EVALUATING EDUCATORS' PERSPECTIVES ON NEP 2020

Dr. Seema Hariramani

Associate Professor, Shri Chimanbhai Patel Institute of Business Administration, Ahmedabad hariramaniseema89@gmail.com

Ms. Khushboo Narang

Research Scholar, School of Commerce, Gujarat University narangkhushboon@gmail.com

Abstract

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 aims to bring about comprehensive changes in the education system in India to meet the evolving needs of the 21st century. The study undertaken here aims to explore the viewpoint of educators teaching at school and college level regarding the National Education Policy. The research identifies key themes emerging from teacher perceptions, including willingness to change, professional development requirements, administration requirements, benefits of NEP and the role of technology in the classroom. The data for the study is collected from 200 educators in Ahmedabad through Google Forms using two stage sampling method. Analysis of the collected data is done using SPSS. Other techniques like Factor analysis, Sentiment analysis and chi-square tests are also used to test the hypothesis. The findings of the study depict that the educators show a positive attitude and readiness to adapt to the NEP, but significant challenges must be addressed for effective implementation. Key steps include boosting awareness, enhancing preparedness, facilitating training and professional development, tackling institutional and student-related issues, and leveraging recognized benefits. Ensuring these measures will facilitate successful NEP adoption and impact in education.

Keywords: Educators, Factor analysis, National Education Policy 2020, Sentiment analysis, Two stage sampling

INTRODUCTION TO THE NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY

In 2015, India enthusiastically embraced the global commitment to advancing education through Goal 4 (SDG4) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. At the heart of this mission is the profound aspiration to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" by the year 2030. The essence of a forward-thinking education policy lies in its capacity to not only recognize but also restore the prestige and indispensability of teachers at all levels. These educators, who play a pivotal role in shaping the destinies of the next generation, must be granted the utmost respect, dignity, and autonomy. The overarching objective of the new education policy should be to empower teachers comprehensively, enabling them to fulfill their roles with unparalleled effectiveness. In achieving this, the policy should actively cultivate an environment that attracts the best and brightest minds into the teaching profession, ensuring livelihood security while ingraining fundamental principles of quality control and accountability within the system. In conjunction with this teacher-centric approach, a primary focus of curriculum and pedagogy reform should be to transition the education system away from the prevailing culture of rote learning. The goal is to mold individuals who are not only well-rounded but also equipped with the essential 21st-century skills vital for navigating the complexities of the modern world. The central emphasis of this paper resides in the pivotal role attributed to teachers as indispensable stakeholders crucial for the triumphant execution of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Within the educational landscape, teachers are not merely passive participants but active facilitators, serving as the driving force behind the profound transformation of pedagogical practices. Acknowledging their centrality in the educational process, this paper underscores that the successful implementation of NEP 2020 is intricately tied to the attitudes and actions of educators.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ansari and Chavan (2021) conducted a study on "A comparative study of prospective teachers towards NEP 2020". The study uses descriptive research design and analyzes the evolving role of teacher educators considering NEP 2020 and examines how prospective teachers from FYBED and SYBED programs respond to various aspects of the policy. The findings show that FYBED students are more responsive to certain policy aspects, while SYBED students are more responsive to others, reflecting diverse perspectives on NEP 2020's implementation and impact.

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

- Dar and Ganaie (2021) conducted a study on "Importance of Nep 2020 For Changing Role of Teacher Educators". The study is analytical, utilizing relevant books, articles, and research papers, with data and information sourced as needed. An interpretive approach has been employed for the analysis. It explores how NEP 2020 redefines the role of teacher educators and the various classroom roles teachers should assume. It offers suggestions to tackle challenges in teacher education, using an interpretive analysis based on a review of relevant literature and research.
- Features of the National Education Policy 2020 in the Context to Preschool Education and its Expected Impact". The research paper reviews NEP-2020, emphasizing the revitalization of early childhood care and education (ECCE) to support critical brain development by age six, especially for socio-economically disadvantaged communities. It aims to equip community members with essential digital and financial skills, crucial during the pandemic. Building on the Right to Education Act and Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, the paper highlights NEP-2020's key features, implications, and positive impact on foundational skills and widespread ECCE implementation.
- ➤ Jain (2021) conducted a study on "A Critical Analysis of New Education Policy 2020 And It's Future Implications". The study based on primary and secondary data focuses on analyzing the various aspects related to New Education Policy 2020. It also highlights the various difficulties in implementing the New Education Policy 2020.
- Anute et al. (2022) conducted a study on "Perception of Academicians in Higher Education Institutes about National Education Policy 2020". The study is based on primary data and assesses faculty views on NEP 2020's success, with a sample of 120 educators from Pune. Findings reveal that faculty expectations for educational changes are mostly average or slightly below average. The policy has many promises but does not have proper execution plans for their success as this needs proper attention from political leaders.
- > Kumar (2022) conducted a study on "Digital Education: Vision, Perspectives and Problems in Changing Paradigms of NEP-2020". The study, exploratory in nature, states that the Indian government is enhancing education through technology and digital platforms, necessitating infrastructure investments and skilled teachers. Rapid growth in the education sector supports the nation's smart world vision. To protect students, the government must ensure access to safe, censored material and guard against cyber threats.
- Malhotra (2022) conducted a study on "NEP-2020: Implementation Problems and Solutions in the Context of Pedagogical Approaches & Assessment". The study based on primary and secondary data tries to assess the problems and their workable solutions in assessment. Using a descriptive research design, the study concludes that the NEP-2020 aims for a flexible, learner-centric higher education system using technology to make learning stress-free and continuous. It replaces high-stakes exams with teacher assessments and promotes 24/7 learning through blended methods.
- Roy (2022) conducted a study on "A critical study on the holistic and multidisciplinary approach of national educational policy 2020 (NEP 2020) in India." This study examines the holistic and multidisciplinary aspects of NEP 2020, highlighting the role of holistic education in child development and the relevance of a multidisciplinary approach in global education. By reviewing previous policies and literature, it provides context for NEP 2020 and the evolution of education policies. Using a philosophical approach, the study emphasizes the importance of holistic education and the significance of multidisciplinary education for survival, the goal of education.
- Fripathi (2022) conducted a study on "Opinion of the college teachers on national education policy- 2020 in Purba Medinipur district of west Bengal A case study. The study employs descriptive research and uses purposeful stratified sampling. A five-point rating scale questionnaire was developed to assess notable aspects of NEP 2020. Findings indicate that teachers largely agree with NEP 2020, with significant teaching experience influencing their opinions. However, there is no significant relationship between teachers' opinions on NEP 2020 and factors like gender and teacher discipline. The study suggests that implementing NEP 2020 will contribute to the holistic development of future generations in India.
- ➤ Jatav et al. (2023) conducted a study on "A Study of NEP -2020: Challenges of New Education Policies. The study is exploratory in nature and collects primary data through internet surveys. The findings of the study state that the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is a trans formative initiative aimed at creating an inclusive and accessible education system in India, addressing various educational issues and disparities. Its success relies on cooperative federalism and active participation from states. Effective implementation is crucial to leverage India's young population and opportunities in a growing knowledge-based economy.
- Mathur and Shukla (2023) conducted a study on "An Exploratory Study on Teacher's Awareness About the Online Teaching Platforms and its Role for the Professional Development with Reference to Nep 2020". The study focuses on teachers' awareness of online teaching platforms for professional development, aligning with the NEP-2020's emphasis on progressive and research-oriented teaching methods. Utilizing a survey method with a sample of 40 teachers from government schools, the research reveals that most teachers are aware of and have engaged with online teaching platforms. The findings suggest that online teaching-learning platforms are user-friendly and contribute to enhancing teachers' competencies, supporting the trans formative goals outlined in the NEP-2020.

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

- Santra and Basu (2023) conducted a study on "National Education Policy 2020: Opportunities and Challenges for India's Higher Education". The study, based on secondary data, provides insights into the opportunities and challenges posed by the NEP 2020 for higher education in India. Researchers, academics, and policy makers stand to benefit from a nuanced understanding of the policy's potential impact and limitations outlined in this literature review.
- Singh et al. (2023) conducted a study on "Teachers' Psychology towards the Adoption of National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 With Reference to Management Institutes". This research paper delves into the perceptions of teachers regarding the implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 within management institutes. Employing a quantitative research approach, the study aims to comprehensively explore how teachers perceive the trans formative potential of NEP 2020 and the challenges encountered during its adoption. The research gathered data through a Likert-based questionnaire administered to 266 teachers across diverse management institutes. The study's findings reveal predominantly positive perceptions among teachers towards NEP 2020.
- Somani and Gupta (2023) conducted a study on "A study on awareness and relevance towards national education policy, 2020". This research aims to assess the awareness and perceived relevance of students towards the National Education Policy (NEP). Utilizing a quantitative survey approach, the study recognizes students as crucial stakeholders in the policy execution process. These findings contribute to the literature by shedding light on the interplay between student awareness and policy relevance, guiding policymakers and educational leaders in promoting effective communication strategies to engage and empower students in the NEP implementation process.
- Swargiary (2023) conducted a study on "A Survey Study on Lifelong Learning Perceptions and Practices in India: Assessing the Impact of NEP 2020". The research paper explores the perceptions and attitudes of individuals towards lifelong learning within the framework of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India. Utilizing a survey study, the research aimed to assess awareness, understanding, and engagement with lifelong learning initiatives among a diverse sample of participants. The findings provide valuable insights into the potential impact of NEP 2020 on lifelong learning in India, offering recommendations for effective implementation.
- Example 2020 Conducted a study on "Transformation in the Teachers' Role According to the National Education Policy 2020 Guidelines in the Indian Context". This paper provides strategic recommendations for transforming higher education faculty according to NEP 2020. Key areas include promoting multidisciplinary, student engagement, leadership, lifelong learning, technology, and faculty as curriculum designers. Recommendations emphasize training faculty to work in multidisciplinary settings, fostering student-centric and self-directed learning, developing mentoring and leadership skills, encouraging blended and lifelong learning, and enhancing digital and curriculum design skills.
- Mishra (2024) conducted a study on "NEP 2020: Unfolding roles and responsibilities of teachers as mentors and students' perspective. The study states that the teacher mentorship positively impacts student success, teacher development, and classroom dynamics. It enhances teacher retention and job satisfaction, provides essential support, and is influenced by gender, culture, and technology. Different mentor-ship models are evaluated to determine best practices.
- Mishra and Bhattacharya (2024) conducted a study on "Strength, weakness, opportunity and threat of implementation of NEP 2020 in Indian Education: A review with a statistical analysis on the opinion of teaching community". The study, exploratory in nature was conducted through a survey involving 142 teachers was conducted using a Google form to analyze the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) associated with implementing the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in the Indian education system based on teachers' opinions. The survey results indicate that the impact of NEP 2020 varies significantly across disciplines, particularly affecting student admissions, future usefulness, and career opportunities, while teacher training strongly influences their comfort with the policy's implementation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology is a systematic and scientific approach to collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to answer questions or test hypotheses. It includes research design, data collection and analysis methods, the overall research framework, and ethical considerations, ensuring the study's results are valid, reliable, and ethically sound.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- 1. To know about the level of awareness regarding New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 among college and school teachers.
- 2. To assess the opinion of college and school teachers regarding New Education Policy (NEP) 2020.
- 3. To understand educators' preparedness, willingness and perception regarding New Education Policy (NEP) 2020.
- 4. To get an idea about educators' perception about effects of New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 on students.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A descriptive study was undertaken with a sample size of 200 selected based on two stage sampling method to understand the viewpoint of the teachers teaching in higher secondary schools and colleges of Ahmedabad district based upon their responses on

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

Likert scale statements relating to the perception, awareness and other aspects of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020.

DATA COLLECTION

The primary data for the study was collected through a structured questionnaire featuring both Likert scale statements and openended questions and it was distributed using Google Forms. Secondary data for the study was collected from the official government websites and other websites. Initially the questionnaire was tested for its reliability based on the responses from 50 respondents of each school and college using Cronbach's α which was found to be 0.963 which indicates a fair reliability of the questionnaire.

SAMPLING DECISIONS

- 1. Sample Size: 200
- 2. Sampling Unit: Educators teaching in government/private schools and government/ private colleges.
- 3. Sampling Method: Two stage sampling

STATISTICAL TOOLS

- Descriptive Measures
- Factor Analysis
- Multiple Regression Analysis
- Sentiment Analysis

DATA ANALYSIS & DISCUSSIONS

Table 1:- Demographic composition of sample:

Table 1:- Demographi	c composition of sample:		
Sr. No.	Demographics	Frequency	Percentage
	Age		
	18 years to 30 years	140	71
1.	31 years to 40 years	20	10
	41 years to 50 years	26	13
	51 years to 60 years	12	06
	Gender		
2.	Male	104	53
	Female	94	47
	Education		
	HSC	4	2
	Graduate	62	31
3.	Postgraduate	76	39
	PhD	38	19
	Professional course	14	7
	Other	4	2
	Occupation		
4.	Government/private school	83	42
	Government/private college	113	58
	Annual Income		
	Rs. 15 lacs to Rs. 20 lacs	175	88
	Rs. 21 lacs to Rs. 25 lacs	13	7
5.	Rs. 26 lacs to Rs. 30 lacs	1	0.5
	Rs. 31 lacs to Rs. 35 lacs	3	1.5
	Rs. 36 lacs to Rs. 40 lacs	4	2
	Rs. 41 lacs to Rs. 45 lacs	2	1

> HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Table 3:- Krushal Wallis Test

Sr. No.	Hypothesis	Calculated value χ^2	Asymp. Sig.	Decision
------------	------------	---------------------------	----------------	----------

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

1.	H0: Occupation does not affect the opinion towards NEP 2020. H1: Occupation affects the opinion towards NEP 2020.	0.67	0.920	Accept the Null Hypothesis
2.	H0: Age does not affect the opinion towards NEP 2020. H1: Age affects the opinion towards NEP 2020.	8.263	0.041	Reject the Null Hypothesis
3.	H0: Gender does not affect the opinion towards NEP 2020. H1: Gender affects the opinion towards NEP 2020.	1.109	0.292	Accept the Null Hypothesis
4.	H0: There is no significant difference between school and college educators in their opinion towards NEP 2020. H1: There is significant difference between school and college educators in their opinion towards NEP 2020.	0.167	0.920	Accept the Null Hypothesis

The above results indicate that Occupation and Gender does not affects the opinion towards NEP 2020, only Age significantly affects the opinion towards NEP 2020. Secondly, there is no significant difference in the opinion between school educators and college educators.

> FACTOR ANALYSIS

An EFA was performed using principal component analysis and varimax rotation. The minimum factor loading criteria was to set 0.50. The result shows that all communalities were above 0.50. The results were significant, x2 (n=198) = 8078.598 (p < 0.001), which indicates its suitability for factor analysis.

Table 4:- KMO and Barllett's Test

KMO and Barlett's Test					
Kaiser - Meyer - Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy .851					
	Approx. Chi-square	8078.598			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	861			
	Sig.	.000			

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) is a statistic which indicates the proportion of variance in the variables that is common variance which might be caused by the underlying factors. In this study, the KMO measure is 0.851 which indicates the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis. In this regard, data with MSA values above 0.600 is considered appropriate for factor analysis.

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis:

Table 5: - Total Variance Explained: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Total Variance Explained

		Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		Rotation	Sums of Square	d Loadings	
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	17.209	40.974	40.974	17.209	40.974	40.974	8.661	20.621	20.621
2	3.977	9.470	50.443	3.977	9.470	50.443	7.345	17.487	38.109
3	2.931	6.979	57.422	2.931	6.979	57.422	4.348	10.352	48.461
4	2.112	5.028	62.450	2.112	5.028	62.450	3.068	7.305	55.766
5	1.984	4.725	67.175	1.984	4.725	67.175	3.038	7.233	62.999
6	1.222	2.909	70.084	1.222	2.909	70.084	2.669	6.355	69.354
7	1.022	2.434	72.517	1.022	2.434	72.517	1.329	3.163	72.517
8	1.000	2.381	74.898						
9	.910	2.166	77.064						
10	.822	1.958	79.022						
11	.780	1.858	80.880						
12	.728	1.732	82.612						
13	.627	1.494	84.106						
14	.544	1.295	85.402						
15	.529	1.260	86.662						

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

16 .479 1.141 87.803 17 .432 1.029 88.832 18 .394 .939 89.771 19 .363 .864 90.635 20 .359 .854 91.489 21 .336 .800 92.289 22 .304 .723 93.012 23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095	_			
18 .394 .939 89.771 19 .363 .864 90.635 20 .359 .854 91.489 21 .336 .800 92.289 22 .304 .723 93.012 23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 .96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065	1	.479	1.141	87.803
19 .363 .864 90.635 20 .359 .854 91.489 21 .336 .800 92.289 22 .304 .723 93.012 23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 .99.579 39 .058	17	.432	1.029	88.832
20 .359 .854 91.489 21 .336 .800 92.289 22 .304 .723 93.012 23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 <	18	.394	.939	89.771
21 .336 .800 92.289 22 .304 .723 93.012 23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 <	19	.363	.864	90.635
22 .304 .723 93.012 23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 .99.716 40 .056 .133 .99.849 41 .041 .099 .99.948	20	.359	.854	91.489
23 .296 .705 93.717 24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 .99.716 40 .056 .133 .99.849 41 .041 .099 .99.948	21	.336	.800	92.289
24 .288 .686 94.403 25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	22	.304	.723	93.012
25 .264 .628 95.030 26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	23	.296	.705	93.717
26 .246 .585 95.616 27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	24	.288	.686	94.403
27 .225 .537 96.152 28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	25	.264	.628	95.030
28 .202 .481 96.633 29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	26	.246	.585	95.616
29 .184 .439 97.072 30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	27	.225	.537	96.152
30 .159 .378 97.450 31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	28	.202	.481	96.633
31 .157 .374 97.824 32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	29	.184	.439	97.072
32 .152 .361 98.185 33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	30	.159	.378	97.450
33 .129 .307 98.492 34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	31	.157	.374	97.824
34 .112 .267 98.759 35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	32	.152	.361	98.185
35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	33	.129	.307	98.492
35 .101 .241 99.000 36 .095 .226 99.226 37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	34	.112	.267	98.759
37 .083 .197 99.423 38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	35		.241	99.000
38 .065 .155 99.579 39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	36	.095	.226	99.226
39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	37	.083	.197	99.423
39 .058 .138 99.716 40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	38	.065	.155	99.579
40 .056 .133 99.849 41 .041 .099 99.948	39	.058	I	99.716
	40	.056	.133	
42 .022 .052 100.000	41	.041	.099	99.948
	1	.022	.052	100.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 5 helps in explaining the extraction of seven major factors of the educators' opinion about the New Education Policy 2020 along with their extracted cumulative percentage variances. As the table shows, all the seven factors jointly explain 72.517% of the total variance in the responses towards the variables on New Education Policy 2020. These factors align closely with the theoretical propositions of the research, emphasizing the validity of the conducted EFA.

- 1. The factor **Awareness** provides insights about the awareness and application of National Education Policy (NEP) by the educators.
- 2. The factor **Perception** encompassed items related to the National Education Policy's (NEP) focus on holistic education, co-curricular activities, and critical thinking skills.
- 3. The factor **Willingness** reflected educators' readiness to adapt teaching methods, integrate technology, and participate in professional development aligned with NEP recommendations.
- 4. The factor **Lack of Resources** captured concerns related to insufficient training and opportunities of professional development, collaboration opportunities, adjusting with NEP changes, and potential financial burdens for institutions.
- 5. The factor **Preparedness** on educators' familiarity with and confidence in explaining NEP goals and objectives.
- 6. The factor **Challenges for students** expressed concerns about challenges for students in understanding NEP, including confusion from multidisciplinary education and stress from continuous assessment.
- 7. The factor **Benefits** highlighted positive perceptions, such as NEP promoting teacher freedom, reward and recognition policies, and the benefits of Continuing Professional Development.

The factor loading, providing insights into the relationships between observed variables and identified factors, are presented in the accompanying table. This comprehensive analysis contributes valuable technical findings to the understanding of stakeholders' attitudes and concerns related to the National Education Policy.

> SENTIMENT ANALYSIS

1. Gender group wise Sentiment Score

Gender	Average of score sentiment
Male	0.70
Female	0.77

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

The findings of the sentiment analysis reveal a nuanced gender disparity in perceptions of the new education policy 2020. On average, females exhibit a marginally higher sentiment score of 0.77, indicating a slightly more positive attitude towards the policy compared to their male counterparts, who scored an average of 0.70.

2. Occupation wise Sentiment Score

Occupation	Average of score sentiment
Government/private school	0.72
Government/private college	0.76

The sentiment analysis reveals that school educators tend to view the new education policy 2020 positively, with an average score of 0.72, while college educators demonstrate a slightly higher average sentiment score of 0.76, indicating a somewhat stronger endorsement. Overall, both groups display a favorable outlook, with college educators exhibiting a slightly more pronounced inclination towards the policy, although individual opinions within each group warrant consideration.

3. Age group wise Sentiment Score

Age group	Average of score sentiment
18-30	0.68
31-40	0.69
41-50	0.81
51-60	0.94

The sentiment analysis underscores diverse viewpoints on the 2020 education policy among different age brackets. While individuals aged 18-30 and 31-40 display moderate positivity alongside areas for enhancement, respondents aged 41-50 and 51-60 express notably stronger endorsement and enthusiasm. These results emphasize the importance of considering age-related nuances in policy reception, offering insights for tailored interventions to enhance effectiveness.

Regression Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Overall Impact	143.5455	27.81493	198
Age	1.55	.937	198

Correlations

	Overall Impact	Age
Pearson Correlation Overall Impact	1.000	035
Age	035	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed) Overall Impact	•	.313
Age	.313	
N		
		198
Age	198	198

Variables Entered/Removeda

Model	VariablesEntered	VariablesRemoved	Method
1	Age ^b		Enter

- a. Dependent Variable: Overall Impact
- b. All requested variables entered.

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted RSquare	Std. Error ofthe Estimate
1	.035 ^a	.001	004	27.86888

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age

b. Dependent Variable: Overall Impact

ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	184.923	1	184.923	.238	.626 ^b
Residual	152228.168	196	776.674		
Overall Impact	152413.091	197			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Impact

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		StandardizedCoefficients		C:-
	В	Std. Error	Beta	ι	Sig.
1 (Constant)	145.143	3.826		37.934	.000
Age	-1.034	2.118	035	488	.626

Coefficients^a

Model		95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1 ((Constant)	137.597	152.689	
	Age	-5.211	3.144	

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Impact

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	141.0084	144.1092	143.5455	.96886	198
Residual	-99.00840	41.92437	.00000	27.79805	198
Std. Predicted Value	-2.619	.582	.000	1.000	198
Std. Residual	-3.553	1.504	.000	.997	198

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Impact

The hypothesis tests whether Age has a significant impact on the Overall Impact of educators' opinions regarding the New Education Policy 2020. To test hypothesis H1, Age was regressed on Overall Impact. Age did not significantly predict Overall Impact F (1, 198) = 0.238, p > 0.05, which indicates that the age does not play significant role in shaping Overall Impact educators' opinion regarding the New Education Policy 2020 (t = -0.448 (p > 0.05). These results clearly direct the negative effect of the Age. Moreover, the R2 = 0.001 depicts that the model explains 1% of the variance in Overall Impact.

CONCLUSION

The study looked at what teachers think about the National Education Policy (NEP). It found that teachers have different thoughts and opinions about how NEP is being put into practice. These include things like whether NEP is focusing on a well-rounded education, if teachers are ready to change how they teach, challenges in working together, how well teachers understand NEP, difficulties students might face, and positive views on things like giving teachers more freedom and opportunities for training. These findings show that NEP affects teachers in many ways, and there are important areas where the policy could be improved to help teachers and students succeed in education.

International, Peer Reviewed journal

E-ISSN: 2584-2609

REFRENCES

- [1] Anute, N., Pawar, J., Ingale, D., & Ghadage, A. (2022). Perception of Academicians in Higher Education Institutes about National Education Policy 2020. *Neuro Quantology, 20*(9), 6402.
- [2] Ansari, M. & Chavan, Chetan. (2021). A Comparative Study of Prospective Teachers towards NEP 2020. 8. 42-48.
- [3] Bhome, S. M., & Anilkumar, R. (2024). A Study on Preparedness of Nep 2020 w r t Degree College Teachers in University of Mumbai. *European Economic Letters (EEL), 14*(1), 250-258.
- [4] Dar, R. A., & Ganaie Nasir, N. A. (2021). Importance of Nep 2020 for Changing Role of Teacher Educators. *Ilkogretim Online, 20*(1), 8289-8301.
- [5] Gandhi, R. (2021). Review on the Key Features of the National Education Policy 2020 in the Context to Pre-school Education and its Expected Impact. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Social Sciences (IJMTS), 6*(1), 241-252.
- [6] Jatav, V. K., Bansal, S. K., & Bairwa, K. (2023). A study of NEP-2020: Challenges of new education policies. *International Journal of Future and Research in Management (IJFMR), 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i01.1527
- [7] Jain, P. K. (2021). A Critical Analysis of New Education Policy 2020 And It's Future Implications. *Journal of Commerce and Trade, 16*(2), 1-8.
- [8] Kakodkar, P. V., Rishipathak, P., & Sriranga, J. (2024). Transformation in the Teachers' Role According to the National Education Policy 2020 Guidelines in the Indian Context. *Journal of Indian Association of Public Health Dentistry, 22*(1), 11-15.
- [9] Kumar, A. (2022). Digital Education: Vision, Perspectives and Problems in Changing Paradigms of NEP-2020. *Journal under Arts and Humanities Category, 9*(1), 111-117.
- [10] Malhotra, S. P. (2022). NEP-2020: Implementation Problems and Solutions in the Context of Pedagogical Approaches & Assessment. *Education@ ETMA, 1*(3), 27-35.
- [11] Maruthavanan, M. (2020). A Study on the Awareness on New Education Policy (2019) among the Secondary School Teachers in Madurai District. *Shanlax International Journal of Education, 8*(3), 67-71.
- [12] Mathur, B., & Shukla, N. M. An Exploratory Study on Teacher's Awareness About the On-line Teaching Platforms and Its Role for The Professional Development with reference to NEP 2020.
- [13] Mishra, M. K. L., & Bhattacharya, M. (2024). Strength, weakness, opportunity and threat of implementation of NEP 2020 in Indian Education: A review with a statistical analysis on the opinion of teaching community. *Science, 94*(66.2), 66-2.
- [14] Mishra, P. NEP 2020: Unfolding Roles and Responsibilities of Teachers as Mentors and Students' Perspective.
- [15] Roy, M. A. N. O. J. I. T. (2022). A Critical Study on the Holistic and Multidisciplinary Approach of National Educational Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) in India. *IJFMR-International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4*(6), 1-7.
- [16] Santra, R., & Basu, S. National Education Policy 2020: Opportunities and Challenges for India's Higher Education.
- [17] Singh, J., Kaur, J., Jarad, R. S., Pawar, J., & Patil, A. H. (2023). Teachers' Psychology Towards the Adoption of National Education Policy (NEP) 2020-With Reference to Management Institutes. *Journal for Re Attach Therapy and Developmental Diversities, 6*(10s (2)), 353-365.
- [18] Somani, P., & Gupta, U. (2023). A Study on Awareness and Relevance Towards National Education Policy, 2020. *The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning, 11*(2).
- [19] SWARGIARY, K. (2023). A Survey Study on Lifelong Learning Perception and Practices in India: Assessing the Impact of NEP 2020.
- [20] Tripathi, P. K. (2022). Opinion of the College Teachers on National Education Policy-2020 in Purba Medinipur District of West Bengal–A Case Study. *Journal of Population Therapeutics and Clinical Pharmacology, 29*(04), 844-849.
- [21] https://www.education.gov.in/nep/about-nep
- [22] https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf