

Effects of Corporatisation on Practices in Private Healthcare Institutions

Reflections by healthcare professionals

Gayatri Sharma, Anand Zachariah, Aparna Sudhakar and Abhay Shukla

Working Paper



Image credit for cover page: Photo by Adarsh Mp via <https://www.pexels.com>

Suggested citation: Sharma G, Zachariah A, Sudhakar A and Shukla A (2026). Effects of Corporatisation on Practices in Private Healthcare Institutions: Reflections by Healthcare Professionals. United Nations University International Institute for Global Health (UNU Global Health), Kuala Lumpur.

Authors

Gayatri Sharma (Forum for Equity in Health and Nirvana, India), Anand Zachariah (Christian Medical College, Vellore, India), Aparna Sudhakar (Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, India), Abhay Shukla (Research Consultant, UNU Global Health).

Acknowledgements

This working paper was authored by Gayatri Sharma, Anand Zachariah, Aparna Sudhakar and Abhay Shukla for the UNU-IIGH Symposium on Powerful Private Actors and Global Health (2025).

It is part of an ongoing effort by the Forum for Equity in Health, a collective of co-learners committed to ensuring access to health for all, and exploring alternative models of health care grounded in justice, equity and dignity.

We thank David McCoy for his thoughtful review and feedback on earlier drafts of this working paper. We also thank Joelle Hwang for copyediting the manuscript.

We gratefully acknowledge all the participants who conducted peer interviews and participated in the collective brainstorming session despite their busy schedules. Their candid reflections and insights formed the foundation of this report.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and editors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the countries of which they are nationals, nor those of the United Nations University, UNU Global Health, or their governing and advisory bodies.

Design

Silvia Fancello, UNU Global Health

I. Background and Methodology

Background

Over the past five decades, India's healthcare landscape has undergone a significant transformation, marked by the rapid expansion of the private sector at the cost of public health infrastructure. From the 1950s to the mid-1970s, healthcare was largely dominated by government-run institutions and charitable hospitals. During the mid-1970s to the 1990s, the sector saw a major rise in nursing homes and small private hospitals in towns, alongside the emergence of a few corporate hospitals in major cities—signalling the shift of healthcare toward a market-driven model. Since the early 2000s, this process has intensified into full-scale corporatisation, with large corporate chains establishing hospitals aimed at maximising investor profits across both urban and semi-urban areas. The corporate emphasis on revenue generation has not remained confined to these large institutions—it now shapes practices across the private healthcare spectrum, influencing individual practitioners, small and mid-sized hospitals, and even non-profit charitable facilities.¹

Corporatisation of healthcare has introduced a layer of managerial oversight driven by business principles, often limiting the professional autonomy of doctors. In corporate hospitals, specialist doctors are offered high salaries but are expected to meet revenue-linked targets, including quotas for admissions, diagnostic tests, and therapeutic procedures. This model is also influencing smaller and medium-sized private and charitable hospitals, many of which are now taking loans, hiring specialist consultants, and investing in costly medical equipment to remain competitive. As a result, healthcare costs in these facilities have risen sharply, leading to reduced access or denial of care for economically disadvantaged patients, and contributing to financial hardship for those who seek treatment.²

Corporatisation has also strained the doctor-patient relationship, contributing to a breakdown of trust and a rise in incidents of violence against doctors and hospital staff. The rapid expansion of the private healthcare sector has been accompanied by chronic underinvestment in the public health system. As a result, many patients turn to public facilities only when private care is

¹ Chakravarthi, I., Shukla, A., & Marathe, S. (2022). *Growing corporatisation of private healthcare in India and its implications*

² Marathe, S., Hunter, B. M., Chakravarthi, I., Shukla, A., & Murray, S. F. (2020). The impacts of corporatisation of healthcare on medical practice and professionals in Maharashtra, India. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(2), e002026. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002026>

unaffordable, reinforcing a two-tiered system where access and quality are shaped by one's ability to pay.³

Parallel to the corporatisation of healthcare in India has been the rapid privatisation of medical education. Today, nearly half of all medical colleges in India are privately run, with students required to pay substantial fees. Many of these institutions lack adequate infrastructure, faculty, and clinical exposure, affecting the quality of training.^{4,5} Upon graduation, students often pursue high-paying specialisations or corporate sector jobs to recoup the significant financial investment made in their education.

This report is based on an exploratory consultation to understand how corporatisation of health care is affecting health care workers working in private hospitals and the practice of medicine.

Aim

To understand how corporatisation of health care is affecting health care professionals working in private hospitals and the practice of medicine.

Objectives

To identify:

1. Clinical practices that are commercially influenced and their effects.
2. Effects of commercialisation on the relationships between healthcare workers, patients and the hospital
3. The response of health care workers to the commercially influenced practices.

Methodology

We invited interested health professionals to an online brainstorming session on the impact of corporatisation of health care on health professionals.

Each participant was requested to have an informal conversation with 3-5 health care professionals who are working or have worked in private hospitals, with regard to corporatisation and commercially affected practices. A question guide was provided. Questions focused on

³ Ghoshal, R. (2016). What ails India's two-tiered healthcare system? A philosophical enquiry. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 12(1), 25. <https://ijme.in/articles/what-ails-indias-two-tiered-healthcare-system-a-philosophical-enquiry/>

⁴ Bajpai, V. (2023). Privatization of medical education in India: Challenges and the way forward. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2023.043>

⁵ Supe, A., & Burdick, W. (2007). Challenges and issues in medical education in India. *Academic Medicine*, 81(12), 1076–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ACM.0000246699.94234.ab>

themes of commercially affected practices, restrictions in autonomy, prioritizing revenue over patient care, overuse of unnecessary procedures, admissions and investigations, and relationships between doctors, patients, and the hospitals, and attempts that they have made to change the system. Information with regard to the specialisation of the doctor and the type of hospital were recorded without identifying information.

During the consultation, each of the participants was asked to share the experiences gathered, while ensuring confidentiality of the interviewees.

The 12 participants included a diverse group of healthcare professionals—primary care physicians, public health experts, medical college faculty, specialists and super-specialists from both public and private sectors, as well as nurses. The session was facilitated by two moderators, with an additional team member responsible for note-taking and technical coordination.

The online consultation was conducted on March 10, 2025, for 2 ½ hours. The first part of the consultation consisted of participants sharing their experiences. The second part consisted of reflections on the shared experiences to understand broader trends.

The consultation was recorded and subsequently transcribed. The transcript was then edited for clarity. Two members of the research team independently reviewed the transcript to identify emerging themes in relation to the study questions. Through discussion, the researchers reached consensus on a final set of thematic categories. A compilation of illustrative quotes was prepared for each theme. These quotes were then jointly examined to interpret the significance of each theme and to explore interconnections between them. This detailed analysis informed the development of the results and discussion sections of the report.

II. Results

Commercially influenced practices affecting clinical decision-making

In several accounts, participants noted that the ethos of care was being replaced with a consumer-driven model where patients were seen less as individuals with clinical needs and more as paying clients to be directed toward higher-cost options.

“It is more like a market. We are the provider and you are the consumer—whether you want it or not. And these are the things which are available.” (Pediatrician and rural healthcare practitioner)

Managerial interference and erosion of clinical autonomy

Participants noted that managerial priorities increasingly overrode clinical judgment, with physicians expected to follow standardized protocols aimed at meeting organizational targets, rather than using their clinical expertise to make decisions in the best interest of the patient.

“Frequent meetings were conducted where the message was: prices are fixed by us, you work for us.” (Internal medicine physician, working at private medical college)

“In hospitals backed by foreign investors or multi-national companies, leadership was inaccessible, and clinical staff had no channel to influence policy. Middle management rotated frequently and had no clinical background.” (Transplant surgeon with experience of working in public and private sector)

Revenue generation, rather than patient need, frequently shaped key decisions—such as whether a procedure could be performed, who should perform it, or where a patient should be admitted.

“Qualified ER physicians were restricted from performing procedures like central line insertions to enable billing under higher-paid consultants.” (Emergency medicine physician)

Several respondents noted explicit directives prohibiting discussions of treatment costs or alternatives with patients, placing constraints on informed consent and ethical engagement with patients.

Others cited policies where service delivery was contingent upon upfront payment, including in emergency care settings.

“Nurses were asked to inform patients and families that they would not get medicines if their charges were not paid up to date. Medications were withheld if bills were pending.” (Nurse with experience of charitable institution, working in corporate hospital)

While some clinicians reported having autonomy in their practice, they acknowledged that such experiences were exceptions in an increasingly target-driven system.

Target-driven culture

A concern raised by participants was the institutional emphasis on numerical performance indicators—particularly procedure volumes and departmental revenue—as key metrics for evaluating healthcare professionals in corporate hospital settings. These targets often translated

into explicit or implicit pressure to maintain high volumes of interventions, with financial incentives and recognition closely tied to these expectations.

“In chain hospitals especially, there’s constant monitoring of the income that each hospital in the chain, department or doctor generates. If you fall short, your job feels insecure all the time.”
(Internal medicine physician, working at private medical college)

“If they did not meet their targets, they would receive warnings at regular intervals—every six months or so.” (Pediatrician and rural healthcare practitioner)

These practices reflect a shift toward a revenue-driven model of healthcare delivery. Clinical care itself is thus increasingly redefined to serve the institution first, and then the patient. This metric-driven culture is set, monitored, and embedded into the everyday functioning of corporate hospitals.

Commercial pressures and the overuse of unnecessary procedures

In addition to the pressures outlined above, several participants expressed concern about the growing normalization of surgical and diagnostic interventions in the absence of clear clinical indications.

“A neurologist in a corporate hospital would advise thrombolysis for stroke patients even when it wasn’t indicated—for example, in chronic or subacute infarcts. This was being done because they received additional cuts for doing so.” (Internal medicine physician, working at private medical college)

“A friend working in a corporate hospital described the health check-up process as a ‘fishing net.’ Ultrasound scans were routinely offered, and many asymptomatic gallbladder stones were picked up. These patients were then told they needed surgery.” (Pediatrician working at charitable hospital)

“After a celebrity faced complications from an untreated gallstone, a corporate hospital began promoting routine surgery for asymptomatic cases, using the celebrity in a video campaign”
(Pediatrician working at charitable hospital)

In some hospitals, physicians were expected to justify their compensation by performing a certain number of procedures. This pressure was reinforced through the celebration of procedural milestones—such as achieving a target number of surgeries.

Unnecessary diagnostics

Participants reflected on a pattern of investigations in some hospitals, where high-cost diagnostics were routinely preferred over simpler, appropriate options. Patients did not have a clear understanding of the options for investigation and treatment, and there appeared to be a lack of informed consent.

Examples included:

- Routine full-body scans as part of general health check-ups; extensive blood panels and MRI scans for patients with conditions like altered sensorium due to hypoglycemia.
- Routine MRI cholangiograms before gallbladder surgery
- Whole body CT scans instead of the recommended first-line FAST (Focused Assessment via Sonography in Trauma) ultrasound exam in emergency trauma cases

Cost escalation through pharmaceutical and consumable practices

Doctors reported being instructed to prescribe costly medications and unnecessary supplements, and to direct patients to in-house pharmacies, which were priced higher than outside alternatives. In some cases, wards had their own mini-pharmacies with even steeper prices—particularly problematic during emergencies when staff had no choice but to use them. Basic items such as hand rubs, underpads, measuring jars, and diapers were issued individually for each patient, with no option to return unused supplies.

Additionally, more expensive brands of the same medicine were routinely prescribed—for example, a ₹4,000 version of Meropenem instead of an equally effective ₹900 alternative.

Unnecessary hospital admissions and inflated billing

Participants reported routine interference during patient admissions and billing, describing institutional strategies designed to maximize revenue—often at the expense of clinical appropriateness, patient preference, or ethical standards of care. These practices included the admission of patients who could have been managed on an outpatient basis, the extension of hospital stays beyond medical necessity, and the strategic allocation of beds to higher-cost categories.

“In some hospitals, because the emergency ward had a higher billing rate, doctors were advised to first admit patients in emergency, keep them there for some time, and then transfer them to the wards.” (Internal medicine physician, working at private medical college)

Nurses described being instructed not to question room allocations, even when patients explicitly preferred more affordable multi-sharing or ward beds. In some cases, general wards were removed altogether, as they were seen as less profitable than private rooms.

Additional costs were often embedded through administrative layers—such as customer relations staff whose services were billed separately. Patients were frequently given only partial cost information at the time of admission—typically room charges—while additional fees for consultations, nursing, and consumables were presented later, resulting in unexpectedly high bills.

Cut practice and referral incentives

Clinicians reported that it is routine for specialists to share a portion of their fees with referring doctors. Similar incentive structures were observed in referrals for diagnostics and pharmacies, where physicians were expected to direct patients in exchange for commissions. In some instances, emergency department doctors were reported to redirect patients to external private hospitals or higher-cost diagnostic centres for an incentive.

Commercialization and the transformation of clinical relationships

Participants reflected on how commercialization has altered not only the delivery of care, but also the relational fabric of healthcare institutions. These shifts were visible in how hospitals relate to patients, how healthcare workers engage with patients and with each other, and how clinicians relate to the institutions in which they work. Across accounts, commercial imperatives were seen to erode mutual respect, while introducing or reinforcing hierarchies within clinical spaces—often along lines of caste, gender, religion, and socioeconomic status.

- **Hospital-Patient relationship**

The hospital-patient relationship has become increasingly transactional, shaped by interactions filtered through billing structures and administrative policies.

Participants described how fragmented, opaque pricing and the involvement of non-clinical staff—such as customer relations executives—contributed to confusion and mistrust. These

patient-facing dynamics mirror the institutional strategies outlined in the section on Inflated Billing and Unnecessary Admissions, where administrative decisions prioritize revenue over transparency and care.

- **Healthcare Provider - Patient relationship**

Doctors and nurses described how commercial pressures influenced their capacity to build trust with patients. Emotional engagement with patients' realities was often displaced by the need to navigate institutional demands, sometimes leaving clinicians themselves feeling alienated from the values with which they had entered the profession.

"It was made clear that the primary role of staff was to generate profit." (Internal medicine physician, working at private medical college)

Nurses reported being responsible for conveying billing details to patients, a task that often created discomfort and led to strained interactions, as patients became more hesitant and less trusting.

"Staff nurses were regularly compared to air hostesses and were told to focus on delivering customer service rather than patient care." (Nurse with experience of charitable institution, working in corporate hospital)

Participants reported systemic and interpersonal discrimination against economically disadvantaged patients, particularly those holding Below Poverty Line (BPL) cards. In some cases, surgeries were refused outright or postponed for BPL patients, while cash-paying patients received immediate attention. Delays, denial of procedures, and the withholding of information about more affordable alternatives were common themes.

These attitudes, participants noted, were internalized by junior staff, contributing to a broader culture of exclusion. These dynamics also reshaped the provider-patient relationship, distancing doctors and nurses from their ethical commitments and fostering mistrust among patients.

- **Inter-staff dynamics and power structures**

Participants described how internal hierarchies within hospitals were also shaped by financial incentives and positional power. For example, in some institutions, senior doctors dominated admission and casualty rosters to maximize personal income, often sidelining junior staff in the process. These patterns, referred to informally as "admission politics," were closely tied to revenue-sharing arrangements with the hospital management.

Participants further noted that in some hospitals, once a senior doctor secured a high compensation package, others on the team expected similar remuneration. This culture of comparative entitlement contributed to inflated procedure costs and further entrenched revenue-oriented decision-making.

- **Doctor-Hospital relationships and revenue sharing**

Many participants felt they were positioned as revenue-generating employees rather than decision-making professionals, with little access to or influence over institutional leadership. This dynamic left clinicians feeling isolated—like replaceable cogs in a larger machine, disconnected from both decision-making and meaningful patient care.

Those who generated higher revenue for hospital management were perceived to enjoy greater job security and institutional support. In some cases, doctors reported that as much as 90% of the consultation fee paid by patients was retained by the hospital. One clinician described eventually withdrawing from the hospital’s formal consultation process — continuing to see admitted patients when needed, but refusing to record these consultations in the official log, as doing so only generated revenue for the hospital, while very little of the payment reached the treating physician.

Gender disparities were also evident, with male doctors reportedly receiving a significantly higher share of consultation fees than their female counterparts—as much as 70-80%—further compounding structural inequities.

Ownership, finance, and institutional drift

Hospitals once run by doctors or community-based institutions now often rely on external investors and adopt business strategies to stay afloat. In some cases, charitable institutions have taken on significant debt to compete with corporate hospitals, leading to higher costs and reduced access to affordable care.

“After the original founders were removed, local political actors reportedly tripled service charges.” (Ayurvedic physician, general practitioner)

These institutional shifts were not seen as isolated incidents. Participants described the growing entanglement of hospitals with insurance providers, pharmaceutical suppliers, and political actors. Together, these forces have fostered an oligopolistic healthcare ecosystem.

“One hospital chain, initially 100% venture capital-funded, has since been acquired by a larger corporate hospital network. This reflects a broader pattern of cartelisation, with a few large players dominating the healthcare market.” (Public health researcher)

There were also concerns about public hospitals becoming dependent on private institutions for critical services like transplants, sometimes due to formal agreements that restricted in-house training and self-sufficiency. Participants observed a gradual but significant transformation in the ethos of healthcare institutions, especially over the last decade. Facilities once rooted in charitable or service-oriented principles are increasingly aligning themselves with market-based models.

“This has resulted in a combination of private-sector pricing with public-sector levels of apathy.” (Internal medicine physician, working at a charitable institution)

Organisational priorities shaping daily care

Building on the structural changes outlined above, participants noted a corresponding shift in the everyday culture of healthcare delivery. The increasing dominance of commercial imperatives has altered how care is provided, how staff are trained and deployed, and how institutional accountability is upheld—or neglected. In some hospitals, MBBS doctors were hired on a per-shift basis to manage emergency departments, with limited familiarity with the institution’s values or protocols. Understaffed ICUs, inadequate supervision and support to frontline staff, and remote decision-making by consultants contributed to poor patient outcomes, with little internal oversight.

The illusion of quality in private healthcare

Participants challenged the widespread assumption that private healthcare guarantees higher standards of care. Many patients who made significant financial sacrifices to access private hospitals encountered rushed procedures, poor communication, and minimal accountability. Structural understaffing, high staff turnover, and cost-cutting measures were cited as key factors compromising patient safety and dignity.

In some cases, clinical errors occurred due to staff shortages or fatigue—such as incorrect medication timings, injuries during routine procedures, or failure to follow basic safety protocols. Several participants described how patients, particularly those traveling long distances in hopes

of being operated on by senior surgeons, were instead treated by junior doctors without being informed in advance.

Essential services—such as providing epidural anaesthesia during labour—were sometimes denied due to gaps in staffing, while frequent attrition among healthcare workers was linked to adverse outcomes, including neonatal deaths.

Impact on the healthcare professional

Commercialization has reshaped not only clinical practices and institutional dynamics, but also the everyday experiences and identities of healthcare professionals. Across interviews, participants reflected on how commercial pressures influenced their ethical choices, working conditions, emotional well-being, and the education of future doctors. The following subsections highlight how health professionals experience, resist, and are shaped by these systemic forces.

- **Emotional burnout and professional disillusionment**

Participants described a growing dissonance between the values that initially motivated them to enter healthcare, and the commercial pressures embedded in corporatised medical practice. Many clinicians reported being pushed toward revenue-generating activities that conflicted with their professional ethics, leading to emotional exhaustion and a sense of moral compromise.

Over time, this misalignment prompted some to withdraw from full-time clinical roles, to pursue alternative pathways such as teaching, or to accept the commercial realities with resignation. The resulting emotional burnout was marked not only by detachment from patients but also by a deeper disillusionment with the institutional systems they worked within.

“It has become clear that those working in corporate hospitals tend to fall into one of two categories: doctors who reconcile with the commercialisation of healthcare as an unavoidable cost of ‘quality care,’ and those who eventually leave—disillusioned by the systemic exploitation and the erosion of patients’ rights.” (Transplant surgeon with experience of working in public and private sector)

A nurse in a corporate hospital shared, *“I lost my emotions. I even completed my shifts without knowing the names of the patients.” (Nurse with experience of charitable institution, working in corporate hospital)*

A retired nephrologist shared feeling uneasy in a corporate hospital where he was assigned procedure targets. Attempts to work independently were hindered by inadequate infrastructure, especially for transplants, eventually leading him to return to the corporate setting, albeit reluctantly. Another participant shared that they had stepped away from full-time clinical practice to focus solely on teaching transplant procedures, citing an inability to ensure patient care in a fully accessible manner in the corporate hospital as the reason for this shift.

Exploitation and abuse in private facilities

Participants highlighted the precarious conditions faced by healthcare workers—particularly nurses and junior staff—in smaller, often unregulated private healthcare facilities. Many of these institutions were described as being run like family businesses, with informal hierarchies and limited oversight. Basic labour protections, formal grievance mechanisms, and accountability structures were frequently absent.

In such environments, nurses were sometimes assigned domestic chores, reflecting a disregard for professional boundaries. Institutional responses tended to protect high-earning clinicians rather than support lower-paid employees, reinforcing existing power asymmetries.

- **Attempts at resistance and systemic pushback**

Amid structural pressures, some health professionals actively sought ways to resist practices they found ethically troubling. Acts of resistance ranged from informal peer-monitoring to strategic changes in work patterns to preserve autonomy.

One initiative involved forming a WhatsApp group to monitor a neurologist's overuse of thrombolysis, allegedly for personal commission. The group—comprising staff from across hierarchies—created transparency around each decision, discouraging unnecessary interventions. While participants noted that such accountability-oriented action might not have been initiated if the financial benefit had gone to the institution rather than the individual, the effort was seen as an effective form of internal regulation.

Despite structural constraints, many continued to express empathy and compassion in their interactions with patients, striving to uphold the values that drew them to the profession. Others, unable to reconcile their principles with the demands of a privatized system, chose to leave institutional settings altogether. One respondent explained that part-time work allowed them to maintain ethical boundaries, while full-time clinicians were more dependent on the institution and thus less able to push back.

Effect of commercially affected practices on medical education and de-skilling:

Participants observed a growing shift in medical education toward specialization, profitability, and high-cost interventions—often at the expense of foundational clinical skills and patient-centred care. Many newly trained medical professionals effectively become super specialists before fully developing key generalist skills expected of an MBBS graduate.

Participants noted that government-employed doctors engaged in private practice often deprioritize teaching responsibilities, treating them as secondary to clinical income. Additionally, some educators were reported to be involved with private coaching centres, where students were incentivized to recruit peers—raising questions about conflicts of interest and cartelisation within the education system. In one postgraduate session, a trainee recommended a CT scan for obstructive jaundice, bypassing the more appropriate and affordable ultrasound. When questioned, a senior consultant responded, “This is what we do in our hospital”.

In teaching hospitals, students often follow the example of senior doctors. As a result, commercially driven values become embedded in the training environment. Especially in private institutions, students are socialized into revenue-driven practices from the outset and rarely trained to critically examine their ethical or systemic implications. Many assume that high-cost care is always the best care, without learning when simpler, more affordable approaches might be better. Participants reported that at some public institutions, senior alumni working in corporate healthcare are regularly invited to speak, reinforcing the idea that financial achievement is the sole marker of success in medicine. This has destabilised the ethical norms of clinical practice.

Treatment is increasingly viewed as a product to be bought, and access to care as something only available to those who can pay.

There is a growing sense that medical education today is producing a different kind of doctor—to fit the demands of a commercialized healthcare system, rather than the needs of a community.

III. Reflections, analysis, and the way forward

Healthcare institutions being transformed in the era of corporatisation

Until the mid-1970s, India's healthcare system was primarily public, with the private sector accounting for less than 20% of hospitals.⁶ As public infrastructure struggled to meet rising demand, the government introduced incentives to attract private investment. This shift deepened after the 1991 economic crisis, when structural adjustment reforms curtailed public health spending and accelerated the privatization of care. The rise of corporate hospital chains in the 2000s consolidated a profit-oriented model that now shapes not only how care is delivered, but also how it is taught, valued, and justified.^{1, 6}

The themes that have emerged from this effort largely echoed findings from previous research on the growing commodification of healthcare and its systemic impacts. However, participants also offered concrete, ground-level insights—detailing how these dynamics play out within hospital settings through specific incidents and practices. These are not simply cases of mismanagement or individual malpractice, but rather an implication of the systemic embedding of market logic into the very fabric of healthcare delivery.

Participants describe how many hospitals are transitioning from being doctor- or trust-run establishments to investor-controlled entities, reflecting trends of finance-driven consolidation. Smaller and charitable hospitals are found to be taking loans or submitting to investors to compete in the intensely contested market, which is increasingly shaped by corporate or corporate-type hospitals. Corporate hospitals tend to reshape and hegemonise the commercial space by acquiring the most modern (and generally expensive) technologies, which are attractive to patients. They also engage in aggressive marketing tactics, such as giving hefty commissions to referring doctors. This is accompanied by attracting prominent specialist doctors by offering them often exorbitant 'packages' (may be up to 10 million rupees annually or even more). This kind of business environment leaves smaller and charitable hospitals struggling to retain their client base on one hand, and to retain specialist doctors and medical professionals on the other hand. In this situation, many are now willing to adopt corporate practices while seeking investments from globalised capital, which treats healthcare as a lucrative arena for accumulation.

The correlation between the entry of large foreign investors into particular hospitals and changes in management structures and practices was clearly noted; these transformations were often

⁶ Kumar, D., Tanu, T., & Sagar, V. (2022). Privatization of health sector: An Indian perspective. *Trends in Telemedicine & E-Health*, 3(5), 572. <https://doi.org/10.31031/TTEH.2022.03.000572>

associated with the leadership becoming inaccessible, and the appointment of middle managers having no background in clinical care.

Another worrisome trend is the broad pattern of oligopolisation with selected large corporate players moving towards dominating the market. Some processes of monopolisation are also evident in certain high-technology areas like specific transplant surgeries, where dominant corporates have not only captured a large share of the commercial market for these lucrative procedures, but in some instances have even exerted their influence to retard the building of capacity of the public health system to provide such surgeries.

Systemic shifts in healthcare culture and practice

Two striking themes that surfaced during this study were the growing sense of alienation among healthcare workers, and the impact of privatisation on medical education. Several participants described ethical dissonance, emotional burnout, and a fractured doctor-patient relationship. Many expressed concern about overcharging, unnecessary procedures, and medical negligence, linking these issues to the erosion of autonomy and trust between providers and patients. Similar patterns have been documented in other low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where public perceptions of malpractice and profiteering have, at times, led to violence against healthcare workers.²

Clinicians described a growing sense of alienation from their ethical commitments, as patients were increasingly treated as paying clients rather than individuals with complex needs. These institutional priorities are mirrored in the training of healthcare professionals, where medical education appears increasingly oriented toward producing a workforce that serves the demands of a commercialized system. Instead of cultivating critical reflection and ethical reasoning, education has come to assume very market logic it ought to interrogate.

Corporate hospitals—with aggressive branding strategies and investor-driven models—have become emblematic of a socially disembedded, profit-centric healthcare system. This reflects broader global trends, as private equity and development finance increasingly view healthcare in LMICs as a lucrative sector.²

Business metrics (revenue targets, procedure quotas, etc.) frequently override clinical autonomy, leading to restrictions and warping of the skills of practicing doctors, forcing them to narrowly follow commercially induced directives of corporate management. This erodes their status as expert professionals, preventing them from exercising their own clinical judgement in line with scientific and social considerations. Examples are the rise of "fishing net" diagnostics

(for example, detection of asymptomatic gallstones linked with pushing clinically unnecessary gallbladder surgeries) and imposing expensive but unnecessary procedures like thrombolysis being routinely conducted even for stroke patients where this was not indicated.

Another significant trend is intensified stratification among medical professionals, dividing the profession into ‘celebrity doctors’ and elite specialists who are part of the corporate hospital management, in contrast with the majority of practicing medical professionals who are supposed to follow dictates from the management. Existing hierarchies based on gender and professional seniority are intensified, with women doctors often receiving lower consultancy rates compared to male colleagues. Senior consultants tend to control admission rights (linked with higher income) while often sidelining junior colleagues.

Although higher rates are being charged by corporate hospitals, most clinicians involved in the actual provision of care not only have minimal influence over management practices, but they generally receive only a small fraction of the payment made by the patient. This mirrors observations of growing ‘de-professionalisation’ of clinical care providers in the global context.

Despite these challenges, participants also spoke of moments of resistance, collective action, and everyday empathy. Some found creative ways to challenge unethical practices or preserve patient-centred care in their own work.

While this documentation effort included participants from diverse professional backgrounds, it has certain limitations. Many accounts were based on observations or conversations with peers, making it difficult to independently verify specific claims. Additionally, the small sample limits the generalizability of the findings and might not fully capture the range of experiences across India’s vast and varied healthcare workforce. Nonetheless, the narratives align with existing literature and underscore the urgent need for deeper, systematic research into the experiences of both healthcare workers and patients within India’s increasingly privatized and corporatized health system.

Privatization and the shifting landscape of medical education

Since the 1970s, India has witnessed a steady privatization of medical education. Nearly half of all medical colleges today are privately owned—often by business or political interests—charging high capitation fees while offering inadequate infrastructure, clinical exposure, and teaching support. Even in public colleges, students often observe faculty being involved in private practice or coaching academies, reinforcing commercial models of medicine. The rise of the

National Eligibility cum Entrance Test (NEET) for undergraduate and postgraduate entry has spawned a parallel education economy centred on private coaching, test-taking, and high-cost specialization.

This environment of converting medical education into an industry reproduces a profit-oriented workforce, which manufactures doctors attuned to private sector demands. The graduates are focused on income-based career paths, and are often disconnected from ethical and public health imperatives. The findings of this consultation—on deskilling, moral distress, and a business-oriented mindset—reflect the outcomes of this system.

Shifting employment patterns

In states like Maharashtra, large corporate hospitals are rapidly replacing older employment models such as state-employed positions and doctor-owned facilities. This transition is accompanied by performance-linked contracts, precarious working conditions, and a loss of autonomy—particularly for early-career doctors.² Research from India and other LMICs, including Vietnam and Ethiopia, reveals growing concern among medical professionals regarding intensifying competition, rising indebtedness, and limited support from professional bodies. Globally, researchers note that corporatisation in healthcare has far-reaching implications for medical practice.² In India, these tensions are felt acutely, as public policy increasingly promotes private-sector provision and insurance-based financing.

Condition of health workers and economic inequality

The economic efficiencies attributed to healthcare privatization often come at the expense of frontline healthcare workers. A systematic review⁷ found that privatization frequently leads to worsened outcomes in job security, wage equity, and workload. Similarly, Goodair et al. (2024)⁸ note that privatized hospitals tend to prioritize financial gains over care standards, especially by minimizing staffing and focusing on high-revenue patients. Empirical studies examining hospital privatization across contexts—including South Korea, the UK, and India—found that outsourcing was consistently associated with lower staff-to-patient ratios and weakened employment conditions. Contrary to the promise that competition in mixed markets would enhance quality, the evidence points to a deterioration of care standards, particularly

⁷ Alayed, T. M., Alrumeh, A. S., Alkanhal, I. A., & Alhuthil, R. T. (2024). Impact of privatization on healthcare system: A systematic review. *Saudi Journal of Medicine & Medical Sciences*, 12(2), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.4103/sjmms.sjmms_510_23

⁸ Goodair, B., et al. (2024). The effect of health-care privatisation on the quality of care. *The Lancet Public Health*, 9(3), e199–e206. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(24\)00003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(24)00003-3)

affecting low-income and uninsured populations.^{9,10} These trends were echoed by participants in this report, who reported similar experiences within Indian hospital systems.

It is important to acknowledge that the expansion of private hospitals has also brought perceived improvements in access and quality for a limited subset of the population—primarily affluent and urban patients.

As Stinson, Pollak, and Cohen (2005)¹¹ argue, healthcare cannot be treated as an ordinary market commodity; the sector critically depends on trust, teamwork, and continuity. For-profit models that undermine the well-being of the healthcare workforce may compromise not only employment standards, but also the quality and integrity of care itself.¹² This highlights the need for robust regulatory oversight to protect both patients and healthcare workers.

The path forward: Reclaiming healthcare as a social good

Institutional overreach and the erosion of ethics place health care workers in a critical position—not just as clinicians but as defenders of patients’ rights. However, the personal and professional cost of resisting unethical practices is high, and many institutions have strong incentives to ensure this cost remains prohibitive. If health is a human right, then profit cannot be the arbiter of who receives care. Instead, upholding this right demands strong public oversight to hold both public and private providers accountable to the goal of universal, affordable and dignified healthcare.^{12, 13, 14} Here we briefly suggest some steps which can enable movement in the direction of reclaiming healthcare as a social good.

⁹Maarse, H. (2006). The privatization of health care in Europe: An eight-country analysis. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 31(5), 981–1014. <https://doi.org/10.1215/03616878-2006-014>

¹⁰Ovretveit, J. (2003). Nordic privatization and private healthcare. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 18(3), 233–246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.712>

¹¹Cohen, M. (2006). The privatization of health care cleaning services in Southwestern British Columbia, Canada: Union responses to unprecedented government actions. *Antipode*, 38(3), 626–644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0066-4812.2006.00599.x>

¹²Toebe, B. (2008). Taking a human rights approach to healthcare commercialization. In M. J. Selgelid, B. M. Rappert, & M. C. Smith (Eds.), *Health capital and sustainable socioeconomic development* (1st ed., pp. 441–454). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420046915-32>

¹³World Health Organization. (1978). *Declaration of Alma-Ata*. <https://www.who.int/teams/social-determinants-of-health/declaration-of-alma-ata>

¹⁴World Health Organization & United Nations Children’s Fund. (2018). *Declaration of Astana: Global Conference on Primary Health Care, Astana, Kazakhstan, 25–26 October 2018*. <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/primary-health/declaration/gcphc-declaration.pdf>

a. Re-centering socially responsive indicators and strengthening accountability

The testimonies from nurses and doctors in our report paint a picture of moral distress—caregivers feeling forced to choose between meeting revenue targets and honouring their professional and ethical commitments. To counter this, healthcare leaders (public and private alike) need to champion a different set of metrics beyond the corporate balance sheet. Quality of care, equity of access, patient satisfaction, and staff well-being are all critical indicators of a health system’s performance.¹⁵¹⁶

Such a reorientation requires internal accountability mechanisms: for instance, ethics committees with teeth, whistleblower protections for staff, and zero tolerance for policies that undermine patient rights. Globally, many frameworks stress accountability as a pillar of health governance; for example, recent resolutions on social participation and accountability for UHC encourage countries to institutionalize community monitoring and grievance redressal in healthcare.¹⁷

b. Strengthen public provisioning and stewardship, revitalize primary health care and public provisioning

The evidence presented in this report suggests that unregulated commercialization is fundamentally at odds with the goal of “Health for All.” It is imperative that government and regulatory bodies proactively enforce standards for ethical practice, quality, and fair pricing. Where existing laws (such as the Clinical Establishments Act or patient rights charters) are in place, they must be implemented rigorously with participatory oversight mechanisms.¹⁸

A robust public sector can form the necessary counterbalance to corporate dominance. Reinvesting in public health services, especially in primary and secondary care would expand access, reduce dependence on private providers, and restore trust in the public health system. When primary care is strong and community-rooted, hospitals are less likely to become profit-driven entry points drawing in patients with every health need. Policymakers can draw on international norms here; for example, laws that ban discrimination by insurers and hospitals on

¹⁵ Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (n.d.). *Types of quality measures*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. Retrieved from <https://www.ahrq.gov/talkingquality/measures/types.html>

¹⁶ Olayiwola, J. N., & Beeson, T. (2024). *Measuring and monitoring health equity within healthcare organizations*. Mayo Clinic Proceedings. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2024.04.01>

¹⁷ UHC2030. (2024). Open letter to Ministers of Health: About the resolution on social participation for universal health coverage, health and well-being. <https://www.uhc2030.org/news-and-events/news/open-letter-to-ministers-of-health-about-the-resolution-on-social-participation-for-universal-health-coverage-health-and-well-being-555656/>

¹⁸ Peer, R. F. (2013). Right to healthcare: The way forward. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 2(1), 4-8. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2249-4863.109929>.

financial grounds, or require a minimum quota of low-cost beds in private hospitals, have been used in various countries to maintain equity.¹⁹

c. Embed ethical training and accountability in medical education

- **Foster critical dialogue:** Create platforms within medical colleges to debate the commercialisation of healthcare and its effects on clinical ethics, public health, and equity. These should include seminars, ethics modules, and cross-disciplinary teaching that embeds reflection into every subject.
- **Promote non-profit and public medical institutions:** Strengthen government colleges and hospitals, and support charitable and not-for-profit institutions with a social mission.
- **Support alternative educational models:** Initiatives like the Rural Sensitisation Program²⁰, Travel Fellowships²¹ and Nirman²² offer immersive experiences that expose students to grassroots healthcare challenges and community-based practice.
- **Encourage primary care and family medicine:** Elevating the status and visibility of generalist disciplines is key to creating a more balanced and need-responsive healthcare system.
- **Involve civil society and advocacy networks:** Groups such as the Medico Friend Circle (MFC) and Jan Swasthya Abhiyan (JSA) can play a critical role in resisting commercialisation and fostering alternative visions of health care and education.
- **Document and research systemic impacts:** A sustained effort is needed to systematically study how five decades of privatisation have reshaped medical education—its priorities, outputs, and consequences for public health. This evidence is essential to inform policy and advocacy.

Professional associations in India (and globally) need to take a stronger stance as well, developing guidelines on interactions with the private sector, referral practices, and conflicts of interest.

If the trends outlined in this report are met with complacency, the danger is a health system that delivers high-tech clinical care for a privileged few while failing the healthcare needs of many. A key takeaway from this effort is the urgent need to strengthen this discourse on corporatisation

¹⁹World Health Organization. (2008). *Primary health care: Now more than ever – The World Health Report 2008*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241563734>

²⁰Rural Sensitisation Program. (n.d.). *The RSP*. <https://www.travelfellowship.org/the-rsp>

²¹Travel Fellowship. (n.d.). *Vision and values*. <https://www.travelfellowship.org/Vision-and-values>

²²Nirman. (n.d.). *About info*. <https://nirman.mkcl.org/about/info>

of healthcare and deepen research—particularly on how medical education shapes clinical practice, and how patients across public and private settings experience the shifting landscape of care. Listening to these voices will be critical to understanding, and ultimately addressing, the real-world consequences of healthcare commercialization.

These dynamics are not unique to India. However, India, which has the largest private healthcare sector among LMICs across the world, is witnessing intensified versions of the global trend of finance capital encroaching into healthcare. The Indian case underscores the universality of these processes—and the urgent need for dialogue within and across countries among medical professionals and healthcare workers, patients’ groups, health sector civil society organisations and researchers. This is urgently necessary to challenge corporatisation - and its impacts in terms of commercialised distortion and denaturation of medical practices, and to counter this by ensuring socially anchored, publicly organised, rational and humane health systems.

Copyright © 2026 United Nations University International Institute for Global Health,
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37941/RR/2026/4>

ABOUT UNU Global Health

UNU Global Health serves as the UN's think tank on global health. The institute works to advance equitable, just and effective policies and practices by interrogating power and gender asymmetries in global health governance and accountability, health systems and workforces, digital health governance and security, climate health emergencies, and just transitions.

Through collaborative policy research and training, UNU Global Health generates knowledge and strengthens capacities for decision-making by Member states, UN and other multilateral agencies and civil society groups for sustainable development of global health and well-being.

<https://unu.edu/global-health>

UNU Global Health Building,
Hospital Canselor Tuanku Muhriz UKM (HCTM),
Jalan Yaacob Latif, Bandar Tun Razak, Cheras,
56000 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: +60 3-9171 5394
Email: iigh-info@unu.edu