Social Infrastructure and Economic Development in India: A Narrative Review with Special Reference to Education Infrastructure

Dikshita Borah

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Adarsha Mahavidyalaya, Tulungia, Bongaigaon, Assam

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1015EC0115

Received: 30 October 2026; Accepted: 04 November 2026; Published: 21 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Social infrastructure contributes to economic and human development by expanding people's access to essential services and strengthening their capabilities. Within this broad category, education infrastructure is particularly important because it provides the physical, digital, institutional and human conditions necessary for teaching, learning, skill formation and research. This paper reviews the relationship between education infrastructure and economic development in India through a narrative synthesis of theoretical contributions, academic studies and official policy and statistical documents. It distinguishes the availability of educational facilities from their functionality and from the learning outcomes they are expected to support. The discussion draws on human capital theory, endogenous growth theory and the capability approach, while also considering the screening and signalling perspectives that caution against treating educational attainment as a direct measure of productive skill. Indian evidence on returns to education, school learning and education-sector management is used to qualify the argument. Official sources, including UDISE+, ASER and policy reports, indicate progress in the expansion of basic and digital facilities, but also reveal continuing differences across facilities and regions. These administrative and survey indicators provide important information about access and learning; however, they do not by themselves establish that infrastructure investment causes higher productivity or economic growth. The paper therefore advances a conceptual argument: well-planned, functional and equitably distributed education infrastructure can support human capital formation and inclusive development when complemented by qualified teachers, effective governance, relevant curricula and labour-market opportunities. The paper concludes that educational infrastructure should be assessed not merely by the number of institutions or facilities created, but by their quality, accessibility, utilisation and contribution to meaningful learning.

Keywords: Social infrastructure, education infrastructure, human capital, learning outcomes, economic development, digital divide, India.

1. INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure is commonly understood as the basic facilities and systems that support economic activity and social life. Roads, railways, electricity, irrigation and communication networks are generally classified as economic or physical infrastructure because they facilitate production, mobility and exchange. Yet the availability of physical infrastructure alone cannot ensure sustained and inclusive development. The productive capacity of an economy also depends on the knowledge, skills, health and capabilities of its people. This makes social infrastructure—particularly education—an essential part of the development process.

Social infrastructure may be understood as the organised facilities, institutions and services that enable individuals and communities to develop their capabilities, participate in social and economic life and improve their well-being. Education, healthcare, sanitation, drinking water and related services are important components. The present paper retains this wider context but concentrates on education infrastructure. It does not attempt to assess every component of social infrastructure in equal detail.

Education infrastructure is more than the physical presence of a school or college. It includes the buildings and learning spaces in which education takes place; digital facilities that support access to information and

technology-enabled learning; institutional arrangements such as governance, curricula and academic support; and the human resources required to deliver education, particularly qualified teachers and trained technical staff. These dimensions interact. A computer laboratory without reliable electricity, connectivity, maintenance or trained teachers may have limited educational value. Similarly, a well-constructed school cannot ensure learning if teaching quality and institutional support are weak.

The importance of education infrastructure is especially relevant to India because educational opportunities remain uneven across states, districts, rural and urban locations and socioeconomic groups. The National Education Policy 2020 emphasises equitable access, quality learning environments, technology integration and institutional improvement (Ministry of Education, 2020). UDISE+ 2024–25 reports high availability of some basic facilities, including drinking water and electricity, while computer and internet access remain less widespread (Ministry of Education, 2025). These figures indicate progress, but they should be interpreted as indicators of reported facility availability rather than direct measures of facility quality, regular functionality or student learning.

The central argument of this paper is therefore deliberately qualified. Education infrastructure can create the conditions through which learning, skills, research and productivity may improve. However, the presence of infrastructure alone does not demonstrate that these outcomes have occurred. The relationship depends on the quality and use of facilities, teaching and institutional effectiveness, the socioeconomic context of learners and the capacity of the labour market to use acquired skills. The paper examines these connections as a conceptual and evidence-informed narrative review, not as a causal impact evaluation.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

India has expanded its network of schools, colleges, universities and technical institutions and has introduced programmes to improve school facilities and digital learning. Nevertheless, expansion in the number of institutions and facilities does not necessarily ensure equal access to quality education. Remote and rural areas may face difficulties relating to school accessibility, classrooms, laboratories, libraries, electricity, internet connectivity and the availability of qualified teachers. Disparities may also exist within states and between institutions serving different socioeconomic groups.

A second concern is the gap between facility availability and effective educational use. Administrative data may indicate that a school has a computer, library or internet connection, but such information does not necessarily reveal whether the facility is functional, adequately maintained, accessible to all students or regularly integrated into teaching. The distinction matters because infrastructure is an input into the educational process, whereas learning achievement is an outcome influenced by several interacting factors.

A third problem concerns the way the relationship between education and economic development is often presented. Theoretical arguments suggest that education can improve productivity, innovation and employment prospects, but the existence of these mechanisms is not sufficient evidence that a particular infrastructure programme has generated measurable economic returns in India. A careful review must distinguish theoretical expectations, observed associations and causal findings. This paper addresses these issues by examining the role of education infrastructure while recognising the limits of the available evidence.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To clarify the concept and major dimensions of education infrastructure within the broader framework of social infrastructure.
2. To examine the theoretical relationship between education infrastructure, human capital formation and economic development.
3. To review Indian evidence on educational returns, learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness relevant to the infrastructure–development debate.
4. To assess the status and regional distribution of selected physical and digital school facilities using available official information.

5. To identify the institutional and policy conditions required for education infrastructure to contribute to inclusive development.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

6. How should education infrastructure be defined and distinguished from other dimensions of educational provision?
7. Through what channels may education infrastructure support human capital formation and economic development?
8. What does the available Indian literature indicate about the relationship between education, learning outcomes and economic returns?
9. What do official indicators reveal about the availability and uneven distribution of educational facilities, and what are their limitations?
10. What policy measures can improve the quality, functionality and equitable distribution of education infrastructure?

5. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

5.1 Human Capital Theory and the Economic Value of Education

Schultz (1961) placed investment in education and training within the analysis of human capital, arguing that such investment can enhance the productive capabilities of individuals. Becker (1964) developed this approach by examining the costs and returns associated with education and training. Mincer (1974) provided an influential empirical framework for analysing the relationship between schooling, work experience and earnings. Together, these contributions explain why education is often treated as an investment that may generate benefits over an individual's working life.

For the present study, human capital theory offers a basis for understanding education infrastructure as an enabling input. Classrooms, laboratories, libraries, digital resources and qualified teachers can support the process through which knowledge and skills are acquired. However, the theory does not imply that every additional facility automatically increases productivity. The quality of instruction, relevance of learning, student attendance, institutional management and opportunities to use acquired skills are also important.

5.2 Screening and Signalling Perspectives

The human capital interpretation has been challenged by approaches that emphasise the signalling or screening function of education. Spence (1973) argued that educational qualifications may communicate information about an individual's attributes to employers, even when education does not itself raise productivity by the same amount. Arrow (1973) similarly examined the screening role of higher education. These perspectives caution against interpreting higher earnings among educated workers as conclusive evidence that education alone caused the earnings difference.

This debate is relevant to education infrastructure because improved access to institutions may increase enrolment and credential attainment without necessarily producing equivalent improvements in learning or productive skills. Infrastructure policy should therefore be evaluated not only by enrolment, completion or qualification rates, but also by learning achievement, skill relevance and the ability of graduates to participate productively in the economy.

5.3 Education, Economic Growth and the Limits of Aggregate Evidence

Lucas (1988) incorporated human capital accumulation into endogenous growth theory and explained how knowledge and skills may influence long-term growth through productivity and spillover effects. Barro (1991) examined cross-country relationships between human capital indicators and economic growth. These contributions provide theoretical and macroeconomic reasons for investing in education. Nevertheless, cross-country growth regressions are subject to challenges involving measurement, omitted variables, reverse

causality and the difficulty of isolating the independent contribution of education. Pritchett (2001), for example, questioned why increases in measured educational attainment had not consistently translated into corresponding aggregate growth outcomes in some developing countries.

The implication is not that education is economically unimportant. Rather, the quantity of schooling, quality of learning and effective use of skills must be distinguished. Economic growth may also depend on institutions, technology, labour demand, infrastructure beyond education and the broader investment environment.

Accordingly, the present paper treats the education-infrastructure-to-growth relationship as conditional rather than automatic.

5.4 Indian Evidence on Returns to Education

Indian studies provide a more context-specific understanding of the economic returns to education. Duraisamy (2002), using national household survey data, estimated returns to education in wage employment and examined differences by gender, age cohort and rural–urban location. The study reported variation in returns across levels of schooling and population groups, illustrating that the economic value of education is not uniform.

Fulford (2014) examined returns to education in India using both wage and consumption-related measures. His analysis highlights an important distinction: positive individual-level associations between education and economic well-being do not necessarily imply equally large gains when outcomes are compared across cohorts and states. Mitra (2019) further examined heterogeneity in returns across the wage distribution and population groups. These studies demonstrate why average returns should not be treated as universal or identical across labour-market segments.

This literature is relevant to the present paper, but it does not directly estimate the causal effect of school buildings, internet connectivity or laboratories on economic growth. It provides evidence on the returns associated with education and the heterogeneity of those returns. The infrastructure link must therefore be argued through the conditions that make effective education possible, rather than by presenting returns-to-schooling estimates as direct estimates of infrastructure returns.

5.5 School Infrastructure, Learning and Institutional Effectiveness in India

The World Development Report 2018 emphasised that schooling and learning are not equivalent: children may attend school without acquiring foundational skills (World Bank, 2018). This distinction is central to infrastructure analysis. Physical facilities may improve the environment in which education is delivered, but learning also depends on teacher effectiveness, instructional time, pedagogy, school leadership, student background and household conditions.

The Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) provides household-based evidence on children's basic reading and arithmetic abilities in rural India. ASER 2024 reports changes in foundational learning and also provides information on school-level facilities through its school survey components (ASER Centre, 2025). Such evidence is valuable because it shifts attention from inputs alone to learning outcomes. However, ASER is primarily a rural survey and its findings should not be treated as a complete measure of all Indian schools or as proof that a particular infrastructure input caused a change in learning.

Muralidharan and Singh (2020) evaluated a large-scale school-management intervention in India. Their experimental study found that the intervention improved neither school functioning nor student outcomes, despite the completion of assessment and rating activities. Although this was not an evaluation of physical infrastructure, it illustrates a broader institutional lesson: introducing a formal input or management tool does not guarantee improved outcomes unless the relevant incentives, capacity and implementation conditions are addressed.

The literature reviewed above suggests that educational outcomes are produced through a combination of resources and institutional processes. It also shows that research on returns to education, learning outcomes and

school management should not be conflated with direct causal evidence on the economic returns to individual infrastructure investments.

5.6 Research Gap

The literature offers substantial theoretical discussion of human capital and economic growth, empirical estimates of returns to education in India, and survey-based evidence on learning outcomes. Official reports also document the availability of school facilities. However, these strands of evidence often address different stages of the education–development relationship. Studies of returns to education generally focus on educational attainment and earnings; learning assessments focus on competencies; and administrative datasets record facilities and institutional characteristics. These sources cannot be treated as interchangeable.

The contribution of this narrative review is to bring these strands together through a clearly defined conceptual framework. It examines how physical, digital, institutional and human dimensions of education infrastructure may support access, learning and skill formation, and how these outcomes may in turn contribute to economic growth and broader development. It also identifies the limits of the evidence and avoids claiming that the reviewed material establishes a causal impact of infrastructure investment on India's economic performance.

6. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

6.1 Human Capital Theory

Human capital theory views education and training as investments that can improve knowledge, skills and productive abilities (Schultz, 1961; Becker, 1964). Education infrastructure provides part of the environment in which these capabilities can be developed. Functional laboratories can support practical learning; libraries can widen access to information; accessible classrooms can support participation; and digital resources can facilitate access to educational content. These inputs are expected to be most effective when combined with qualified teachers, relevant curricula and adequate institutional management.

6.2 Endogenous Growth Theory

Endogenous growth theory emphasises the role of knowledge and human capital in sustaining long-term economic growth (Lucas, 1988). Educational institutions may contribute by developing skilled workers, supporting research and facilitating the diffusion of knowledge. Universities and technical institutions can also connect education with innovation and technological adaptation. These are plausible channels, but their strength depends on the quality of research, links with productive sectors, funding and the wider innovation system.

6.3 Capability Approach

Sen's (1999) capability approach defines development in terms of the expansion of substantive freedoms and the opportunities people have to lead lives they value. Education is important not only because it may increase earnings, but also because it expands people's ability to access information, make choices, participate in public life and pursue different occupations. This approach differs in emphasis from human capital theory: the latter focuses on education's contribution to productive capacity, whereas the capability approach treats education as part of a broader expansion of human freedom. The two perspectives can inform complementary dimensions of policy, but they should not be presented as identical theories.

6.4 Conceptual Pathway

The paper uses the following pathway as a conceptual proposition rather than as an empirically established causal result:

Education infrastructure → Access and effective learning conditions → Learning and skill formation → Productive capabilities and wider opportunities → Potential contributions to growth and human development

Each link is conditional. Infrastructure must be accessible and functional; learning requires effective teaching and student participation; skills must be relevant; and the economy must provide opportunities for their productive use.

7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

7.1 Research Design

The study adopts a narrative review and conceptual synthesis design based on secondary sources. It is not presented as a qualitative field study, systematic review or econometric investigation. The purpose is to interpret and connect relevant theoretical literature, Indian empirical studies, official statistical publications and education-policy documents in order to develop a coherent account of the possible contribution of education infrastructure to economic development.

7.2 Sources and Scope of the Review

The review draws on foundational academic works on human capital, earnings and economic growth; published studies concerning returns to education in India; research on school learning and institutional effectiveness; and official sources such as the National Education Policy 2020, UDISE+ 2024–25, ASER 2024, the India Employment Report 2024 and relevant government policy publications. The geographical focus is India. The substantive focus is school education, higher education, vocational and technical education, and digital educational facilities.

7.3 Approach to Synthesis

Sources are discussed thematically under the following areas: (i) theoretical explanations of education and development; (ii) the dimensions and availability of education infrastructure; (iii) learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness; (iv) returns to education and labour-market outcomes; and (v) regional inequality and policy responses. The review compares the type of evidence each source provides and distinguishes conceptual arguments, descriptive indicators, observational associations and experimental findings. It does not claim to have applied a systematic database search, formal screening protocol or coding procedure.

7.4 Methodological Qualification

No primary survey, interview, field observation or econometric estimation has been undertaken. The paper therefore does not estimate the causal effect of education infrastructure on productivity, earnings or economic growth. Its conclusions are interpretative and conceptual, based on the scope and limitations of the secondary literature reviewed.

8. CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND DIMENSIONS OF EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE

For this paper, education infrastructure is defined as the interconnected set of physical facilities, digital resources, institutional arrangements and human resources required to make education accessible, functional and capable of supporting meaningful learning, skill development and research. This definition distinguishes four dimensions.

8.1 Physical Infrastructure

Physical infrastructure includes school and college buildings, classrooms, libraries, laboratories, workshops, furniture, electricity, drinking water, toilets, ramps, hostels and other facilities that support safe and accessible learning. Its significance depends on suitability, maintenance, accessibility and actual use, not simply on the existence of a facility.

8.2 Digital Infrastructure

Digital infrastructure includes computers, internet connectivity, smart classrooms, digital libraries, learning-management platforms, virtual laboratories and accessible digital content. It can broaden access to educational resources and support flexible learning. However, its effectiveness depends on reliable electricity and connectivity, availability of devices, affordability, digital literacy, language accessibility and teacher preparedness.

8.3 Institutional Infrastructure

Institutional infrastructure refers to the systems and arrangements through which educational institutions function. It includes governance, academic planning, curriculum design, assessment systems, accountability, student support, quality assurance and links with employers and research organisations. These arrangements determine whether physical and digital resources are converted into effective educational opportunities.

8.4 Human Infrastructure

Human infrastructure comprises qualified teachers, faculty members, librarians, laboratory assistants, technical personnel, administrators and other trained staff. Teachers and academic personnel are central to the effective use of educational facilities. A school may possess modern equipment, but its educational value will remain limited if staff are not trained to use it or if students do not receive appropriate academic support.

9. EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE IN INDIA: STATUS AND CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

9.1 Basic School Facilities

UDISE+ 2024–25 reports that 93.6 per cent of schools had electricity, 99.3 per cent had drinking water facilities and 89.5 per cent had library or reading-corner facilities. It also reports internet facilities in 63.5 per cent of schools, computer facilities in 64.7 per cent and ramps with handrails in 54.9 per cent of schools (Ministry of Education, 2025). These figures suggest that basic facility coverage is relatively high in some categories, while digital access and certain accessibility facilities remain less widespread.

These indicators require careful interpretation. A reported facility may indicate presence but not necessarily adequacy, reliability, accessibility or regular use. For example, the presence of an internet connection does not reveal its speed, affordability, continuity or availability to every student. Similarly, the presence of a library does not indicate the number, relevance or condition of books, nor how often students use it. The reported availability of electricity does not, by itself, establish uninterrupted supply. The paper therefore treats UDISE+ figures as important administrative indicators of reported infrastructure coverage, not as direct measures of educational quality.

9.2 Digital Infrastructure and the Digital Divide

The expansion of digital education has created new opportunities for access to learning materials, online courses and educational communication. At the same time, unequal access to devices, connectivity and digital skills can reproduce existing educational inequalities. A school-level indicator of internet or computer availability does not capture whether individual learners have devices at home, whether they can afford data or whether digital materials are accessible in their language and learning context.

The National Education Policy 2020 recognises technology as an important support for education while emphasising the need to address the digital divide (Ministry of Education, 2020). Digital investment should therefore be integrated with teacher development, maintenance, accessible content and alternatives for learners who lack reliable connectivity. Technology should complement, rather than substitute for, effective teaching and inclusive educational provision.

9.3 Learning Outcomes as a Necessary Complement

Facility indicators should be considered alongside learning assessments. ASER 2024 provides information on

foundational reading and arithmetic among children in rural India and documents changes in learning levels over time (ASER Centre, 2025). These findings are useful for understanding whether school participation is accompanied by foundational learning. However, ASER's rural focus and its survey design should be recognised when interpreting the results. It does not establish that changes in learning were caused by changes in infrastructure.

A more complete assessment of education infrastructure would therefore combine administrative information on facilities with data on functionality, teacher availability, classroom processes, attendance and learning outcomes. Such triangulation would help avoid the assumption that higher facility coverage necessarily means better learning.

10. EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND HUMAN CAPITAL FORMATION

Human capital formation is a cumulative process through which individuals acquire knowledge, skills, experience and other capabilities. Education infrastructure can support this process by providing an environment for regular attendance, effective instruction, practical learning and access to information. Physical facilities create the basic conditions for teaching; digital resources can broaden learning opportunities; institutional arrangements support continuity and quality; and qualified teachers facilitate the development of knowledge and competencies.

The relationship is complementary rather than mechanical. Infrastructure is an enabling input, not a substitute for pedagogy, adequate instructional time, student support or effective governance. The quality of human capital depends on what students learn and are able to apply, not merely on the number of years spent in educational institutions. This distinction is consistent with the World Bank's (2018) emphasis on the global learning challenge.

11. EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE, ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

11.1 Economic Growth and Economic Development: Conceptual Distinction

Economic growth generally refers to an increase in the real output or real income of an economy over time. Economic development is a broader concept that includes structural transformation, improvements in living standards, reduction of deprivation, wider access to opportunities and the expansion of human capabilities. Growth may provide resources for development, but an increase in output does not automatically ensure that its benefits are distributed equitably. In this paper, productivity and output-related effects are discussed as possible contributions to growth, while inclusion, capability expansion and access to opportunity are treated as wider dimensions of development.

11.2 Labour Productivity and Employability

Education can improve workers' knowledge and skills, potentially enabling them to perform tasks more efficiently and adapt to technological change. Infrastructure may support this process when it enables effective instruction, practical training and access to relevant learning materials. Indian studies of returns to education, including Duraisamy (2002), Fulford (2014) and Mitra (2019), show that the economic returns associated with education vary across groups and labour-market segments. These studies support the importance of education but do not isolate the effect of infrastructure as a separate causal factor.

The transition from education to employment also depends on the structure of labour demand, the relevance of curricula, work experience and the availability of suitable jobs. The India Employment Report 2024 highlights continuing challenges relating to youth employment, education and skills (International Labour Organization & Institute for Human Development, 2024). Education infrastructure is therefore most likely to support employability when technical and vocational facilities are linked to current and emerging labour-market needs.

11.3 Innovation, Research and Technological Adaptation

Universities, technical institutions and research centres can contribute to innovation through laboratories, libraries, research facilities and collaboration with industry. These facilities may strengthen the capacity to generate, adapt and disseminate knowledge. The potential contribution depends on research funding, academic autonomy, trained personnel, institutional collaboration and opportunities to translate research into practical applications. The existence of laboratories alone is not evidence of increased innovation.

11.4 Poverty Reduction and Social Mobility

Access to quality education can widen occupational choices and improve the possibility of economic mobility, particularly for individuals from disadvantaged households. Education may contribute to poverty reduction through improved skills and employment opportunities. However, the distribution of these benefits depends on affordability, location, social barriers, gender relations and the quality of education available to different groups. From the capability perspective, education also has intrinsic value because it expands people's choices and ability to participate in society (Sen, 1999).

11.5 Regional Development

Educational institutions may contribute to local economies through employment, demand for transport and accommodation, and the circulation of income. Colleges, universities and training centres can also help build local skills and support regional knowledge networks. These effects are likely to vary according to institutional scale, local economic linkages and the capacity of the regional economy to absorb skilled workers. The establishment of an institution in a less-developed region should therefore be accompanied by attention to quality, accessibility and links with local development priorities.

12. REGIONAL DISPARITIES IN EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Differences in education infrastructure across states and regions reflect a combination of factors, including fiscal capacity, income levels, settlement patterns, geography, administrative capability, historical investment and policy priorities. Remote, hilly, tribal and sparsely populated areas may face higher costs of providing and maintaining educational facilities. Urban areas may have greater institutional concentration, but inequalities also persist within cities and across neighbourhoods.

The original manuscript cites interstate differences in computer availability using NITI Aayog's school-education analysis. Such comparisons are useful for identifying uneven provision, but they should not be interpreted as a simple ranking of state performance without considering population distribution, school size, rural–urban composition, institutional type, fiscal resources and the functionality of facilities. A higher state-level percentage does not necessarily mean that every district or disadvantaged group has adequate access.

A balanced regional assessment should therefore combine state averages with district-level and school-level indicators. It should also distinguish between the availability of facilities and the distribution of learning outcomes. This is particularly important for states with remote and geographically dispersed communities, where physical access, transport, teacher deployment and digital connectivity may interact.

13. GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES FOR STRENGTHENING EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE

13.1 National Education Policy 2020

The National Education Policy 2020 provides a broad framework for improving access, equity, quality and institutional development. It emphasises foundational learning, multidisciplinary education, vocational exposure, technology integration and improved learning environments. Its implementation requires sustained coordination between the Union and state governments, adequate resources and institutional capacity (Ministry of Education, 2020).

13.2 Samagra Shiksha

Samagra Shiksha is an integrated programme covering school education from pre-school to Class XII. It supports interventions relating to access, quality, teacher education, inclusive education and school facilities. Its contribution should be assessed not only through expenditure or facilities created, but also through implementation quality, maintenance and educational outcomes.

13.3 PM SHRI Schools

The PM SHRI initiative seeks to develop selected schools as model institutions aligned with the vision of the National Education Policy. Its emphasis includes improved infrastructure, teaching practices, technology and learning environments. The wider policy question is how effective practices and quality improvements can be extended beyond selected institutions and adapted to local needs.

13.4 PM POSHAN

PM POSHAN is primarily a school nutrition intervention rather than an education-infrastructure programme. It is relevant to the wider social conditions that influence education because nutrition can affect children's health, attendance and ability to participate in learning. It is included here as a complementary social intervention, not as a component of physical education infrastructure.

13.5 Digital Education Initiatives

Initiatives such as DIKSHA, SWAYAM and PM e-Vidya support access to digital educational content and online learning. Their reach and effectiveness depend on connectivity, device access, electricity, language accessibility and the digital capabilities of teachers and learners. Digital platforms cannot independently resolve inequalities arising from inadequate infrastructure or unequal household resources.

13.6 Higher Education and Research Development

Investment in universities, technical institutions, laboratories, libraries and research facilities is important for advanced skill development and knowledge creation. However, infrastructure development in higher education must be accompanied by qualified faculty, research funding, transparent governance, academic collaboration and opportunities for graduates and researchers.

14. MAJOR CHALLENGES

14.1 Unequal Access and Regional Distribution

Educational facilities remain unevenly distributed across states, districts and social groups. Remote and disadvantaged communities may face distance, transport and affordability barriers even where aggregate facility coverage appears satisfactory.

14.2 Functionality and Maintenance

Construction and procurement are only the first stages of infrastructure development. Buildings, sanitation facilities, laboratories, computers and internet systems require regular maintenance, replacement and recurrent funding. Non-functional facilities reduce the value of public investment.

14.3 Digital Inequality

Differences in device ownership, connectivity, electricity, affordability and digital literacy influence whether students can benefit from digital learning. School-level connectivity figures do not fully capture these household-level inequalities.

14.4 Teacher Availability and Professional Development

Qualified teachers are essential for converting infrastructure into learning. Uneven teacher deployment, vacancies, limited professional development and insufficient technical support may weaken the effectiveness of physical and digital facilities.

14.5 Quality and Relevance of Learning

Infrastructure expansion must be accompanied by effective pedagogy, foundational literacy and numeracy, appropriate curricula, assessment and student support. The distinction between schooling and learning remains central.

14.6 Research and Technical Capacity

Higher education institutions may face constraints in research funding, modern equipment, technical staff and collaboration with industry. These limitations can reduce their contribution to innovation and technological development.

14.7 Data and Monitoring Constraints

Administrative indicators provide useful information but may not fully capture quality, functionality, frequency of use or student access. Differences in definitions, reporting practices and institutional coverage can also complicate comparisons over time and across states.

15. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

15.1 Adopt a Quality- and Functionality-Based Investment Approach

Public investment should be guided by the condition and actual use of existing facilities, not only by targets for new construction. Infrastructure audits should identify gaps in safety, accessibility, maintenance and functionality.

15.2 Prioritise Underserved Regions

Resource allocation should account for geographical remoteness, social disadvantage, school size, transport barriers and local fiscal capacity. District-level planning can help identify gaps hidden by state averages.

15.3 Integrate Digital Access with Teacher Preparedness

Digital investment should combine reliable connectivity, electricity, devices, maintenance, accessible content and teacher training. Offline and low-bandwidth options should remain available for areas with weak connectivity.

15.4 Strengthen Teacher and Institutional Capacity

Recruitment, equitable deployment, continuous professional development and academic leadership should accompany infrastructure investment. Schools and colleges need adequate technical and administrative support to use facilities effectively.

15.5 Link Vocational and Higher Education with Employment and Research

Technical laboratories, workshops and vocational centres should be aligned with local and national labour-market needs. Universities should be supported through research funding, modern facilities and collaboration with industry and public research institutions.

15.6 Improve Data Quality and Outcome Monitoring

Infrastructure monitoring should distinguish between presence, functionality, accessibility and actual utilisation. Administrative data should be read alongside learning assessments, teacher information and disaggregated district-level indicators.

15.7 Ensure Sustainable Maintenance Funding

Project planning should include recurrent expenditure, repair schedules, replacement plans and clear institutional responsibility. Maintenance should be treated as a core component of infrastructure investment rather than an afterthought.

15.8 Evaluate Major Programmes Transparently

Major education initiatives should include credible monitoring and evaluation designs. Where feasible, programme assessments should examine changes in access, facility functionality, learning outcomes and equity, while using appropriate comparison strategies before making causal claims.

16. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The review leads to several interrelated observations. First, education infrastructure is a multidimensional concept. Physical facilities, digital resources, institutional arrangements and qualified personnel are complementary elements, and an assessment restricted to buildings or equipment provides an incomplete picture.

Second, the theoretical literature provides plausible mechanisms linking education infrastructure with human capital formation and economic performance. Human capital and endogenous growth theories explain how learning and knowledge may support productivity and innovation, while the capability approach highlights the wider freedoms and opportunities enabled by education. Screening and signalling perspectives, however, caution that credentials and years of schooling cannot automatically be equated with productive skills.

Third, Indian evidence confirms that returns to education vary across population groups and labour-market contexts. Studies by Duraisamy (2002), Fulford (2014) and Mitra (2019) demonstrate heterogeneity in economic returns. These findings reinforce the importance of education while also showing why aggregate claims require qualification. They do not constitute direct estimates of the returns to specific infrastructure investments.

Fourth, official data indicate that India has expanded the availability of several basic school facilities, while gaps remain in digital access and accessibility infrastructure. Yet availability indicators do not necessarily measure quality, functionality or student use. ASER learning evidence adds an important outcome perspective, but it cannot by itself identify the causal contribution of infrastructure.

Fifth, the effectiveness of education infrastructure depends on institutional and human factors. The evidence discussed by Muralidharan and Singh (2020) illustrates that formal management interventions do not automatically improve school functioning or student outcomes. Infrastructure policy therefore requires effective implementation, incentives, professional capacity and continuous monitoring.

Finally, the relationship between education infrastructure and economic development is conditional. Functional and inclusive facilities can improve the conditions for learning and capability formation. Whether these capabilities translate into higher productivity, employment, innovation and balanced regional development depends on labour-market opportunities, economic structure and the distribution of educational quality. The paper consequently supports education infrastructure as a potentially productive long-term investment, while recognising that the present review does not establish a causal growth effect.

17. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study has several limitations. First, it relies entirely on secondary sources and does not include primary fieldwork, interviews or direct observation of educational institutions. Second, it is a narrative review rather than a systematic review; the selection and discussion of sources are thematic and do not follow a reproducible database-search and screening protocol. The review may therefore not cover every relevant publication.

Third, the paper does not undertake econometric estimation or a causal evaluation of any infrastructure programme. It cannot determine the magnitude of the effect of classrooms, laboratories, internet connectivity or other facilities on learning, earnings or economic growth. Fourth, the official indicators discussed are subject to limitations of coverage, definition and measurement. Reported availability does not necessarily establish functionality, quality, frequency of use or equal access among students.

Fifth, the national-level focus limits the extent to which the paper can explain district-specific and state-specific differences. The review identifies the importance of regional variation but does not conduct a new district-level statistical analysis. Future research could address these limitations through district-level panel data, school-level facility and learning indicators, programme evaluations and mixed-method field studies.

18. CONCLUSION

Social infrastructure is an important foundation of economic and human development because it supports the capabilities required for individuals to participate in society and the economy. Within this broad framework, education infrastructure has a distinctive role in creating the conditions for learning, skill formation, research and technological adaptation. Its contribution, however, cannot be assessed simply by counting schools, classrooms, computers or internet connections.

The review demonstrates the need to distinguish physical, digital, institutional and human dimensions of education infrastructure. It also highlights the difference between facility availability, effective use and learning outcomes. Indian studies on returns to education show that economic benefits vary across individuals and labour-market contexts, while learning assessments and research on school management underline the importance of teaching quality and institutional effectiveness. These sources support a cautious interpretation rather than a claim that infrastructure expansion automatically produces economic growth.

Education infrastructure can be treated as a potentially productive long-term investment when it is functional, accessible, well-maintained and supported by qualified teachers, effective governance and relevant curricula. Its broader developmental contribution also depends on whether educational opportunities reach disadvantaged communities and expand substantive capabilities. For India, the policy priority should therefore move beyond infrastructure expansion alone towards quality, equity, functionality and measurable learning. Such an approach can strengthen the foundations for human capital formation and contribute to inclusive and sustainable development.

REFERENCES

1. Arrow, K. J. (1973). Higher education as a filter. *Journal of Public Economics*, 2(3), 193–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2727(73)90013-3
2. ASER Centre. (2025). *Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) 2024.* Pratham Education Foundation. https://asercentre.org/aser-2024/
3. Barro, R. J. (1991). Economic growth in a cross section of countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 106(2), 407–443*. https://doi.org/10.2307/2937943
4. Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. University of Chicago Press.
5. Duraisamy, P. (2002). Changes in returns to education in India, 1983–94: By gender, age-cohort and location. *Economics of Education Review, 21(6), 609–622.* https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757(01)00047-4
6. International Labour Organization, & Institute for Human Development. (2024). *India employment*

report 2024: Youth employment, education and skills. International Labour Organization.

7. Lucas, R. E., Jr. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 22(1), 3–42.* https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(88)90168-7
8. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020.* Government of India.
9. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2025*). UDISE+ 2024–25: Report on school education in India.* Department of School Education and Literacy.
10. Mitra, A. (2019). Returns to education in India: Capturing the heterogeneity. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies, 6(2), 151–169.* https://doi.org/10.1002/app5.271
11. Muralidharan, K., & Singh, A. (2020*). Improving public sector management at scale? Experimental evidence on school governance in India* (NBER Working Paper No. 28129). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w28129
12. Pritchett, L. (2001). Where has all the education gone? *The World Bank Economic Review, 15(3), 367–391.* https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/15.3.367
13. Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review, 51(1), 1–17.*
14. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom.* Oxford University Press.
15. Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87(3), 355–374*. https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010
16. World Bank. (2018). *World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise*. World Bank.