



**The Social Science Review  
A Multidisciplinary Journal**

ISSN: 2584 – 0789

**(Open Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Bi-Monthly Journal)**

**www.tssreview.in**

**OPINION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY 2020 (NEP 2020)  
OF INDIA**

**<sup>1</sup>Dr. Sumit Paroi & <sup>2</sup>Riya Goswami**

<sup>1</sup>*Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Kazi Nazrul University, Asansol, West Bengal, India  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1012-3402>*

<sup>2</sup>*Post-Graduate Student, Department of Education, Kazi Nazrul University, Asansol, West Bengal, India*

**Abstract**

India has recently come up with a New Education Policy 2020 (NEP2020) after 34 years since its previous education policy in 1986. For the policy to be implemented in letter and spirit, the acceptance of it by the teachers who are often considered as the architects of the society is essential. Therefore, to study the opinion of teachers on NEP2020 is very significant. The study aims to find out the opinion of college teachers on NEP2020 and to see if there exists any significant difference in the opinion with reference to certain variables. A self-made 5-point Likert-type opinionnaire with 25 positive and negative items was administered to 80 college teachers from 14 colleges in the Paschim Bardhaman district of West Bengal, India. The data were analyzed with Chi-square, t-test, and ANOVA performed on R-studio software. The findings of the study reveal that there are mixed opinions about NEP2020 among the college teachers. Some recommendations are praised while some are denounced. There is no significant difference of opinion among the college teachers with reference to gender, locality of the institutions, social category they belonged to, nature of job, teaching experience and discipline of study. But there is a significant difference of opinion among college teachers having various academic qualifications.

**Key words:** *New Education Policy 2020 (NEP2020), Opinion, Higher education, and College teachers.*

**Introduction**

Education and society both are related to each other in such a way that if change in one occurs, change in other is obvious. Every country has its own policy on education based on aspirations of the people, social and cultural values, the Constitution of the nation, and traditions. Therefore, every education policy has a lot of social implications and it gives direction to social change that is bound to occur (Thrupp, 2002). India is a country which is known for giving a lot of importance to education from ancient ages. The traditional institutions like Nalanda, Takshashila, and Vikramashila were very famous and attracting students from neighboring countries (Suresh, 2013). Education has accelerated the growth of India economically so substantially that it ranks the fifth largest economy in the world (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 2022). Indian personalities and scholars are contributing to highly prestigious academic institutions and multi-national organisations in the world. At this juncture when the new education policy

2020 is passed in the Union cabinet of India on 29 July, 2020 and yet to be implemented completely throughout the country, it becomes an importance question for investigation what the college teachers' opinions are on the said policy. The question asked is very important because the spirit and implementation of the policy would depend to a great extent on the views and the level of acceptance of the policy by the teachers.

34 years after National Policy on Education in 1986, India has formulated a new National Education Policy 2020 which is now being implemented in the country. The policy is said to transform all the areas of education in the country from Primary to Higher education level (Kathi et al., n.d.). Some of the recommendations of the policy with regard to Higher education are forward-looking vision for quality higher education; Institutional restructuring and consolidation; making education holistic and multi-disciplinary; ensuring optimal learning environment and support for students ; motivated, energized, and capable faculty; ensuring equity and inclusion in higher education; impetus to teacher education; reimagining vocational education; quality academic research; transforming regulatory system; effective governance and leadership (Ministry of Education, 2020). Higher education plays an important role in the economic development of a country (Dumciuviene, 2015). Therefore, research on policy which has direct bearing on higher education is highly needed. A study done on school teachers' perception on NEP2020 reveals that though most of the teachers agree on most of the changes introduced in the policy, yet some teachers were apprehensive about the consequences and implementation of the policy (Sharma & Akalamkam, 2021). Yet in another study the results show teachers agreeing upon most of the changes in the policy whereas some of the changes like NTA entrance test for B.Ed. admission, abolition of M.Phil. degree and policy on medium of instruction are not welcomed at all (Murugesan & Vijayalakshmi, 2021). There are also some challenges for implementation of the policy such as lack of infrastructure and funds and corruptions in the education systems (Arun et al., 2022).

## **Method**

**Objectives of the study:** The study aims to find out the opinion of college teachers on the recommendations of NEP-2020 on various aspects of higher education. It also aims to study whether there lies any significant difference in the opinion among college teachers with reference to gender, locality of the institutions, social category, nature of job, teaching experience, academic qualifications, and discipline of study.

**Hypotheses:** The study has certain null hypotheses. These are:

1. There is no significant difference between the observed frequencies and the frequencies expected to be equally distributed if the respondents are asked to opine on various aspects of higher education as recommended by NEP-2020.
2. There is no significant difference in the opinion of college teachers with reference to teaching experience, job position, academic qualification, gender, discipline, social category, and locality of the institutions.

**Participants:** 80 college teachers from 12 general degree colleges from the district of Paschim Bardhaman, West Bengal agreed to participate in the study. Teachers of only either government or government-aided general degree colleges were approached for data collection.

**Instruments and Procedures:** An opinionnaire consisting of 25 items based on the recommendations of the New Education Policy 2020 on Higher education was constructed to elicit the opinion of the college teachers. The items were framed in the manner of 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Out of 25 items, 13 items were positive and 12 items were negative. The scoring procedure for positive items was 5 for 'strongly agree', 4 for 'agree', 3 for 'neutral', 2 for 'disagree', and 1 for 'strongly disagree' and the scoring procedure for negative items were just vice-versa. The opinionnaire was initially given to 8 university teachers and the suggestions received were incorporated.

**Result:** The participants were asked the following questions and the responses received are shown in tabular form.

**Table 1**  
*Agreement of the participants to the positive items of the opinionnaire*

| SL No. | Item  | N  | Strongly Agree | Agree          | Neutral        | Disagree       | Strongly Disagree | Chi-Square    | P           |
|--------|---|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1.     | It is a good move by NEP 2020 to place more emphasis on the development of cognitive skills and learning outcomes in higher education.  | 80 | 11<br>(13.75%) | 46<br>(57.5%)  | 14<br>(17.5%)  | 9<br>(11.25%)  | 0<br>(0%)         | <b>45.700</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 2.     | Introducing an education which integrates humanities and arts with science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEAM education) will help in proper assessment of the students | 80 | 12<br>(15%)    | 32<br>(40%)    | 21<br>(26.25%) | 11<br>(13.75%) | 4<br>(5%)         | <b>29.125</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 3.     | NEP2020 will transform vocational education in our country towards betterment.  | 80 | 11<br>(13.75%) | 44<br>(55%)    | 11<br>(13.75%) | 10<br>(12.5%)  | 4<br>(5%)         | <b>63.375</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 4.     | Community engagement in higher education should be increased.   | 80 | 14<br>(17.5%)  | 34<br>(42.5%)  | 20<br>(25%)    | 8<br>(10%)     | 4<br>(5%)         | <b>34.500</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 5.     | If NEP 2020 is implemented it will create empowered faculty to conduct innovative teaching, research, and service.  | 80 | 8<br>(10%)     | 35<br>(43.75%) | 22<br>(27.5%)  | 8<br>(10%)     | 7<br>(8.75%)      | <b>37.875</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 6.     | India should open high performing Indian university campuses in other countries.  | 80 | 8<br>(10%)     | 38<br>(47.5%)  | 20<br>(25%)    | 7<br>(8.75%)   | 7<br>(8.75%)      | <b>45.375</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 7.     | NEP 2020 will increase the level of teaching-learning and research in HEIs by making it multidisciplinary and cross-disciplinary.   | 80 | 8<br>(10%)     | 40<br>(50%)    | 21<br>(26.25%) | 7<br>(8.75%)   | 4<br>(5%)         | <b>55.625</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 8.     | If NEP 2020 is implemented, India will be promoted into a global study destination by providing premium education at affordable costs.  | 80 | 9<br>(11.25%)  | 28<br>(35%)    | 21<br>(26.25%) | 14<br>(17.5%)  | 8<br>(10%)        | <b>17.875</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 9.     | India should allow foreign university campuses to open and provide higher education in India.   | 80 | 8<br>(10%)     | 38<br>(47.5%)  | 17<br>(21.25%) | 14<br>(17.5%)  | 3<br>(3.75%)      | <b>45.125</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 10.    | Establishing HEIs in or near every district will ensure access, equity, and inclusion.  | 80 | 17<br>(21.25%) | 35<br>(43.75%) | 16<br>(20%)    | 5<br>(6.25%)   | 7<br>(8.75%)      | <b>32.250</b> | <b>.00*</b> |

\* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

The above data clearly reveal that the observed frequencies are significantly different from that to be expected if the opinion of the college teachers were equally distributed among the ranges of the scale. Since the opinions are not equally distributed, most of the opinions fall on “agree” as evident from the above table. The participants have favourable opinions towards NEP2020 for it would emphasise on cognitive skills and learning outcomes; implement STEAM education; transform vocational education; increase community engagement; make empowered faculty who conduct innovative teaching, research and service; improve teaching-learning and research through multi-disciplinary education; open educational campuses abroad and allowing foreign universities to open campuses in the country; and ensure access, equity, and inclusion.

**Table 2**  
*Agreement of the participants to the negative items of the opinionnaire*

| SL No. | Item   | N  | Strongly Agree | Agree          | Neutral        | Disagree       | Strongly Disagree | Chi-Square    | P           |
|--------|--|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1.     | NEP2020 will create hurdles in research at most universities and colleges in higher education.   | 80 | 8<br>(10%)     | 27<br>(33.75%) | 21<br>(26.25%) | 19<br>(23.75%) | 5<br>(6.25%)      | <b>21.250</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 2.     | It is hazardous to do away with high-stakes examinations and introduce continuous and comprehensive evaluation                             | 80 | 5<br>(6.25%)   | 30<br>(37.5%)  | 29<br>(36.25%) | 10<br>(12.5%)  | 6<br>(7.5%)       | <b>38.875</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 3.     | Multiple entry and exit points as said by NEP2020 will create nuisance in HEIs.  | 80 | 13<br>(16.25%) | 27<br>(33.75%) | 24<br>(30%)    | 13<br>(16.25%) | 3<br>(3.75%)      | <b>23.250</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 4.     | Turning affiliated colleges into autonomous degree-granting Colleges (AC) is a bad idea to increase the quality of education and research. | 80 | 11<br>(13.75%) | 29<br>(36.2%)  | 21<br>(26.25%) | 17<br>(21.25%) | 2<br>(2.5%)       | <b>26.000</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 5.     | NEP 2020 will not help increase Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in Higher education in India to 50 % in 2035.                                  | 80 | 6<br>(7.5%)    | 33<br>(41.25%) | 27<br>(33.75%) | 10<br>(12.5%)  | 4<br>(5%)         | <b>43.125</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 6.     | NEP2020 will create more educated unemployment in the country.   | 80 | 3<br>(3.75%)   | 29<br>(36.25%) | 24<br>(30%)    | 17<br>(21.25%) | 7<br>(8.75%)      | <b>30.250</b> | <b>.00*</b> |

\* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

The above data clearly reveal that the observed frequencies are significantly different from that to be expected if the opinion of the college teachers were equally distributed among the ranges of the scale. Since the opinions are not equally distributed, most of the opinions fall on “agree” as evident from the above table. The participants have unfavourable opinions towards NEP2020 for it would create hurdles in research; do away with high-stake examination; create nuisance in the institutions for multiple exit and entry; be a bad idea to grant autonomy to the colleges; and increase educated unemployment.

**Table 3**

*Neutral response of the participants to the positive and negative items of the opinionnaire*

| SL No. | Item  | N  | Strongly Agree | Agree          | Neutral        | Disagree       | Strongly Disagree | Chi-Square    | P           |
|--------|---|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1.     | NEP 2020 will deteriorate the quality of education in universities and colleges.  | 80 | 5<br>(6.25%)   | 21<br>(26.25%) | 29<br>(36.25%) | 20<br>(25%)    | 5<br>(6.25%)      | <b>28.250</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 2.     | NEP 2020 is essential for holistic development of students in higher education.   | 80 | 10<br>(12.5%)  | 27<br>(33.75%) | 31<br>(38.75%) | 11<br>(13.75%) | 1<br>(1.25%)      | <b>39.500</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 3.     | NEP2020 will not significantly contribute to the economic development of the country.   | 80 | 4<br>(5%)      | 27<br>(33.75%) | 29<br>(36.25%) | 16<br>(20%)    | 4<br>(5%)         | <b>36.125</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 4.     | Light but tight regulation by a single regulatory authority (for example HERA) for higher education will not make any difference about our fragmented education eco system.                   | 80 | 1<br>(1.25%)   | 29<br>(36.25%) | 33<br>(41.25%) | 11<br>(13.75%) | 6<br>(7.5%)       | <b>50.500</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 5.     | NEP 2020 will not help India to achieve global standards of quality in higher education   | 80 | 10<br>(12.5%)  | 21<br>(26.25%) | 30<br>(37.5%)  | 16<br>(20%)    | 3<br>(3.75%)      | <b>26.625</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 6.     | NEP 2020 did not recommend any practical solution for inclusive education in higher education.  | 80 | 6<br>(7.5%)    | 28<br>(35%)    | 30<br>(37.5%)  | 14<br>(17.5%)  | 2<br>(2.5%)       | <b>40.000</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 7.     | If NEP2020 is implemented it will create the same vibrant multidisciplinary environments as ancient Indian universities Takshashila, Nalanda, Vallabhi, and Vikramshila, in higher education. | 80 | 4<br>(5%)      | 20<br>(25%)    | 28<br>(35%)    | 16<br>(20%)    | 12<br>(15%)       | <b>20.000</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 8.     | If NEP2020 is implemented, local/Indian languages will not be useful for higher education.  | 80 | 8<br>(10%)     | 23<br>(28.75%) | 27<br>(33.75%) | 16<br>(20%)    | 6<br>(7.5%)       | <b>20.875</b> | <b>.00*</b> |
| 9.     | NEP 2020 should not allow Private institutions in higher education.   | 80 | 6<br>(7.5%)    | 21<br>(26.25%) | 28<br>(35%)    | 20<br>(25%)    | 5<br>(7.5%)       | <b>25.375</b> | <b>.00*</b> |

The above data clearly reveal that the observed frequencies are significantly different from that to be expected if the opinion of the college teachers were equally distributed among the ranges of the scale. Since the opinions are not equally distributed, most of the opinions fall on “neutral” as evident from the above table. The participants are in neutral position whether NEP2020 would increase quality of higher education; bring about holistic development in children; contribute significantly to the country’s economy; unite our fragmented education eco-system; solve the problems of Inclusive education; allow

private institutions; use regional language in higher education; and restore the past glory of ancient Indian universities such as Nalanda and Takshashila.

**Table 4**

*t-test for finding significant difference in opinion with reference to gender, locality, social category, nature of job, teaching experience, and academic qualification of college teachers*

| Variable               | Groups           | N  | Shapiro Wilk | Leven's Test | Mean   | df | t     | p      | Remarks |
|------------------------|------------------|----|--------------|--------------|--------|----|-------|--------|---------|
| Gender                 | Male             | 45 | 0.5          | 0.63         | 75.955 | 78 | 1.73  | 0.087  | not sig |
|                        | Female           | 35 |              |              | 80.342 |    |       |        |         |
| Locality               | Urban            | 49 | 0.5          | 0.37         | 76.09  | 78 | 1.112 | 0.269  | not sig |
|                        | Rural            | 31 |              |              | 79     |    |       |        |         |
| Social category        | Unreserved       | 59 | 0.5          | 0.87         | 74.047 | 78 | 1.818 | 0.072  | not sig |
|                        | Reserved         | 21 |              |              | 79.237 |    |       |        |         |
| Nature of Job          | Full Time        | 51 | 0.5          | 0.35         | 76.137 | 78 | 1.836 | 0.07   | not sig |
|                        | Part Time        | 29 |              |              | 80.931 |    |       |        |         |
| Teaching experience    | >10 yrs          | 24 | 0.5          | 0.77         | 79     | 78 | 1.356 | 0.178  | not sig |
|                        | <10 yrs          | 56 |              |              | 75.25  |    |       |        |         |
| Academic Qualification | Masters          | 36 | 0.5          | 0.767        | 81.69  | 78 | 2.829 | 0.005* | sig     |
|                        | M.Phil. or Ph.D. | 44 |              |              | 74.75  |    |       |        |         |

\* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

When the questions come whether the opinion of college teachers differs significantly with reference to gender, locality of the institutions, social category of the respondents, nature of the job, teaching experience, and qualifications of the respondents, we can clearly see from the above table that 1. there is no significant difference between male and female teachers regarding their opinions towards NEP2020, 2. there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers regarding their opinions towards NEP2020, 3. there is no significant difference between reserved and unreserved social category teachers regarding their opinions towards NEP2020, 4. there is no significant difference between full-time and part-time teachers regarding their opinions towards NEP2020, 5. there is no significant difference between teachers who have teaching experience more and less than 10 years regarding their opinions towards NEP2020, but 6. there is a significant difference between teachers whose highest qualification is Masters' degree and those who have M.Phil. or Ph.D. as their highest degree regarding their opinions towards NEP2020.

**Table 5**

*ANOVA (One-way) for finding out significant difference of opinion with reference to the discipline of the college teachers*

| Discipline            | N  | Sum sq | Mean sq | df | F     | p    | Remarks |
|-----------------------|----|--------|---------|----|-------|------|---------|
| Arts                  | 57 | 104.00 | 52.13   | 2  | 0.675 | 0.07 | not sig |
| Science               | 14 | 10150  | 131.82  | 77 |       |      |         |
| Commerce & Management | 9  |        |         |    |       |      |         |

From the above table it is also evident that the opinion of college teachers does not significantly differ with reference to the discipline of subjects namely Arts, Science, and Commerce or Management they belong to.

### **Discussion**

After going through the literature and the analysis of the obtained data it can be said that respondents have a mixed opinion on NEP2020 (Murugesan & Vijayalakshmi, 2021; Pallathadka et al., 2021; Sharma & Akalamkam, 2021). No one either approve or renounce fully the New Education Policy 2020 (Wadhwa & Kumar, 2022). In this study what we observe is some of the recommendations of NEP2020 are endorsed by the participants while others are opposed. Interestingly, there are so many points where the respondents neither approve nor oppose on the changes recommended by the NEP2020. This could be either people do not have complete knowledge of NEP2020 or are confused or people wait to opine until the policy gets implemented fully across the country (Pallathadka et al., 2021). One of the questions asked was whether NEP2020 would deteriorate the quality of education in colleges and universities. People responded in a neutral way. In this regard the study by Gupta may be reviewed where she explained that the quality of higher education in India would depend on how far the government is able to implement the NEP2020 in actual practice (Gupta, 2021). With many challenges of education specially related to infrastructure, well-trained human resource, and political interference the implementation of NEP2020 is very difficult and probably that is why people are taking time to give their verdict on NEP2020 (Ahmad, 2017).

Apart from being neutral, people have shown renounce to some of the recommendations of NEP2020. On asking if NEP2020 would increase the educated unemployment in the country, people have responded in positive. But one of the important objectives of NEP2020 is to increase employability among the students. This issue can be understood more deeply from the study done by Yadav and Yadav. They say that one of the important causes of educated unemployment is supply of educated people is more than demand in the society (Yadav et al., 2021). Why people say that NEP2020 would increase educated unemployment because this policy aims to increase the enrolment ration to higher education from around 27% at present to 50% by 2035. Then, the supply would be much higher than the demand in the society. Therefore, it is crucial to create employment opportunities besides giving training to the skills.

People also support some of the moves introduced in the NEP2020. For example, on asking if India should allow foreign universities to open campus in it. The participants responded in the positive. In this regard the study done by Schukoske may be referred. She says that so many Indian students get admission in the foreign universities every year. If the foreign universities themselves open campuses in the country, it would benefit a lot of Indian students (Schukoske, 2006). Though there are talks of cultural and ethical values degradation if foreign universities allowed in India (Kumar & Ganesan, 2013), but the best way is to regulating cross-border higher education with mutual benefits for all (David & Wildemeersch, n.d.). They have also responded positively to multidisciplinary education emphasized by NEP2020. Multidisciplinary education is a must to modernize our education system (Bhushan, n.d.). Senge (as cited in (Wicklein & Schell, 1995) noted that multidisciplinary education instead of fragmented education helps us apply knowledge to solve complex problems in a better way.

The findings of the study namely there is no significant difference of opinion between male and female teachers and there is no significant difference of opinion between the teachers of Arts, Science and Commerce and Management combined are similar to the study done by Murugesan & Vijayalakshmi, 2021 (Murugesan & Vijayalakshmi, 2021). Interestingly the study finds out there is a significant difference between teachers whose highest qualification is Masters' degree and those who have M.Phil. or Ph.D as their highest degree regarding their opinions towards NEP2020. Respondents with highest qualification of Masters' degree are more favorable towards NEP2020 than respondents who have either M.Phil. or Ph.D. degrees.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study it could be concluded that there are mixed opinions about NEP2020 among the college teachers. Some recommendations are praised while some are denounced. There is no significant difference of opinion among the college teachers with reference to gender, locality of the institutions, social category they belonged to, nature of job, teaching experience and discipline of study. But there is a significant difference of opinion of teachers having various academic qualifications.

At the end it could be said that there should be a greater number of seminars, workshops, and talks by experts directly related to policy making for vast dissemination and proper understanding. To be successful as a policy it requires further convincing people, reviewing itself and finding out the challenges for implementation.

## References

1. Ahmad, Y. (2017). Journal of Education and Practice [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org) ISSN. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1). [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org)
2. Arun, D. P., Malik, J. S., & Shelar, R. (2022). Perceived Challenges of National Education Policy, 2020 by the students. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 73–76. <https://doi.org/10.48165/ijee.2022.58214>
3. Bhushan, S. (n.d.). *HIGHER EDUCATION Multidisciplinary Approach in*. [www.cemca.org](http://www.cemca.org)
4. Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Routledge.
5. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pearson.
6. David, S. A., & Wildemeersch, D. (n.d.). *Engaging with Cross-Border Higher Education in India, while Sustaining the Best Tradition of Indian Values*.
7. Dumciuviene, D. (2015). The Impact of Education Policy to Country Economic Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 2427–2436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.302>
8. Gupta, A. (2021). Focus on Quality in Higher Education in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(1), 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00195561211007224>
9. Heumann, C. & Shalabh, M. S. (2016). *Introduction to Statistics and Data Analysis: With Exercises, Solutions and Applications in R*. Springer.
10. Kathi, S., Naidu, A. R., & Rangaiah, B. (n.d.). A Critical Analysis of India's National Education Policy (2020): Insights into Educational Transformation. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 2022(9), 4561–4567. <http://journalppw.com>
11. Kumar, V. A., & Ganesan, R. (2013). Foreign Universities in India-Ethical Issues in New Scenario. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 8(3), 34–38. [www.iosrjournals.org](http://www.iosrjournals.org)
12. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy, 2020*, Government of India. Ministry of Education.
13. Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of I. (2022). *INDIA SHINING AS FIFTH LARGEST ECONOMY OF THE WORLD*. <https://static.pib.gov.in/WriteReadData/specificdocs/documents/2022/sep/doc202294100001.pdf>
14. Murugesan, V., & Vijayalakshmi, M. (2021). OPINION OF TEACHERS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY 2020 IN INDIA. In *TNTEU International Journal of Educational Research* (Vol. 1). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349077236>
15. Pallathadka, H., Manoharmayum, D., Pallathadka, L., & Makki, V. (2021). School Education According to Indian National Education Policy 2020 -A Case Study. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.03.038>

16. Schukoske, J. (2006). Bringing Foreign Universities to India. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.  
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1425569>
17. Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
18. Sharma, S., & Akalamkam, K. (2021). A Study of School Teacher's Perspective on National Education Policy 2020. *Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators*, 10(2), 75–86.  
[https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/publication/journalsandperiodicals/vtte/Dec\\_Issue-2021.pdf](https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/publication/journalsandperiodicals/vtte/Dec_Issue-2021.pdf)
19. Suresh, P. (2013). Higher Education Institutions in Ancient Indian History. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, 1(3), 317. [www.ijcrt.org](http://www.ijcrt.org)
20. Thrupp, M. (2002). Education Policy and Social Change. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(2), 321–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690220137792>
21. Wadhwa, N., & Kumar, R. (2022). NEP,2020-A Review cum Survey Based Analysis of Myths and Reality of Education in India Nanoparticles via green route and application in health care View project Antimicrobial and Phytochemical Activity Analysis of Plants View project. *International Journal of Advanced in Management, Technology and Engineering Sciences*, 12(1), 12–22.  
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357660759>
22. Wicklein, R. C., & Schell, J. W. (1995). Case Studies of Multidisciplinary Approaches to Integrating Mathematics, Science and Technology Education. *Journal of Technology Education*, 6(2).
23. Yadav, M., Yadav, B., & History, M. A. (2021). Education And Unemployment: A Case Study of Their Relationship in India. In *Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal* (Issue 10). <http://ijmer.in/pdf/e-Certificate%20of%20Publication-IJMER.pdf>