

Vol. VIII, Issue: II, No. 14, July - December : 2022
ISSN - 2277-7067



राष्ट्रहिताय संस्कृतम्

Kavikulaguru Kalidas Sanskrit University
Ramtek, Dist. Nagpur, Maharashtra

Peer Reviewed

**Journal of
Fundamental &
Comparative Research**

UGC CARE Listed Journal

शोधसंहिता

New Research Frontiers

**A STUDY ON AWARENESS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY AMONG UG
TEACHERS**

S. RAMESH, Assistant Professor of Commerce, SR & BGNR Government Arts & Science
College(A), Khammam, Telangana state
VIJAY KUMAR PVS, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Dr. BRR Government College,
Jadcherla

Abstract

Even after two years of introduction of National Education Policy (2020) several members of the teaching fraternity are yet to come to terms with it. The researchers want to find awareness on National Education Policy (2020) among UG teachers in Khammam District. In his study, it was found mainly the awareness level is below average. Awareness levels of UG teachers was calculated according to the variable Gender, Location, Type of Institution, years of service, and type of family.

Keywords: Awareness, New Education Policy, Gender, Location, service

Since Independence, we have tackled the big issues of inequality, economic development and academic development. Implementation of previous educational policies is incomplete. The incomplete program of the National Education Policy 1986 is modified in 1992. The Children's Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 ensures that all children between the ages of six and fourteen must be educated at a nearby school. Young students today are turning towards technology for their every requirement and also for academic development. Therefore, the children and youth of the country must be provided with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values as well as the skills that would enable them to contribute to the social, economic and political transformation of India. In September 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Aithal, 2019). The way global education is developed is the same in Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. SDG4 seeks to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” by 2030. Five of the seven SDG4 goals focus on quality education and knowledge outcomes. The vision of the National Education Policy envisages an India-centric education system that directly contributes to transforming our nation into an equitable and vibrant information society by providing high-quality education to all. For educational policy to be successful, teachers must know it. If the teachers have complete knowledge about it, then only it will achieve the desired goal.

Review of Literature

Ms.Sujatha Ramesh, Dr. K. Natarajan (2019) compared the NEP(2019) with the American Education system. The NEP permitted to switchover course like that of USA. The flexible approaches are similar to that of the USA.

Kalervo N Gulson, Sam seller (2018) came to one conclusion that enabling new private and public connections will be of great help.

Nikil Govind (2019) Aithal P.S, Shybhrajyotsna Aithal (2019) analyzed positive and negative impacts of the proposal and added some valuable suggestions for further improvement.

Statement of the Problem

A Study on the Awareness on New Education Policy among UG Teachers.

Objectives of the Study

- To find out the awareness of National Education Policy 2020.
- To find out whether there is any difference between the awareness of National Education Policy

among the UG teachers based on the independent variables like gender, location, type of management, residential status, and family type.

Scope of the Study

The present investigation aims to find awareness of New Education policy among UG teachers in the Khammam district.

Hypothesis

- The awareness of New Education Policy is not above average.
- There is no significant difference among UG teachers level of awareness of New Education Policy based on gender, location, type of management, years of service, and family type.

Limitation of the Study

The study is restricted to UG Teachers who are living in Khammam District only.

The study is limited to 200 UG teachers only.

As the study is conducted with a small sample, results can't be generalized.

The methodology of the Study

Investigators adopted survey method to collect data from the population for studying the awareness levels of National Education Policy among UG teachers in Khammam District.

Population and Sample

The UG teachers who are working in Khammam District of Telangana state are considered as the population for the present study. The government, private UG teachers were selected for the above study. The investigator adopted a simple random sampling method to collect data. Totally 200 data were collected from various UG teachers.

Tool Used

Multiple-choice type questionnaire was used as a tool for collecting data in the present study. The device includes 25 items related to National Educational Policy. The validity and reliability of the device were checked and corrected by the experts.

Averages, Standard Deviation, t test were used in the study.

Data Analysis

Hypothesis 1

The mean values on the awareness of National Educational Policy (2019) of UG teachers were calculated concerning the variables of the study. The result of the investigation was presented in the table.

Variables	Specifications	N	M
Gender	Male	100	21.56
	Female	100	19.82
Location	Rural	40	18.26
	Urban	160	31.28
Type of Management	Government	60	34.12
	Private	140	30.12
Years of Service	Above 10 years	110	27.12
	Below 10 years	90	36.12
Family Type	Joint	40	39.12

	Nuclear	160	31.26
--	---------	-----	-------

The above table shows that the awareness on National Education Policy awareness mean values of UG teachers is below 50%. Therefore the Null hypothesis is accepted. i.e., The awareness of National Education Policy is not above average.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness of New Education Policy based on gender:

Variable	Specification	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Remark
Gender	Male	100	22.45	6.45	2.42	Significant
	Female	100	20.34	5.56		

The calculated 't' value is 2.42, which is greater than 1.96 table value of 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference among UG teachers on awareness of New Education Policy based on Gender.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness on New Education Policy based on Location.

Variable	Specification	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Remark
Location	Rural	40	24.32	8.43	1.85	Not Significant
	Urban	160	26.72	8.88		

The calculated 't' value is 1.85 is lesser than the table value of 0.05 level of significance. Hence the Hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness on New Education Policy based on Location.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness of New Education Policy based on Management.

Variable	Specification	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Remark
Management	Government	60	33.47	7.33	1.01	Not Significant
	Private	140	32.12	8.18		

The calculated 't' value is 1.01, which is lesser than the 1.96 table value of 0.05 level of significance. Hence the Hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness of New Education Policy based on Management.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness on New Education Policy (2019) based on Years of Service.

Variable	Specification	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Remark
Years of Service	Above 10 years	110	29.23	5.45	4.12	Significant
	Below 10 years	90	32.98	6.71		

The calculated 't' value is 4.12, which is greater than 1.96 table value of 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference among UG teachers on awareness on New Education Policy based on Years of Service.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference among UG teachers on awareness on New Education Policy based on type of family.

Variable	Specification	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Remark
Family type	Joint family	40	34.78	8.12	2.01	Significant
	Nuclear family	160	32.11	7.66		

The calculated 't' value is 2.01, which is greater than 1.96 table value of 0.05 level of significance. Hence the Hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference among UG teachers on awareness on New Education Policy based on Family type.

Findings

- The awareness of the National Education Policy is not above average.

2. Male UG teachers have more awareness than female teachers.
3. Urban UG teachers have more awareness than Rural teachers.
4. Government UG teachers have more awareness than private teachers.
5. There is a significant difference among UG teachers' awareness based on Years of Service. Those who are having below ten years of service have more awareness than above ten years of service.
6. There is a significant difference among UG teachers in awareness on New Education Policy based on Family type. Those who are living in a joint family have more awareness than nuclear family.

Conclusion

As is evident, UG teachers have low level of awareness of the National Education Policy Awareness programmes must be organized by the government. Female teachers and those who are living in nuclear families have less awareness about NEP. More than ten years of serviced teachers are not interested to know about the recent updates due to lethargic behavior. The government must arrange awareness programs to make create awareness of the National Education Policy seriously.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Vinovskis, M. (2015). *From A Nation at Risk to No Child Left Behind: National education goals and the creation of federal education policy*. Teachers College Press.
2. Lingard, B., & Rawolle, S. (2011). New scalar politics: Implications for education policy. *Comparative education*, 47(4), 489-502.
3. Lähdemäki, J. (2019). Case study: The Finnish national curriculum 2016—A co-created national education policy. In *Sustainability, human well-being, and the future of education*(pp. 397-422). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
4. DeBray-Pelot, E., & McGuinn, P. (2009). The new politics of education: Analyzing the federal education policy landscape in the post-NCLB era. *Educational Policy*, 23(1), 15-42.
5. Moutsios, S. (2009). International organisations and transnational education policy. *Compare*, 39(4), 469-481.
6. Amoah, V. A., & Baum, T. (1997). Tourism education: policy versus practice. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
7. Marcotte, D. E., Bailey, T., Borkoski, C., & Kienzl, G. S. (2005). The returns of a community college education: Evidence from the National Education Longitudinal Survey. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 27(2), 157-175.