates that teachers spend substantial time uploading lesson evidence, updating assessment dashboards, marking attendance digitally, and aligning classroom activities with predefined digital categories (Lewis & Holloway, 2019). Hence, the process produces what researchers call "data-driven performativity," where teachers make decisions based on what is countable rather than what is meaningful.

In India also, the expansion of state-level platforms has increased requirements for real-time data entry. Many teachers report that "teaching must be shown through data," revealing how digital infrastructures reshape instructional priorities and reduce the discretionary space teachers once had to make contextual pedagogical decisions.

1.4 Assessment Pressures: High-Stakes Testing and Continuous Evidence Production

The rising trend of high-stakes testing further erodes autonomy by narrowing instructional focus and prioritizing measurable outputs over rich and varied learning experiences. Empirical studies from East Asia, the United States, Latin America, and Europe all show that teachers tailor instruction to ensure students perform well on mandated tests, sometimes at the expense of deeper conceptual understanding (Au, 2007).

These teachers frequently express this when they say that "they cannot slow down" or "cannot experiment" due to the pressure of assessments. This sentiment corresponds with research showing that high-stakes exams constrain the scope of teaching, reduce curricular breadth, and shift teachers' attention toward test-aligned content (Lingard & Sellar, 2013). Thus, high-stakes exams become a cause of fear and anxiety in not only students but also teachers, as they internalize the idea that their worth is proven through exam performance.

This is particularly clear. In India, where foundational learning assessments are increasingly tied to system performance, teachers are expected to produce continuous evidence of student progress. Also, high-stakes exams like JEE put an unbearable kind of pressure on teachers and students alike. Hence, Ramachandran et al. find that teachers often feel compelled to conduct assessments even when students are not developmentally ready, as assessment results influence school reputation and administrative evaluation.

So we can call that assessment regime thus functioning as governance mechanisms—steering teachers toward measurable outputs and reducing their ability to exercise professional discretion.

1.5 Employment Precarity and the Weakening of Professional Voice

One of the important factors that influence teacher autonomy is employment structures. In many countries, the rise of contractual teaching positions has weakened teachers' ability to express dissent, innovation, or professional judgment in the teaching-learning process. OECD data shows that teachers on temporary or precarious contracts report lower autonomy, higher compliance, and reduced willingness to challenge directives (OECD, 2020). Indian evidence highlights the vulnerability of contract teachers and para-teachers. Many teachers express that they "cannot question anything" because their job security depends on maintaining administrative approval. Ramachandran et al. document that precariously employed teachers often limit their professional contributions to avoid being perceived as non-compliant or resistant to authority.

This structural vulnerability diminishes autonomy not through formal regulation but through psychological and organisational dependence. As when teachers lack stability, the risks associated with exercising autonomy outweigh the potential benefits, leading to self-imposed compliance.

1.6 Socio-Emotional and Identity Consequences: From Professionals to Technical Workers

The declining autonomy affects not only instructional decisions but also the emotional, social, and identity dimensions of teaching. Many empirical studies report increased stress, burnout, and professional alienation among teachers who experience their work as tightly regulated (Day & Gu, 2010). Teachers frequently state that they "feel like labourers completing tasks," a sentiment that mirrors academic descriptions of "deprofessionalization" in teaching.

The scholars note that when teachers lose control over planning, pacing, assessment choices, and relational practices, their sense of professionalism becomes compromised (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Therefore, this is not merely a matter of morale; it reflects a structural shift in how teaching is organized as labour. The global trend of teachers' descriptions of reduced autonomy reflects a transformation of roles—from creative instructional designers to implementers of externally defined expectations.

1.7 Synthesis: A Global Pattern of Converging Pressures to reduce teacher autonomy

The studies that are documented in this paper show that across global and Indian contexts, a coherent pattern is seen: teacher autonomy is diminished through interacting mechanisms of administrative intensification, curricular prescription, surveillance, assessment pressures, and employment precarity. Teachers articulate these shifts through everyday descriptions in their conversations—"we just follow what is given," "everything must be recorded," "our decisions don't matter"—while academic analyses reveal deeper structural logics shaping these experiences.

Taken all these together, the evidence suggests that autonomy loss is not an incidental by-product of reform but a predictable outcome of systemic changes in how schooling is governed. Thus, these empirical observations lay the foundation for Section Two, which explores the broader philosophical, historical, and structural forces driving this global reorganization of teaching. So the author will discuss these in the next section, regarding what the broader socio-economic factors are responsible for this.

SECTION II
2.1.1 Introduction: From Pedagogical Freedom to Global Governance in Teaching: Tracing the Historical Rise

The rising decline of teacher autonomy that characterizes contemporary schooling does not arise from recent administrative decisions alone. It reflects a profound, historically sedimented reorganization of educational thought and governance and is reflected in schooling practices. Over more than a century, shifts in epistemology, political economy, and institutional rationality have converged to redefine teaching as an activity that must be standardized, monitored, and rendered increasingly measurable and evaluated. Thus, the professional discretion once embedded in the role of the teacher has progressively contracted under the influence of positivist epistemologies, bureaucratic rationalization, neoliberal governance, and digital surveillance. These macro-transformations create the structural conditions within which the empirical patterns described in Section One become intelligible. So I will discuss it historical evolution in subsequent sections.

2.1.2 Rise of Positivism and the Early Rationalization of Schooling (Late 19th–Mid 20th Century)

The genealogy of declining teacher autonomy starting from the 19th century begins with the rise and consolidation of the force of positivism, though, which redefined legitimate knowledge as that which could be

observed, quantified, and generalized. Also, educational psychology, heavily influenced by behaviorist traditions, embraced positivist assumptions, resulting in models that conceptualized learning only as a sequence of discrete, measurable outcomes (Thorndike, 1922; Skinner, 1954). This epistemological turn did more than shape cognitive theories; it established a normative expectation that educational processes ought to be observable and amenable to precise specification. Thus, this represents the most significant shift in the criteria for what constitutes legitimate thought. Working broadly within this paradigm shift, the early twentieth century also saw rapid bureaucratization of state schooling. So we can conclude that, even before the global accountability turn, the seeds of diminished discretion for teachers were embedded in these administrative architectures.

2.1.3 Post-War Reconstruction and the Shift toward Large-Scale Coordination (1945–1970)
Following the Second World War, education systems expanded dramatically as states sought to promote reconstruction, national cohesion and development, and social mobility. This expansion required stronger administrative coordination and oversight by governments. These oversights are reflected in national curricula, uniform examinations, and inspectorate systems, which became central tools for achieving coherence across rapidly growing school systems across the globe (Green, 1997).

Although this era retained some space for teacher professionalism—particularly in countries with stronger welfare-state traditions—the logic of coordination and standardization continued to strengthen worldwide. Furthermore, international organizations such as UNESCO began promoting comparative frameworks for tracking educational development across nations, reinforcing the idea that educational progress should be measured through universal indicators.

Hence, this period established a model of schooling that increasingly valued uniformity and measurable performance among teachers. Although teachers' autonomy was still present, it was already circumscribed by institutional demands for system-level coherence.

2.1.4 The 1970s Crisis and the Emergence of Accountability Rationalities
The economic crises of the early 1970s across the globe marked a decisive moment in the restructuring of education governance. The oil shocks, rising inflation, and fiscal austerity measures destabilized faith in welfare-state models and generated pressure to justify public expenditure. Education, traditionally viewed as a social good, became reframed as an economic instrument whose efficiency needed to be demonstrated and measured (Harvey, 2005). One more theory—the human capital theory—gained substantial influence, articulating a direct link between schooling, productivity, and economic growth. As a result, governments across the world sought mechanisms and observable measures to make schools accountable for results. Consequently, teacher autonomy increasingly appeared, within these policy discourses, as an inefficiency that could impede measurable improvement. National systems introduced centralized tests, detailed performance reports, and oversight mechanisms designed to ensure adherence to prescribed standards and curricula (OECD, 1995).

2.1.5 Neoliberal Governance, Managerialism, and the Reconfiguration of the Teaching Profession (1980s–1990s)
In the late 1980s, the subsequent rise of economic reforms and neoliberal governance profoundly accelerated the reorganization of teacher autonomy across schooling. Different governments in nations like the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and later many Asian and Latin American countries introduced reforms grounded in market logics, managerial oversight, and performativity (Ball, 2003). Schools were reframed as competitive organizations expected to demonstrate measurable improvement, and teachers were positioned as agents responsible for producing measurable outputs. Conversely impacting teaching-learning decisions.

These changes correspond with critical analyses of deprofessionalization, wherein the expertise of teachers is subordinated to externally defined standards and policy imperatives (Apple, 2004). Moreover, Bernstein's theory of pedagogic recontextualization likewise also illuminates how state agencies assume greater control over curriculum and knowledge selection, shrinking the interpretive space traditionally occupied by teachers and other members of the society.

The international development agencies contributed further to the convergence of these reforms. As countries sought to modernize their economies, policy borrowing intensified, and teacher regulation became central to widely adopted "global reform packages" (Sahlberg, 2016). Alongside this, even regions with historically different educational traditions began implementing performance-based accountability systems that further restricted teacher autonomy across the globe.

2.1.6 Globalization, Benchmarking, and the Universalization of Standardization (2000s)
At the turn of the millennia, the introduction of large-scale global assessments—particularly the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)—significantly deepened the global shift toward measurable schooling. International agencies introduced international rankings, which created competitive pressures that encouraged governments to adopt reforms aligning national curricula with global benchmarks (Lingard & Sellar, 2013). This quest for improved rankings led to increased prescription, uniformity, and data monitoring.

As comparative education research showed, policy borrowing intensified dramatically during this period across the nations (Steiner-Khamsi, 2012). Nations looked to high-performing systems such as Finland, Singapore, and Shanghai, frequently adopting elements of their curricula and assessment frameworks without attending to the socio-cultural and institutional contexts that sustained them. This practice resulted in the worldwide diffusion of standardized pedagogic structures, teaching-learning methods, evaluations of students, and accountability measures. Subsequently, teachers in diverse contexts began to report similar experiences: reduced flexibility and discretion, tighter pacing demands, mandatory instructional scripts pre-decided by higher authorities, and increased oversight. The ecological model of teacher agency developed by Priestley, Biesta, and Robinson provides a valuable analytic framework for understanding this period. Their research demonstrates that teachers' actions are shaped by structural, cultural, and material conditions, and that policy environments characterized by strong accountability and prescriptive curricula severely restrict the conditions under which teacher agency can be exercised.

Thus, even when teachers express commitment to creativity or contextual adaptation, the institutional conditions surrounding them exert powerful constraints that limit autonomous decision-making, and they surrender to these institutional forces.

2.1.7 The Digital Turn: Datafication, Surveillance, and the Post-Bureaucratic Governance of Teaching (2010s–Present)

Recently, the adoption of digital technologies has intensified the restructuring of teacher autonomy by creating new modalities of surveillance and data extraction. Real-time dashboards, digital lesson logs, app-based monitoring, online assessment systems, and constant updates of their teaching and learning to higher authorities and parents render teaching continuously visible and subject to evaluation. Despite this, these tools are frequently framed as supportive or efficiency-enhancing; yet, research consistently shows that they deepen managerial oversight and reduce the room for improvisation and decision-making by teachers.

These expressions map onto sociological analyses of datafication, which argue that digital infrastructures transform professional work into a series of data points that can be monitored, compared, and intervened upon (Lewis & Holloway, 2019). Perryman et al. conducted a study of governmentality that demonstrates how teachers internalise these visibility demands in their behaviour, regulating their conduct in accordance with perceived expectations rather than immediate pedagogical judgment.

This dynamic and rising data culture is strongly evident in India as well, where teachers must upload attendance, assessment results, and classroom activities on state platforms, a process that reallocates time away from instruction toward compliance tasks. As Ramachandran et al. note, teachers often reinterpret their professional responsibilities through the demands of these digital systems, which shape their perceptions of what counts as legitimate work and duty for teachers.

2.1.8 Conclusion to Part One

Tracing these historical and philosophical transformations—from positivism to neoliberal governance and from bureaucratic rationalization to digital surveillance—it can be seen that teaching has been progressively reconfigured as a governed activity characterized by standardization, visibility, and measurable outputs. These changes can be seen in teachers' everyday expressions, such as "we no longer decide" or "we simply implement," and this reflects not personal grievances but structural realities shaped by a century-long redefinition of educational purpose and practice. After identifying the historical traces of declines in teacher autonomy, the next part of this section examines how these macro-level forces manifest in the micro-level processes of teaching, reshaping planning, instruction, assessment, relationships, and the professional identity of teachers across global contexts.

2.2 Why This Shift Happened:

After tracing the historical roots of declining teacher autonomy, we need to look towards the educationists at how they perceive this historical decline, what the factors responsible for this phenomenon are, and how these changes lead to the loss of power of the teacher as an effective educator. So we need to look. The contemporary erosion of teacher autonomy is the result of shifts in epistemology, state governance, political economy, and institutional rationality. This section tries to synthesize the principal theoretical traditions that illuminate *why* this global shift occurred and *how* it reorganized teaching as governed work rather than a professional, interpretive, and relational practice.

2.2.1 The Rise of Positivism and the Epistemic Construction of Measurable Schooling

The earliest foundations of autonomy decline lie in the ascendancy of positivism, which positioned measurable, observable knowledge as the highest form of truth and knowledge production. Positivist epistemology shaped early educational psychology, particularly through behaviorist theorists such as Thorndike (1922) and Skinner (1954), who conceptualized learning as a sequence of discrete, quantifiable behaviors that can be observed. Hence, once learning became defined in measurable terms, schooling was reorganized around standardized outcomes, efficiency, and comparability (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). And it can be evaluated effectively based on predefined objectives. From an epistemic perspective, this transition diminished the professional latitude for teacher interpretation and adaptation. Apple (1988) argued that the positivist framing of learning rendered

teachers vulnerable to bureaucratic tight control, as rationalized systems privilege standardization over judgment. This merging of tests and objective assessments in the middle of the twentieth century made this technocratic view of teaching even stronger. It made it so that educational validity had to be measured from the outside (Labaree, 2010).

This epistemological shift is the conceptual root of today's learning outcomes, competency frameworks, and standardized accountability metrics, which value quantifiable data more than any other form of knowledge production and distribution. Singh (2022) argues that the dominance of positivism in modern schooling has systematically reduced teachers' curriculum agency by redefining what counts as legitimate knowledge and how curriculum must be enacted. Thus, the teacher's voice—once central to the interpretive act of teaching—was gradually displaced by technical rationality that could be "verified" through quantification and evaluated accordingly.

2.2.2 Bureaucratic Rationalization and the Administrative Structuring of Teacher Work
Alongside epistemic change, the rise of bureaucratization of schooling also provided a powerful structural mechanism for constraining the autonomy of teachers. Weber's theory of bureaucratic rationality explains this shift, as it emphasizes that modern institutions rely on formal rules, hierarchical oversight, and standard procedures to ensure predictability and administrative coherence (Weber, 1978). As state-controlled schooling expanded globally, this model became the dominant organizational logic.

The result of all these changes is that the teachers became what Lipsky (1980) termed "street-level bureaucrats," whose discretion is limited by administrative regulation. Their daily professional work increasingly centered on implementing state-defined objectives rather than exercising professional autonomy. Bernstein's (2000) notion of the *pedagogic device* further clarifies this decline in autonomy as he shows how state agencies began to control the classification and framing of knowledge, thereby reducing teachers' interpretive role in curriculum recontextualization.

In India also aligning with this global trend, bureaucratic intensification is well documented: teachers are required to maintain multiple registers, produce school-level data, and comply with inspection routines that overshadow instructional duties. These bureaucratic expectations represent not one unique incidental burden but structural expressions of a rationalized administrative order that systematically narrows professional discretion.

2.2.3 Neoliberalism, Managerialism, and the Global Restructuring of Educational Governance
The most significant intensification of autonomy decline emerged with the ascendancy of neoliberal governance in the late twentieth century, particularly in developed nations and then subsequently in developing nations. Educational sociologists have repeatedly demonstrated that neoliberal reforms repositioned schooling within the frameworks of market competition, efficiency, and performance accountability (Apple, 2004; Ball, 2003; Giroux, 2014). The combined influence of these conditions redefined teachers' work through managerial logics that emphasize standardization, surveillance, and measurable effectiveness.

Ball's (2003) concept of **performativity** shows how teachers become governed by policy technologies—targets, evaluations, performance audits—that compel them to prioritize what can be measured, and they adapt their teaching-learning process according to that.

Critical scholars also contribute by identifying how power is legitimized by different powerful sections through various processes. Bernstein's (2000) recontextualization theory enhances this analysis by illustrating how state actors exert greater control over curriculum and pedagogy, thereby constricting the parameters within which teachers are allowed to operate. Similarly, Bourdieu's (1998) theory of symbolic power further clarifies how audit cultures redefine professional legitimacy: measurable performance becomes the dominant form of symbolic capital, marginalizing experiential, concrete, and relational knowledge productions.

2.2.4 Teacher Agency and the Structural Conditions of Professional Action
The cumulative impact of these epistemic, administrative, and neoliberal factors is best analyzed through the theory of agency. Priestley, Biesta, and Robinson conceptualize teacher agency not as individual capacity but as an emergent ecological phenomenon shaped by structural, cultural, and material affordances. When systems impose rigid curricula, frequent monitoring, and data-based accountability, the ecological conditions necessary for agency are weakened, even if teachers possess strong personal or professional resources, and thus his/her resultant autonomy gets weakened over the course of time. Their research in Scotland demonstrates how greater policy discourses shape teacher beliefs, norms, and professional dispositions, subtly narrowing the repertoire of actions that teachers consider legitimate and working only with a broader ecological framework.

Collectively, these theoretical traditions converge on a clear conclusion: the global decline in teacher autonomy is not accidental or episodic, but it is the result of deep intellectual, structural, and political shifts that redefined teaching as a governed, measurable, and accountable form of labour.

2.3 Why These Trends Must Be Reconsidered: Educational, Sociological, and Ethical Imperatives

The contraction of teacher autonomy requires urgent reconsideration because it undermines core educational, democratic, and sociological purposes of schooling. So teachers' autonomy must be restored. Empirical and theoretical literature increasingly demonstrates that excessive standardization, surveillance, and managerial control diminish the professional judgment central to high-quality pedagogy and effective teaching-learning. Research shows that when teachers lack discretion in curriculum, teaching-learning, and evaluation, they cannot meaningfully adjust instruction to diverse learner needs, resulting in narrowed pedagogy and reduced responsiveness (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Priestley, Biesta, and Robinson (2015) further argue that teacher agency depends on ecological conditions—structural, cultural, and material—that are significantly weakened under rigid accountability systems, and thus the solution also lies in strengthening ecological conditions, which gives more freedom and power back to teachers in all pedagogical choices.

Also, high-stakes testing environments consistently produce reductions in curricular breadth, as teachers prioritize examinable content at the expense of holistic, creative, and inquiry-based learning (Au, 2007), which undermines the holistic development of students. Freire (1972) warns that such instrumentalism reinforces a "banking model" of instruction that limits critical consciousness and democratic participation, and this learning as praxis should be introduced.

Also, one of the major ramifications of this is teacher burnout, dissatisfaction, and attrition. Day and Gu (2010) observe strong correlations between limited decision-making power and emotional exhaustion. Ingersoll and Merrill (2017) similarly show that autonomy is a key predictor of teacher retention. In contexts like India, the combination of administrative intensification, digital oversight, and frequent data reporting heightens stress and diminishes professional purpose and increases attrition among teachers as they lose zeal for teaching. Teachers often express that they "work for the system, not the student," a sentiment that illustrates Weber's (1978) analysis of bureaucratic rationalization and Power's (1997) concept of audit-induced emotional labour. The decline in autonomy also poses ethical and democratic risks. Giroux (2014) argues that when teachers lose discretion, schools lose their capacity to cultivate critical citizenship, empathy, democratic agency, and critical consciousness among students. Finally, autonomy loss sustains structural inequalities, as teachers in under-resourced settings consistently report that rigid pacing and centrally imposed expectations fail to match learners' realities, thereby reproducing inequity.

Across these diverse strands of theoretical arguments and empirical evidence, a clear consensus emerges: reclaiming teacher autonomy is essential for professional responsiveness, democratic education, teacher well-being, and educational equity. These arguments provide the foundation for Section Three, which examines structural and organizational reforms needed for restoring meaningful professional discretion of teachers.

SECTION III

Reclaiming teacher autonomy requires more than minor procedural adjustments; it demands structural, cultural, and policy transformations that address the historical, epistemic, and managerial forces that reduce its autonomy and have redefined teaching as technical labour. The cumulative evidence presented in the previous sections demonstrates that autonomy has declined due to many systemic shifts, some of which are positivist measurement logics, bureaucratic rationalization, neoliberal managerialism, global benchmarking, and digital surveillance. This closing section identifies the possible organizational and administrative pathways through which educational systems can restore teacher agency while maintaining commitments to equity and accountability in education. These pathways are grounded in global research on teacher education as well as empirical insights from India, where teachers consistently articulate the need for reduced administrative burden, more flexible curriculum frameworks, and professional trust.

3.1 Reconfiguring Accountability Systems to Support Professional Judgment

First of all, reforms aimed at restoring autonomy must begin by reshaping accountability regimes that currently constrain professional judgment. Systems that shift toward *intelligent accountability*—a form of oversight that balances trust with evidence—create conditions conducive to teacher agency (Sahlberg, 2016). So a shift towards intelligent accountability is warranted. Intelligent accountability relies on professional conversation, school self-review, collaborative inquiry, and sample-based system monitoring rather than constant individual surveillance. Perryman et al. (2017) show that when accountability is based on professional dialogue rather than performance surveillance, teachers experience reduced pressure, greater confidence, and higher willingness to innovate and transact curriculum effectively. Hence, reorienting accountability in this manner requires all educational stakeholders to move away from narrow metrics and incorporate indicators of relational work, inclusive practice, and contextual responsiveness—dimensions that cannot be reduced to data alone.

For countries like India, where accountability mechanisms rely heavily on classroom observations, classroom logs, data submission, and compliance recording, adopting a more formative, trust-based approach could significantly ease teacher stress and expand professional discretion.

3.2 Reducing Administrative Burden and Reasserting Pedagogical Time

A central element of autonomy restoration involves restructuring teachers' non-instructional workload, which demands constant attention of teachers towards non-teaching workloads. This administrative intensification diverts time and mental energy away from planning, reflection, and student engagement. Many national and

international studies strongly indicate that reducing administrative load leads to improved instructional quality, increased morale, and stronger professional identity (Day & Gu, 2010; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2017).

Therefore, organizational reforms must prioritize removing redundant documentation, consolidating reporting systems, and ensuring that digital platforms serve pedagogical rather than surveillance functions. This requires the streamlining of data processes, especially in low- and middle-income systems where teachers often manage welfare schemes, surveys, and school-level logistics in addition to teaching.

The solution to this problem is that school leaders can redistribute administrative responsibilities through clerical support staff, school office strengthening, or centralized data teams. Such interventions align with Weber's argument that bureaucracies must separate technical-professional work from clerical functions to preserve occupational expertise (Weber, 1978). By freeing teachers from low-value administrative tasks that require limited creativity and just repetition, teachers reclaim the time necessary for high-quality planning and responsive pedagogy.

3.3 Allowing Curriculum Flexibility

The power of designing a curriculum is a powerful lever for restoring autonomy. Curriculum frameworks that have excessive prescription, like rigid pacing guides, textbook fidelity requirements, and inflexible learning-outcome calendars, narrow teachers' interpretive space. Conversely, much research shows that curricula that provide conceptual clarity and depth while allowing contextual adaptation foster both autonomy and coherence (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012).

We can borrow from Bernstein's (2000) theory of the pedagogic device, which argues that strong classification with weak framing—clear knowledge structures but flexible instructional methods—best supports teacher professionalism. This allows systems to maintain national standards while granting teachers discretion in pacing, method, and content adaptation. Similarly, Priestley, Biesta, and Robinson (2015), in their study, emphasize that teacher agency depends on supportive structural conditions that acknowledge teachers as interpreters rather than implementers of curriculum.

In India, this problem requires extra attention, as rigid textbook-based curriculum structures often impede adaptation for diverse learners. In India many teachers note the need to "go back or slow down," yet feel pressure to keep up with mandated sequences. Such reforms also align with Freire's (1972) emancipatory pedagogy, which positions curriculum as a dialogic space rather than a fixed script to be implemented. It is worth noting that autonomy-enabling curricula are not unstructured—they are structured differently, privileging interpretation over compliance.

3.4 Strengthening Professional Learning Communities and Collaborative Autonomy

Restoring autonomy requires cultural as well as broader structural shifts. It is to be noted that autonomy is not isolation; it is collective professional agency exercised within supportive cultures.

Hence, schools that organize regular peer observations, collaborative planning meetings, reflective dialogue, and teacher-led innovation projects create conducive conditions where autonomy becomes relational, justifiable, and sustainable.

3.5 Reimagining School Leadership as Distributed, Ethical, and Trust-Based

Many educationists, like Giroux (2014), iterated that democratic educational philosophy must cultivate conditions enabling critical, ethical, autonomous pedagogy. Leaders should self-reflect and regulate and therefore must challenge reductive interpretations of accountability and model relational rather than managerial authority.

In empirical studies from India, teachers often report that supportive school heads "give us freedom to teach," while authoritarian heads intensify surveillance and resultant stress. Leadership training should therefore incorporate ethics of trust, relational care (Noddings, 2013), and inclusive decision-making—values essential for an autonomy-enabling school culture, which can significantly boost autonomy of teachers.

3.6 Policy-Level Reforms: Redesigning System Architectures for Autonomy

Finally, autonomy cannot be fully restored without system-level policy reforms. These include limiting high-stakes testing and replacing it with holistic indicators, decentralizing certain pedagogical decisions to school and cluster levels, reducing contract-based employment that weakens teacher voice, and designing digital systems for diagnostic support rather than surveillance purposes. If acted upon, such reforms respond to the structural barriers identified by many researchers worldwide, which demonstrates that teachers often "know what learners need but cannot act" due to centralized mandates and administrative pressures. So it is imperative that system architectures evolve toward supportive governance that recognizes teachers as central agents of educational transformation.

CONCLUSION

This paper discusses that the decline of teacher autonomy should be seen from a wider viewpoint and that it is a product of deep historical, epistemic, and structural forces. Hence, teachers' everyday expressions—"we no longer decide," "we teach for the record," "our students need more time"—reflect not personal complaint but structural misalignment between policy logics and pedagogical realities. Thus, restoring autonomy is both

possible and necessary. The pathways outlined in Section Three—intelligent accountability, reduced administrative burden, flexible curriculum frameworks, collaborative professional cultures, supportive leadership, and policy redesign—offer actionable strategies for rebalancing governance in favor of professional agency, which requires quality education. It is to be noted that systems that trust teachers, support contextualized decision-making, and value relational pedagogy are better positioned to develop reflective, ethical, and responsive learners.

In conclusion, educational systems must recenter their reforms around the teacher as a knowledgeable, ethical, and context-sensitive professional and should give them maximum independence. Only then can autonomy be reclaimed, not as a privilege but as a structural foundation for meaningful and equitable education where teachers remain the most crucial and central figure of pedagogical processes.

REFERENCES

1. Apple, M. W. (1988). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education.* Routledge.
2. Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
3. Au, W. (2007). High-stakes testing and curricular control: A qualitative metasynthesis. *Educational Researcher*, 36(5), 258–267.
4. Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215–228.
5. Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global education inc.: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary.* Routledge.
6. Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity* (Rev. ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
7. Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 33–46.
8. Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action.* Stanford University Press.
9. Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2010). *The new lives of teachers.* Routledge.
10. Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* Macmillan.
11. Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Vintage.
12. Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Penguin.
13. Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education.* Haymarket Books.
14. Green, A. (1997). *Education and state formation: The rise of education systems in England, France and the USA.* Palgrave.
15. Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (Vol. 1). Beacon Press.
16. Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times.* Cassell.
17. Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school.* Teachers College Press.
18. Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). *Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all.* Corwin.
19. Ingersoll, R., & Merrill, E. (2017). A quarter century of changes in the elementary and secondary teaching workforce. *CPRE Research Reports*, 2017(1), 1–33.
20. Kim, T. (2019). Accountability and autonomy in East Asian school systems. *Comparative Education Review*, 63(3), 345–368.
21. Labaree, D. F. (2010). *Someone has to fail: The zero-sum game of public schooling.* Harvard University Press.
22. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
23. Lewis, S., & Holloway, J. (2019). Datafication and teachers' work. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 44(1), 5–20.
24. Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy.* Russell Sage Foundation.
25. Lingard, B., & Sellar, S. (2013). 'Catalyst data': PISA and the reimagining of educational governance. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 40(3), 353–372.
26. Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.
27. OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals.* OECD Publishing.
28. Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification.* Oxford University Press.
29. Priestley, M., Biesta, G., & Robinson, S. (2015). *The role of beliefs in teacher agency* (Working paper). University of Stirling.
30. Perryman, J., Ball, S., Braun, A., & Maguire, M. (2017). Translating policy: Governmentality and the reflective teacher. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(6), 745–756.
31. Ramachandran, V., Bhattacharjea, S., & Sheshagiri, K. M. (2018). *Teachers in the Indian education system: Synthesis of a nine-state study.* NUEPA.
32. Sahlberg, P. (2016). *The global educational reform movement and its impact on teachers.* Routledge.

33. Schmidt, W., Cogan, L., & Houang, R. (2017). Schooling for tomorrow: Curriculum and instruction. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(4), 467–484.
34. Singh, R. (2022). Critique of the Impact of Positivism on Modern Schooling Curriculum Processes in the Context of Value Education. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(9), 4608–4614.
35. Skinner, B. F. (1954). *The science of learning and the art of teaching*. Harvard University Press.
36. Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2012). Understanding policy borrowing and lending. *World Yearbook of Education*, 3–17.
37. Thorndike, E. (1922). *The psychology of learning*. Teachers College Press.
38. Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia*. Harvard University Press.
39. Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.
40. Worth, J., & Van den Brande, J. (2020). *Teacher autonomy: How does it relate to job satisfaction and retention?* National Foundation for Educational Research.
41. Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. Sage.