

## Core Template - 2

### T-NPI-Policy (Inferential Policy Formulation)

#### *Policy as Structured Reasoning: Governance Implications*

The T-NPI-Policy template extends the logic of inferential reasoning into the domain of governance, reconceptualising policy formulation as a process of *structured epistemic justification*. Traditional policy approaches often rely on the replication of best practices or the scaling of pilot interventions. While such strategies can be effective, they frequently lack sensitivity to contextual variation and do not adequately articulate the causal mechanisms underlying policy success. The T-NPI framework addresses this limitation by grounding policy recommendations in *inferentially validated relations*, thereby transforming policy from an administrative decision into an epistemically justified proposition.

The methodological progression begins with the *analytical definition of the policy problem*, guided by *nirvacana*. This phase ensures that the issue is conceptualised in terms of underlying structures rather than surface manifestations. In contemporary policy analysis, this corresponds to problem structuring, where the formulation of the problem determines the trajectory of intervention.

The second phase involves *systematic evidence compilation (samuccaya)*, integrating data from government reports, institutional studies, and comparative cases. This phase parallels systematic review methodologies, but is distinguished by its inferential orientation. The objective is not merely to summarise evidence but to identify patterns that can support causal reasoning.

The third phase is *comparative pattern identification*, where cases are examined to detect recurring configurations of conditions and outcomes. This aligns with comparative policy analysis, which seeks to derive insights from cross-contextual examination. However, T-NPI introduces a more explicit inferential structure, ensuring that patterns are interpreted in terms of causal relations rather than descriptive similarities.

The fourth phase consists of *vyāpti formulation*, where the policy-relevant causal relation is articulated. This step corresponds to the development of a theory of change, but with a stronger emphasis on empirical validation and the elimination of confounding conditions (*upādhi*). The resulting inferential rule provides the epistemic foundation for policy design.

The fifth phase involves the *construction of the policy argument through the pañcāvayavī structure*, ensuring transparency and logical coherence. This step is particularly significant in policy contexts, where decisions often lack explicit justification. By articulating the reasoning in a structured manner, T-NPI enhances accountability and facilitates critical evaluation.

The sixth phase addresses *implementation logic*, guided by *prasaṅga* and *sambhava*. Here, the implications of the policy are examined, and its feasibility within existing institutional contexts is assessed. This aligns with

implementation studies in public policy, which emphasise the importance of institutional capacity and contextual constraints.

The final phase involves *monitoring and validation through inferential indicators*, where the success of the policy is evaluated in terms of whether the predicted relation between conditions and outcomes holds in practice. This represents a shift from output-based evaluation to causal verification, aligning policy assessment with the epistemic principles of Nyāya. Through this progression, T-NPI-Policy establishes policy as a form of structured reasoning, where governance decisions are grounded in empirically validated inference. It thus provides a methodological foundation for more coherent, transparent, and effective policy-making.

## Methodological Phases with Empirical Demonstration

### Phase 1: Problem Structuring (*Nirvacana*)

Problem:

*“Weak learning outcomes despite high enrolment.”*

This aligns with the World Bank’s broader critique that education systems often fail to translate schooling into learning.

### Phase 2: Evidence Synthesis (*Samuccaya*)

World Bank data shows:

- Learning improvements require *systemic alignment across institutions*
- Governance structures (national → state → district) are central to delivery

### Phase 3: Pattern Identification

From STARS and Gujarat education reform:

- Decentralised governance improves service delivery
- Teacher training correlates with classroom performance
- Assessment systems drive accountability

### Phase 4: Vyāpti Formulation

*Where governance, teacher systems, and assessment are integrated, education policy outcomes improve.*

This corresponds to *theory of change frameworks* (Weiss, 1995).

### Phase 5: Structured Policy Argument

Using pañcāvayavī:

- Proposition: Integrated governance improves education outcomes
- Reason: Alignment reduces systemic fragmentation
- Example: World Bank-supported programs
- Application: Indian policy ecosystem
- Conclusion: Policy must be system-integrative

### Phase 6: Implementation Logic

STARS demonstrates:

- Multi-level governance (national–state–district)
- Institutional structures for monitoring and feedback

This aligns with *implementation theory* (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973).

### Phase 7: Inferential Monitoring

Indicators include:

- Learning proficiency rates
- Governance index scores
- Teacher training coverage

These correspond to *causal performance indicators*, not just outputs.

### Governance Insight

T-NPI-Policy shows that:

*Policy is not a prescription but a logically structured inference grounded in empirical regularity.*

### References

Bhaskar, R. (1975). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge.

- Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(6), 84–92.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. MIT Press.
- Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., & Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1), 75–105.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and social science*. Sage.
- World Bank. (2020). *The learning poverty report*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2021a). *India: Strengthening teaching-learning and results for states (STARS) program*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2023). *Education statistics (EdStats) database*. World Bank.