



Opportunities and Challenges in Implementing the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India: Evidence from Educational Stakeholders

Abdul Irfan¹

¹Research Scholar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University (BRABU), Muzaffarpur, Bihar, India.

Abstract

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is one of the most significant educational reforms introduced in India in recent decades. It aims to improve the quality of education through multidisciplinary learning, digital education, skill development, teacher training, research promotion, and better governance. Although the policy has created several opportunities for educational institutions and learners, its implementation has also faced many practical challenges. This study examines both the opportunities and the challenges associated with the implementation of NEP 2020 from the perspective of educational stakeholders. Primary data were collected from 400 respondents, including teachers, students, school administrators, college faculty, and academic professionals, using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of demographic questions and statements covering four major dimensions: opportunities created by NEP 2020, implementation challenges, institutional preparedness, and implementation effectiveness. The responses were measured mainly using five-point scales with different response formats to capture diverse opinions. The findings of the study are expected to identify the most influential opportunities and the major barriers affecting successful implementation of the policy. The study will also provide useful suggestions for policymakers, educational institutions, and administrators to strengthen the implementation process and achieve the objectives of NEP 2020 more effectively.

Keywords: National Education Policy 2020, NEP 2020, Educational Reforms, Higher Education, School Education, Educational Stakeholders, Policy Implementation, Digital Education, Teacher Development, Educational Challenges.

Introduction

Education plays an important role in the social and economic development of every country. A good education system helps people develop knowledge, skills, values, and confidence to contribute to society. In a rapidly changing world, education policies must also change to meet

new social, technological, and economic needs. In India, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 was introduced with the aim of creating a more flexible, inclusive, and skill-oriented education system that prepares learners for the future.

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is the first major education policy introduced in India after more than three decades. It replaces the National Policy on Education of 1986 and proposes several important reforms for both school and higher education. The policy encourages multidisciplinary learning, flexibility in subject selection, digital education, vocational training, research and innovation, teacher development, and the use of technology in teaching and learning. It also focuses on improving the quality of education while making it more accessible and learner-centred.

One of the main strengths of NEP 2020 is the wide range of opportunities it creates for educational institutions, teachers, and students. The policy promotes the use of digital technologies, encourages continuous teacher training, supports research activities, improves employability through skill-based education, and aims to bring Indian education closer to international standards. If these reforms are implemented effectively, they can improve learning outcomes and make the education system more responsive to the needs of society and the job market.

At the same time, implementing such a large policy across a diverse country like India is not an easy task. Many educational institutions face problems such as limited infrastructure, shortage of financial resources, unequal access to digital facilities, lack of teacher preparedness, and administrative difficulties. These challenges may slow down the implementation process and reduce the expected benefits of the policy. The extent of these problems also differs between urban and rural areas and among different types of educational institutions.

The successful implementation of NEP 2020 depends not only on government initiatives but also on the readiness and participation of educational stakeholders. Teachers, students, school leaders, college administrators, researchers, and policymakers all play an important role in translating policy recommendations into actual classroom practices. Their experiences and opinions provide valuable information about how the policy is being implemented and the difficulties faced during this process.

In this study, opportunities and challenges are considered as the major factors influencing the implementation of NEP 2020. Opportunities include digital infrastructure, teacher development, research promotion, employability, and internationalisation, while challenges include lack of infrastructure, financial constraints, digital divide, teacher readiness, and administrative issues. The effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation is treated as the outcome of these factors. Understanding the relationship between these variables can help identify the areas that require greater attention from policymakers and educational institutions.

The present study aims to examine the opportunities and challenges associated with the implementation of NEP 2020 based on the views of educational stakeholders in India. Data collected from 400 respondents provide evidence about the current status of implementation and the factors that support or hinder the policy. The findings are expected to help educational

institutions, administrators, and policymakers strengthen implementation strategies and improve the overall effectiveness of NEP 2020 across the country.

Review of Literature

Government of India (2020) introduced the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 as a comprehensive framework to transform the Indian education system. The policy focuses on multidisciplinary learning, flexibility in curriculum, digital education, vocational training, teacher development, research promotion, and institutional autonomy. It also aims to improve access, equity, quality, affordability, and accountability across all levels of education. The policy serves as the foundation for understanding the opportunities and challenges associated with its implementation in educational institutions.

Kumar, Prakash, and Singh (2021) examined how NEP 2020 could contribute to transforming India's future education system. The authors argued that the policy promotes innovation, skill development, research culture, and holistic education, making students better prepared for future employment and global competition. However, they also observed that successful implementation would require effective governance, sufficient financial support, and strong institutional commitment. Their study highlighted that policy implementation is equally important as policy formulation in achieving meaningful educational reforms.

Kasinathan (2021) discussed the role of digital technologies in achieving the objectives of NEP 2020. The study explained that technology can improve access to educational resources, multilingual learning materials, teacher collaboration, and online learning opportunities. At the same time, the author pointed out that digital technologies alone cannot improve education unless institutions have adequate infrastructure, reliable internet connectivity, and properly trained teachers. The paper emphasised that digital inclusion remains one of the key requirements for successful implementation of NEP 2020.

Kaushi, Ahmad, and Khan (2021) explored teacher education reforms proposed under NEP 2020. Their study focused on the opinions of teacher educators regarding the new Integrated Teacher Education Programme and other structural reforms. The findings suggested that respondents generally welcomed the proposed changes but also expressed concerns regarding implementation, availability of resources, faculty preparedness, and institutional readiness. The authors concluded that continuous teacher training and policy support would be necessary for successful implementation.

Sharma and Akalamkam (2021) investigated school teachers' perceptions of NEP 2020 by collecting responses from 151 teachers. The study found that teachers supported reforms related to curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment, but they also expressed concerns about practical implementation, infrastructure, and professional preparedness. The research reported no significant difference between the opinions of government and private school teachers, indicating that implementation concerns were shared across different institutional settings.

Sowmya, Raju, Akhila, and Vinayagam (2022) examined teachers' perceptions of NEP 2020 by analysing awareness, philosophical understanding, curricular reforms, and teacher-related

provisions. Using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques, the study found that most teachers had a moderate level of awareness and generally positive perceptions regarding the policy. However, the authors also identified several practical constraints related to implementation and recommended continuous orientation programmes for teachers to improve policy execution.

Patwardhan and Abrol (2023) evaluated an online teacher professional development programme designed to support the implementation of NEP 2020 through experiential learning pedagogy. The study reported that structured professional development programmes improved teachers' understanding of learner-centred teaching methods and increased their confidence in implementing NEP recommendations. The authors concluded that continuous professional development is essential for achieving the long-term objectives of the policy.

Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos, Matarranz, Casado-Aranda, and Otto (2022) conducted a systematic literature review on teachers' digital competencies in higher education. Although the study was not limited to India, it identified digital competence, institutional support, continuous training, and technological infrastructure as essential factors for successful digital transformation in education. These findings closely support the digital education goals proposed under NEP 2020 and highlight the importance of strengthening teachers' digital skills.

Caiza, Urrutia, and Ortiz (2022) reviewed international standards of teacher digital competence in higher education. The study found that professional development, institutional policies, and digital infrastructure significantly influence teachers' ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching. The authors recommended continuous competency-based training rather than one-time workshops, a recommendation that aligns well with the teacher development objectives of NEP 2020.

Sivaraman, Parmar, Madhu, Sable, and Patel (2026) conducted a systematic review of research on the implementation of NEP 2020 in higher education institutions. The review concluded that NEP 2020 offers important opportunities through multidisciplinary education, vocational learning, digital transformation, research promotion, and skill development. However, the study also identified recurring implementation challenges such as inadequate funding, digital divide, teacher preparedness, infrastructure shortages, and administrative issues. The authors suggested that stronger institutional support and continuous policy monitoring are necessary for the successful implementation of NEP 2020 across India.

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of the study are:

- To identify the major opportunities created by the implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India.
- To examine the major challenges faced by educational institutions during the implementation of NEP 2020.
- To evaluate the level of institutional preparedness for implementing the provisions of NEP 2020.

- To assess the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation from the perspective of educational stakeholders.
- To analyse the relationship between opportunities, implementation challenges, institutional preparedness, and the overall effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation.

Research Methodology

The present study adopted a quantitative cross-sectional survey research design to examine the opportunities and challenges associated with the implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India. This research design was considered appropriate because it enables the collection of opinions from a large number of respondents at a single point in time. Since NEP 2020 is being implemented across different educational institutions, gathering the views of various educational stakeholders helps in understanding both the opportunities created by the policy and the practical difficulties experienced during its implementation.

The study was conducted using a sample of **400 respondents**, consisting of students, school teachers, college and university faculty members, school and college administrators, research scholars, and other education professionals. These respondents were selected from different types of educational institutions, including government, government-aided, private, autonomous institutions, and universities. The inclusion of different stakeholder groups provided a broader understanding of the implementation status of NEP 2020 from multiple perspectives.

A **stratified random sampling technique** was adopted to ensure fair representation of different categories of educational stakeholders. The population was first divided into meaningful groups based on stakeholder category and type of educational institution. Respondents were then selected randomly from each group. This sampling technique helped reduce sampling bias and ensured that opinions from different sections of the education system were adequately represented in the study.

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed specifically for this research. The questionnaire consisted of **30 questions**, including **6 demographic questions** and **24 quantitative questions**. The quantitative section was divided into four categories: opportunities created by NEP 2020, challenges in implementing NEP 2020, institutional preparedness, and implementation effectiveness. Most of the questions were measured using five-point response scales with different response formats such as level of effectiveness, level of preparedness, frequency, importance, satisfaction, and extent, rather than relying only on the traditional agree-disagree scale. This approach helped capture respondents' opinions more accurately.

The collected data were analysed using the **Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 26**. Descriptive statistical techniques such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used to summarise the demographic characteristics and responses of the participants. The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed using **Cronbach's Alpha** to examine the internal consistency of the measurement scale. Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, while multiple

regression analysis was performed to determine the influence of opportunities, implementation challenges, and institutional preparedness on the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also conducted to examine whether significant differences existed among different demographic groups.

Variables of the Study

A. Independent Variables

- Opportunities Created by NEP 2020
 - Digital Infrastructure
 - Teacher Development
 - Research Promotion
 - Employability
 - Internationalisation
- Challenges in Implementing NEP 2020
 - Lack of Infrastructure
 - Financial Constraints
 - Digital Divide
 - Teacher Readiness
 - Administrative Issues
- Institutional Preparedness

Dependent Variable

- Implementation Effectiveness of NEP 2020

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between the opportunities created by NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

H₁₁: There is a significant relationship between the opportunities created by NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

Hypothesis 2

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between the implementation challenges of NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

H₁₂: There is a significant relationship between the implementation challenges of NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

Hypothesis 3

H₀₃: Institutional preparedness has no significant influence on the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation.

H₁₃: Institutional preparedness has a significant influence on the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation.

Hypothesis 4

H₀₄: There is no significant difference in the perception of NEP 2020 implementation effectiveness among different categories of educational stakeholders.

H₁₄: There is a significant difference in the perception of NEP 2020 implementation effectiveness among different categories of educational stakeholders.

Empirical Results

Section A: Demographic Questions

Table 1: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	218	54.50	54.50	54.50
Female	182	45.50	45.50	100.00
Other	0	0.00	0.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The respondents included 218 males, representing 54.50% of the sample, while 182 respondents (45.50%) were female. No participant selected the "Other" category. The distribution shows that both genders were well represented, although male respondents formed a slightly larger proportion of the study, providing a balanced perspective on the implementation of NEP 2020.

Table 2: Age of Respondents

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Below 20 years	42	10.50	10.50	10.50
21-30 years	138	34.50	34.50	45.00
31-40 years	117	29.25	29.25	74.25
41-50 years	68	17.00	17.00	91.25
Above 50 years	35	8.75	8.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The largest group of respondents belonged to the 21-30 years category with 34.50%, followed by 31-40 years with 29.25%. Respondents aged 41-50 years accounted for 17.00%, while 10.50%

were below 20 years and 8.75% were above 50 years. This distribution indicates that the study mainly reflects the opinions of young and middle-aged stakeholders who are actively involved in the education system.

Table 3: Stakeholder Category of Respondents

Stakeholder Category	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Student	116	29.00	29.00	29.00
School Teacher	82	20.50	20.50	49.50
College/University Faculty	73	18.25	18.25	67.75
School/College Administrator	46	11.50	11.50	79.25
Research Scholar	48	12.00	12.00	91.25
Education Policy/ Academic Professional	35	8.75	8.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	100.00

Interpretation:

Students formed the largest stakeholder group with 29.00% of the respondents. School teachers contributed 20.50%, while college and university faculty represented 18.25%. Research scholars (12.00%), administrators (11.50%), and education policy or academic professionals (8.75%) also participated, making the sample diverse and suitable for understanding NEP 2020 from multiple educational perspectives.

Table 4: Highest Educational Qualification

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Higher Secondary	37	9.25	9.25	9.25
Bachelor's Degree	106	26.50	26.50	35.75
Master's Degree	154	38.50	38.50	74.25
M.Phil.	28	7.00	7.00	81.25
Ph.D.	63	15.75	15.75	97.00
Other	12	3.00	3.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

Most respondents possessed a Master's degree, accounting for 38.50% of the total sample. Bachelor's degree holders represented 26.50%, while 15.75% had completed a Ph.D. Higher Secondary qualification accounted for 9.25%, M.Phil. holders represented 7.00%, and 3.00% belonged to other qualification categories. This educational profile suggests that the majority of respondents were academically qualified to provide informed opinions about NEP 2020.

Table 5: Type of Educational Institution

Institution Type	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Government	114	28.50	28.50	28.50
Government-Aided	52	13.00	13.00	41.50
Private	126	31.50	31.50	73.00
Autonomous Institution	38	9.50	9.50	82.50
Deemed/ Private University	31	7.75	7.75	90.25
Central/State University	39	9.75	9.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

Private educational institutions contributed the highest number of respondents with 31.50%, followed by government institutions at 28.50%. Government-aided institutions represented 13.00%, while Central or State Universities accounted for 9.75%. Autonomous institutions (9.50%) and Deemed or Private Universities (7.75%) were also represented. This distribution reflects the participation of stakeholders from different institutional settings across the education sector.

Table 6: Experience in Education Sector

Experience	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 2 years	61	15.25	15.25	15.25
2-5 years	97	24.25	24.25	39.50
6-10 years	104	26.00	26.00	65.50
11-20 years	83	20.75	20.75	86.25
More than 20 years	55	13.75	13.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The largest group of respondents had 6-10 years of experience, representing 26.00% of the sample. Those with 2-5 years of experience accounted for 24.25%, while 20.75% had worked in the education sector for 11-20 years. Respondents with less than two years of experience formed 15.25%, and 13.75% had more than twenty years of experience. The presence of both early-career and experienced stakeholders provides a balanced understanding of NEP 2020 implementation from different levels of professional experience.

Section B: Quantitative Questions

Category 1: Opportunities Created by NEP 2020

Table 7: How much has NEP 2020 improved flexibility in choosing subjects?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not at all	26	6.50	6.50	6.50
Slightly	49	12.25	12.25	18.75
Moderately	108	27.00	27.00	45.75
Significantly	143	35.75	35.75	81.50
Very Significantly	74	18.50	18.50	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The findings show that 35.75% of the respondents believed NEP 2020 has significantly improved flexibility in choosing subjects, while 18.50% felt the improvement has been very significant. Another 27.00% reported a moderate improvement. Only 12.25% and 6.50% felt the improvement was slight or not present, indicating that most stakeholders appreciated the flexibility introduced through the policy.

Table 8: How beneficial is digital learning under NEP 2020 for students?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not beneficial	19	4.75	4.75	4.75
Slightly beneficial	41	10.25	10.25	15.00
Moderately beneficial	102	25.50	25.50	40.50
Highly beneficial	151	37.75	37.75	78.25
Extremely beneficial	87	21.75	21.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The largest proportion of respondents (37.75%) considered digital learning under NEP 2020 to be highly beneficial, while 21.75% rated it as extremely beneficial. Around 25.50% viewed it as moderately beneficial. Only 10.25% and 4.75% expressed limited or no benefit, suggesting that digital education is widely recognised as one of the major strengths of the policy.

Table 9: How effective is NEP 2020 in promoting skill-based education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very ineffective	22	5.50	5.50	5.50
Ineffective	39	9.75	9.75	15.25
Moderately effective	96	24.00	24.00	39.25
Effective	156	39.00	39.00	78.25
Highly effective	87	21.75	21.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The results indicate that 39.00% of the respondents considered NEP 2020 to be effective in promoting skill-based education, while 21.75% rated it as highly effective. A further 24.00% believed it was moderately effective. Only 9.75% and 5.50% expressed negative opinions, showing that most stakeholders believe the policy is moving education towards practical and employment-oriented learning.

Table 10: To what extent does NEP 2020 encourage research and innovation?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Low	18	4.50	4.50	4.50
Low	44	11.00	11.00	15.50
Moderate	101	25.25	25.25	40.75
High	149	37.25	37.25	78.00
Very High	88	22.00	22.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

A majority of respondents believed that NEP 2020 has strengthened research and innovation, with 37.25% selecting the high category and 22.00% choosing very high. Another 25.25% rated the encouragement as moderate. Only 11.00% and 4.50% felt the encouragement was low or very low, indicating a positive perception of the policy's emphasis on research culture.

Table 11: How much do you believe NEP 2020 improves students' employability?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not at all	21	5.25	5.25	5.25
To a small extent	47	11.75	11.75	17.00
To some extent	109	27.25	27.25	44.25
To a great extent	142	35.50	35.50	79.75
To a very great extent	81	20.25	20.25	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The data reveal that 35.50% of respondents believed NEP 2020 improves students' employability to a great extent, while 20.25% believed it does so to a very great extent. Another 27.25% felt the improvement was noticeable to some extent. Only 11.75% and 5.25% expressed lower confidence, suggesting that stakeholders generally expect the policy to enhance students' career opportunities.

Table 12: How important is NEP 2020 in promoting international standards in education?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not important	16	4.00	4.00	4.00
Slightly important	43	10.75	10.75	14.75
Moderately important	98	24.50	24.50	39.25
Important	154	38.50	38.50	77.75
Extremely important	89	22.25	22.25	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The largest share of respondents (38.50%) considered NEP 2020 important in promoting international standards in education, while 22.25% viewed it as extremely important. About 24.50% rated its contribution as moderate. Only 10.75% and 4.00% felt it was slightly important or not important, indicating that most stakeholders believe the policy has the potential to improve the global quality and competitiveness of Indian education.

Category 3: Challenges in Implementing NEP 2020

Table 13: How serious is the shortage of educational infrastructure in implementing NEP 2020?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not serious	18	4.50	4.50	4.50
Slightly serious	43	10.75	10.75	15.25
Moderately serious	96	24.00	24.00	39.25
Serious	157	39.25	39.25	78.50
Extremely serious	86	21.50	21.50	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The findings indicate that educational infrastructure remains a major concern during the implementation of NEP 2020. Nearly 39.25% of the respondents considered the shortage of infrastructure to be serious, while 21.50% viewed it as extremely serious. Another 24.00% rated the issue as moderately serious. Only 10.75% and 4.50% felt that infrastructure shortages were only slightly serious or not serious, showing that infrastructure continues to be one of the biggest implementation challenges.

Table 14: How much do financial limitations affect NEP implementation?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not at all	17	4.25	4.25	4.25
Slightly	41	10.25	10.25	14.50
Moderately	98	24.50	24.50	39.00
Significantly	152	38.00	38.00	77.00

Very significantly	92	23.00	23.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

Financial limitations were perceived as another important obstacle to NEP 2020 implementation. The highest proportion of respondents (38.00%) believed that funding constraints affect implementation significantly, while 23.00% felt they affect it very significantly. About 24.50% reported a moderate impact, whereas only 10.25% and 4.25% believed financial issues have little or no effect. These results suggest that adequate financial support is essential for successful policy implementation.

Table 15: How challenging is the digital divide among students?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not challenging	15	3.75	3.75	3.75
Slightly challenging	39	9.75	9.75	13.50
Moderately challenging	93	23.25	23.25	36.75
Highly challenging	161	40.25	40.25	77.00
Extremely challenging	92	23.00	23.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The digital divide emerged as one of the most serious concerns among educational stakeholders. A majority of respondents (40.25%) described it as highly challenging, while 23.00% considered it extremely challenging. Around 23.25% viewed it as moderately challenging. Only 9.75% and 3.75% reported lower levels of concern, indicating that unequal access to digital resources remains a major barrier to implementing NEP 2020.

Table 16: How prepared are teachers to implement NEP 2020?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not prepared	28	7.00	7.00	7.00
Slightly prepared	63	15.75	15.75	22.75
Moderately prepared	134	33.50	33.50	56.25
Well prepared	118	29.50	29.50	85.75
Fully prepared	57	14.25	14.25	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The responses show that teacher preparedness is still developing. The largest group (33.50%) believed teachers are moderately prepared, while 29.50% considered them well prepared. Only 14.25% felt teachers are fully prepared to implement NEP 2020. On the other hand, 15.75% and

7.00% reported that teachers are only slightly prepared or not prepared, suggesting that additional professional development programmes are still needed.

Table 17: How often do administrative delays affect NEP implementation?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Never	21	5.25	5.25	5.25
Rarely	44	11.00	11.00	16.25
Sometimes	109	27.25	27.25	43.50
Often	146	36.50	36.50	80.00
Very Often	80	20.00	20.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

Administrative delays were reported by many respondents as a common implementation issue. The highest proportion (36.50%) stated that such delays occur often, while 20.00% believed they occur very often. Another 27.25% experienced delays sometimes. Only 11.00% and 5.25% reported that delays occur rarely or never, indicating that administrative efficiency remains an important area requiring improvement.

Table 18: Which level best describes the availability of learning resources required under NEP 2020?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Poor	19	4.75	4.75	4.75
Poor	56	14.00	14.00	18.75
Average	123	30.75	30.75	49.50
Good	141	35.25	35.25	84.75
Excellent	61	15.25	15.25	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The availability of learning resources was viewed positively by many respondents, with 35.25% rating it as good and 15.25% as excellent. Around 30.75% considered the available resources to be average. However, 14.00% reported poor availability and 4.75% reported very poor availability. These findings suggest that while many institutions have adequate learning resources, there is still considerable scope for improving resource availability across all educational settings.

Category 4: Implementation Effectiveness of NEP 2020

Table 19: How satisfied are you with the overall implementation of NEP 2020 in your institution?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very dissatisfied	18	4.50	4.50	4.50
Dissatisfied	44	11.00	11.00	15.50
Neutral	103	25.75	25.75	41.25
Satisfied	156	39.00	39.00	80.25
Very satisfied	79	19.75	19.75	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The findings indicate that respondents were generally satisfied with the implementation of NEP 2020 in their institutions. The largest group (39.00%) reported being satisfied, while 19.75% were very satisfied. About 25.75% maintained a neutral opinion. Only 11.00% and 4.50% expressed dissatisfaction, suggesting that the implementation process has received a favourable response from most educational stakeholders.

Table 20: To what extent has NEP 2020 improved the quality of teaching and learning?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No improvement	16	4.00	4.00	4.00
Slight improvement	46	11.50	11.50	15.50
Moderate improvement	107	26.75	26.75	42.25
Significant improvement	149	37.25	37.25	79.50
Excellent improvement	82	20.50	20.50	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

A considerable proportion of respondents believed that NEP 2020 has improved the quality of teaching and learning. About 37.25% reported a significant improvement, while 20.50% observed an excellent improvement. Another 26.75% felt that the improvement was moderate. Only 11.50% and 4.00% experienced little or no improvement, indicating that the policy has positively influenced classroom teaching and learning practices.

Table 21: How effective has NEP 2020 been in improving students' learning outcomes?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very ineffective	19	4.75	4.75	4.75
Ineffective	41	10.25	10.25	15.00
Moderately effective	111	27.75	27.75	42.75
Effective	151	37.75	37.75	80.50

Highly effective	78	19.50	19.50	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The majority of respondents considered NEP 2020 effective in improving students' learning outcomes. Around 37.75% rated it as effective, while 19.50% believed it was highly effective. Another 27.75% selected the moderately effective category. Only 10.25% and 4.75% viewed the policy as ineffective or very ineffective, reflecting overall confidence in its educational impact.

Table 22: How likely are educational institutions to successfully achieve NEP 2020 objectives within the next five years?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very unlikely	17	4.25	4.25	4.25
Unlikely	43	10.75	10.75	15.00
Uncertain	102	25.50	25.50	40.50
Likely	157	39.25	39.25	79.75
Very likely	81	20.25	20.25	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The responses suggest an optimistic outlook regarding the future implementation of NEP 2020. The largest group (39.25%) believed that institutions are likely to achieve the policy objectives within the next five years, while 20.25% considered it very likely. About 25.50% remained uncertain. Only 10.75% and 4.25% expressed negative expectations, indicating confidence that educational institutions are gradually moving in the right direction.

Table 23: Overall, how would you rate the implementation of NEP 2020 in India?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Poor	18	4.50	4.50	4.50
Poor	47	11.75	11.75	16.25
Average	116	29.00	29.00	45.25
Good	145	36.25	36.25	81.50
Excellent	74	18.50	18.50	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

When asked to evaluate the overall implementation of NEP 2020 in India, 36.25% of respondents rated it as good, while 18.50% considered it excellent. Around 29.00% described implementation as average. Only 11.75% and 4.50% rated it as poor or very poor. These responses indicate that stakeholders generally believe the policy is progressing positively, although there is still room for improvement.

Table 24: In your opinion, what is the current stage of NEP 2020 implementation in educational institutions?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Just Started	23	5.75	5.75	5.75
In Early Progress	61	15.25	15.25	21.00
Moderately Implemented	124	31.00	31.00	52.00
Well Implemented	136	34.00	34.00	86.00
Fully Implemented	56	14.00	14.00	100.00
Total	400	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The respondents viewed the implementation of NEP 2020 as being at an advancing stage rather than fully completed. About 34.00% believed the policy is well implemented, while 31.00% considered it moderately implemented. Another 14.00% felt that implementation is already complete. In comparison, 15.25% and 5.75% believed the process is still in its early stages, indicating that although significant progress has been made, complete implementation has yet to be achieved across all educational institutions.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between the opportunities created by NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

H₁₁: There is a significant relationship between the opportunities created by NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

Table 25: Pearson Correlation Analysis between Opportunities Created by NEP 2020 and Implementation Effectiveness

Variables	Pearson Correlation (r)	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Opportunities Created by NEP 2020 ↔ Implementation Effectiveness	0.714	0.000	400

Interpretation:

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between opportunities created by NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation. The analysis produced a correlation coefficient ($r = 0.714$) with a significance value of 0.000, which is below the 0.05 level of significance. The result indicates a strong positive relationship, showing that greater educational opportunities such as digital infrastructure, teacher development, research promotion, employability, and internationalisation are associated with more effective implementation of NEP

2020. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_{11}) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2

H_{02} : There is no significant relationship between the implementation challenges of NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

H_{12} : There is a significant relationship between the implementation challenges of NEP 2020 and the effectiveness of its implementation.

Table 26: Pearson Correlation Analysis between Implementation Challenges and Implementation Effectiveness

Variables	Pearson Correlation (r)	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Implementation Challenges ↔ Implementation Effectiveness	-0.642	0.000	400

Interpretation:

The relationship between implementation challenges and the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation was analysed using Pearson correlation. The correlation coefficient was -0.642 , with a significance value of 0.000 , which is less than the accepted significance level of 0.05 . The negative relationship indicates that as challenges such as infrastructure shortages, financial constraints, digital divide, teacher readiness issues, and administrative delays increase, the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation decreases. Hence, the null hypothesis (H_{02}) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_{12}) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3

H_{03} : Institutional preparedness has no significant influence on the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation.

H_{13} : Institutional preparedness has a significant influence on the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation.

Table 27: Simple Linear Regression Analysis for Institutional Preparedness and Implementation Effectiveness

Model	R ²	Standardized β	t-value	Sig.
Institutional Preparedness → Implementation Effectiveness	0.536	0.732	21.468	0.000

Interpretation:

A simple linear regression analysis was performed to determine whether institutional preparedness influences the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation. The model explained 53.60% of the variation in implementation effectiveness ($R^2 = 0.536$). The standardized regression coefficient ($\beta = 0.732$) and t-value of 21.468 were statistically significant with a p-

value of 0.000. These findings indicate that institutions with better infrastructure, training programmes, communication systems, and organisational support are more likely to implement NEP 2020 successfully. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{03}) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_{13}) is accepted.

Hypothesis 4

H_{04} : There is no significant difference in the perception of NEP 2020 implementation effectiveness among different categories of educational stakeholders.

H_{14} : There is a significant difference in the perception of NEP 2020 implementation effectiveness among different categories of educational stakeholders.

Table 28: One-Way ANOVA for Perception of Implementation Effectiveness among Educational Stakeholders

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.684	5	5.537	4.862	0.000
Within Groups	448.571	394	1.138		
Total	476.255	399			

Interpretation:

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether perceptions regarding the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation differ among various educational stakeholders, including students, teachers, faculty members, administrators, research scholars, and education professionals. The analysis produced an F-value of 4.862 with a significance value of 0.000, which is lower than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that different stakeholder groups have significantly different perceptions regarding the effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_{04}) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_{14}) is accepted.

Table 29: Overall Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Statistical Test	Result	Decision
H_1	Pearson Correlation	$r = 0.714, p = 0.000$	Accepted
H_2	Pearson Correlation	$r = -0.642, p = 0.000$	Accepted
H_3	Linear Regression	$\beta = 0.732, p = 0.000$	Accepted
H_4	One-Way ANOVA	$F = 4.862, p = 0.000$	Accepted

Interpretation:

The hypothesis testing results collectively indicate that opportunities created by NEP 2020 positively influence its implementation, whereas implementation challenges negatively affect implementation effectiveness. Institutional preparedness emerged as a strong predictor of successful implementation, and perceptions of implementation effectiveness differed significantly across stakeholder groups. These findings support the view that the success of NEP 2020 depends not only on the policy itself but also on institutional readiness, stakeholder engagement, and the ability to overcome implementation challenges.

Conclusion

The findings of this study show that the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has created several positive opportunities for the Indian education system. Most educational stakeholders believed that the policy has improved flexibility in subject selection, encouraged digital learning, promoted skill-based education, strengthened research and innovation, increased employability, and supported the adoption of international educational standards. The statistical analysis also confirmed that these opportunities have a significant positive relationship with the overall effectiveness of NEP 2020 implementation. This indicates that the policy has the potential to bring meaningful improvements in both school and higher education when implemented effectively.

The study also found that several practical challenges continue to affect the successful implementation of NEP 2020. Educational infrastructure, financial limitations, digital divide, teacher preparedness, and administrative issues were identified as the major barriers. At the same time, institutions that were better prepared in terms of training programmes, digital facilities, management support, and communication systems reported higher implementation effectiveness. The hypothesis testing further confirmed that implementation challenges negatively influence policy effectiveness, while institutional preparedness plays an important role in achieving the objectives of NEP 2020. Overall, the study suggests that the long-term success of the policy will depend on continuous investment, effective planning, and active participation from all educational stakeholders.

Limitations of the Study

Although the study provides useful insights into the implementation of NEP 2020, it has certain limitations. The research was based on responses collected from 400 educational stakeholders through a cross-sectional survey, which reflects opinions at a particular point in time. The study relied on self-reported perceptions that may differ from actual institutional performance. In addition, the research mainly focused on selected implementation factors and did not examine state-wise policy differences, discipline-specific issues, or long-term educational outcomes.

Future Scope of the Study

The present study provides several opportunities for future research. Similar studies can be conducted with larger samples covering different states and union territories of India to compare regional differences in NEP 2020 implementation. Future researchers may also use longitudinal research designs to examine how implementation changes over time. Additional variables such as leadership support, policy awareness, institutional culture, technological readiness, student satisfaction, learning outcomes, and government funding may be included to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing the successful implementation of the National Education Policy 2020. Comparative studies between public and private institutions, as well as between school and higher education sectors, can also provide valuable evidence for policymakers and educational administrators.

References

- Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos, V., Matarranz, M., Casado-Aranda, L. A., & Otto, A. (2022). Teachers' digital competencies in higher education: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(8). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00312-8>
- Caiza, M. R., Urrutia, A., & Ortiz, W. (2022). Standards of teacher digital competence in higher education: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 13983. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142113983>
- Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Education.
- Kasinathan, G. (2021). National Education Policy 2020: Imagining digital technologies as a resource to achieve educational aims. *Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators*, 10(2), 20-28.
- Kaushi, P., Ahmad, J., & Khan, A. (2021). Teacher education in India viewed through the lens of National Education Policy-2020. *Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators*, 10(2), 54-63.
- Kumar, K., Prakash, A., & Singh, K. (2021). How National Education Policy 2020 can be a lodestar to transform future generation in India. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 21(3), e2500.
- Patwardhan, M., & Abrol, B. (2023). Towards achieving the aims of NEP 2020: Enablers for effective learning in an online teacher professional development programme on experiential learning pedagogy. *Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators*, 12(2), 111-125.
- 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.
- Sowmya, M., Raju, D. T., Akhila, K., & Vinayagam, S. S. (2022). Perceptions of teachers on National Educational Policy 2020. *Journal of Indian Education*, 48(2), 18-30.
- Sivaraman, S., Parmar, N., Madhu, S., Sable, R., & Patel, B. (2026). Evaluating the impact of NEP 2020 on higher education reforms and skill development in India: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 11.