



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

“A Comparative Study Of The Changes In The National Education Policies (1968, 1986/1992, 2020) And The Problems Faced By Students, Parents, Teachers And School Management.”

DR SHAMMI MINHAS

PHD. IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

ABSTRACT

Education is played vital role in the overall development of a human. Nobody can deny this fact. Due to this, study is based on the effect of government policies on parents & teachers and the students. The continues change in format from different agencies in school curriculums is changing the basic structure of school education. Other problem is faced by the school management who has to be continuously in touch with the changing format. This not only is responsible of loss of man-power & resources but it is very difficult to change the data frequently & train the staff both administrative as well as teaching to go along with the new trend. Indian education system has been accepted & appreciated globally specially in Science, Math, commerce & Technology. We should try to keep up this reputation. The Government should focus only on these forms, which are essential, globally in demand & do constructive work in the already existing policies. On the recommendation of this commission the first national educational policy came in India in the year, 1968. The second national educational policy came in the year 1986 which was further revised in the year 1992. Now the Indian govt. has come up with a third new education policy (NEP, 2020) to strengthen the Indian education system. The new education policy, 2020 replaced the thirty-four years old education policy to bring transformation and holistic development in education.

1. Frequent changes in education policies create confusion and anxiety among students, parents, and teachers.
2. The introduction of the Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) system aimed to reduce student stress but received mixed responses.
3. The government's focus on skill development needs careful implementation to align with educational objectives and student interests.

Keywords: Indian education system, fundamental rights , Central Education Boards

Introduction

Our constitution in its fundamental rights guarantees free and compulsory education to all children till the age of 14. The government plays crucial role in this regard and the citizens of any country expect some basic reforms by the government in power; one amongst them is the provision of good quality education for their role in formulating policies both for educational growth of the student's community as well as training for the teaching fraternity. The government formulates the rules and regulations of the State and Central Education Boards. The changes introduced by the government in power from time to time with purpose to improve the already existing policies. Some are for the improvement but some are unnecessary. It is not necessary to change an already existing Successful program.

It cannot be argued that each political party has its own manifesto, which is prepared very seriously to bring about the best for the Education System of the country. Specially, now, in India when we all fields the transformation also has to be dynamic, the students who are the future citizens of our country have to be molded for global competition. Regular changes cannot be avoided. Anything happening internationally or nationally has its impact within.

Education has consistently been one of the most significant pillars of India's national development strategy. Recognizing the transformative power of education in shaping a just, inclusive, and knowledge-driven society, successive governments since independence have taken deliberate steps to design and implement comprehensive education policies. These policies are intended to not only expand educational access but also improve quality, equity, and relevance in the context of the nation's socio-economic growth and global standing. Over the decades, three major policy documents have served as the foundation for the direction and reform of education in India: the National Policy on Education (NPE) 1968, NPE 1986 (revised in 1992), and the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020.

The NPE 1968 was the first education policy post independence, formulated in response to the recommendations of the Kothari Commission (1964–66). It emphasized the need for a common school system, promotion of regional languages, and equal opportunities in education, especially for underprivileged and marginalized groups. It aimed to establish a national framework that would ensure uniformity while respecting the diverse linguistic and cultural fabric of India. The NPE 1986, which was later modified in 1992, introduced more structural changes. It focused on universalizing elementary education, improving adult literacy, supporting women's education, and enhancing the quality of teachers and teaching methods. It also highlighted the importance of vocational education and technology in schooling, marking a shift towards modernization and skill development.

Review of study

Research by Mallikarjun (2001) focuses on a discussion on the National Curriculum Framework for School Education in relation to the teaching of languages in Indian schools. Parent's perception is included in the discussion most of them are concerned about the number of languages being taught and the stage at which they are introduced in the school. Some others question why children should learn more languages. They feel strongly that learning one or two languages is more than enough. They feel that in their effort to learn more languages, the students are not learning any language properly since they have to concentrate on several languages and many subjects at the same time.

Rajshree and Kumar (2013)¹ focuses on the grading system or ranking system versus the numerical marking of the results in the schools. It traces the marking system and its adequacies. The study reveals that the evaluation system lays an effect over the students on the level of examination stress. The numerical marking system (traditional system) has a direct effect on the examination stress of the students.

Whereas on the contrary the grading system of evaluation puts minimum examination stress, and thus, the students can perform better and yields best results.

Need of the day according to Anthony (2016) is that instead of glamorizing a formula that eludes effective implementation, a formula that has proven to be non-practicable, a viable alternative to the three-language formula for language education in the school curriculum should be worked out. The CBSE insists that the third language to be included in the syllabus must be an Indian language rather than popular foreign languages. According to the Board, the syllabus should include English, Hindi, and an Indian language, while foreign language should be the fourth, optional language subject for Class X board exams. The contention behind the CBSE's new policy is that many parents prefer their children learning foreign languages like French and German over regional languages like Marathi. This is so that their children will be equipped to participate on an international stage. The government's bid to downgrade foreign languages and upgrade Indian languages has however, not gone down well with the parents.

Another article on government policies Impact discusses in detail the current education policies in India. How the frequent changes in the government policies affect the students and parents. This report further covers the main government initiatives since independence and also provides a comparative study of the major Indian national boards of school education with global ones such as the International Baccalaureate and the Cambridge International Examinations Need for this Study. This study underlines the area of how Government's intervention in the field of Education affects the performance of students. It tries to understand whether all the reforms or policies implemented by the government are beneficial for the students. Intensive Research has been done both nationally as well as internationally regarding this topic; however, paper would carry forward the existing research and focus on the perspective of the Teachers and Parents as to what are their views on the frequent changes in the government policies on the students/children.

Objectives of study

1. To find out the views of Parents and Teachers regarding frequent changes in the Government policies.
2. To find out whether the frequent changes in the government policies affect the studies of the students
3. To compare the key goals, features, and focus areas of NEP 2020 with the 1968 and 1986/1992 policies.
4. To highlight challenges faced by the students, teachers, parents and school Management.
5. To evaluate the overall shift in India's educational vision from access and expansion to quality, flexibility, and innovation.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are that the point of view of the students has not been considered. The reason was that the performance of the students could not be self-analyzed but it was considered from the point of view of the parents and teachers. The dynamic nature of policy implementation means that some recent developments or state-level variations may not be fully captured. The focus is on national-level policy documents; state specific education policies and their alignment with NEP 2020 are outside the scope of this study.

Methodology:

Data Sources: The study relies primarily on secondary data sources, including: Official government documents and publications of the respective National Education Policies (NPE 1968, NPE 1986/92, and NEP 2020). Reports and policy briefs published by the Ministry of Education, Government of India. Academic journal articles, books, and research papers analyzing the policies. ▪ Reports from educational research institutions, think tanks, and international organizations such as UNESCO. Media articles and expert commentaries relevant to the education policy context.

Data Collection:

Data were collected through a systematic review of the above documents. Keywords such as “National Education Policy India,” “NPE 1968,” “NPE 1986,” “NEP 2020,” “education reforms India,” and “policy implementation challenges” were used to search digital academic databases including Google Scholar, JSTOR, and government portals. The Primary Data has been collected in the year 2026 from 100 qualified schools Teachers, students and 100 Parents. The Teachers were from Private as well as Government schools (both Rural and Urban). The Parents too were of the children from the same school where these teachers were teaching. The Parents and Teachers children/students were from secondary and senior secondary classes. A close-ended Questionnaire was handed over to them and they were asked to respond to the questions with the options provided to them. Data Analysis and Interpretation Parents Response the Parents were asked three questions and were asked to rate their answers under three categories, “Strongly Agree”, “Somewhat Agree” and “Strongly Disagree”.

Teachers Response:

The Teachers were directly asked whether they felt that frequently changing Government policies affect the students in their studies? They were asked to rate their choice in the following categories:

CATEGORIES	RESPONSE
Strongly Agree	64
Somewhat Agree	28
Somewhat Disagree	05
Strongly Disagree	03

Maximum number of teachers strongly Agreed that the changing Government policies affected in the performance and studies of the students. This survey was done keeping in mind the views of the parents as well as teachers. It can be assumed that like the parents and teachers, the students are also bound to be affected by the constant changes in the educational policies. The school management again is uncertain and is bound by the education policies and the guidelines laid down by the board. It is not necessary for every new government to bring about changes or modify the process of education. Changes should be brought about only where required. Some traditional existing policies may be beneficial to the students. Before introducing any major changes, the government should keep in mind how it would affect the students. Similarly, frequent changes in the same policies are not welcomed by the parents, teachers and schools alike.

Policies

- a) The government policies should be firm and constructive.
- b) Focus should be on developing the government schools, it's Infrastructure and should be brought at par with the private schools.
- c) The gap between the government schools and private schools should be narrowed.
- d) Strict check should be maintained to see whether the board guidelines are being followed or not. Teacher's in house training should be monitored.
- e) Better salaries for the teaching staff.
- f) Better conditions and status for Para-teachers. A model should be created for the schools not performing well to restructure their functioning. Mentoring of government schools by the private schools under students and teacher exchange programs. Government is already running successful schools/schemes like the Jawaharlal Navodyay Vidyalay, Kendriya Vidyalaya, Vidyalaya Sangathan etc. Apart from this the government is also supervising the working of certain religion-based schools like the Madrasas, Christian schools or other religion or region-based schools. The government does not have much control over them but can still keep a strict vigil on these schools, to maintain the harmony in the country.

Comparison of National Education Policies (1968, 1986/92, 2020)

Sr.no	Comparison on behalf of
1	Features
2	Advantages
3	Disadvantages
4	Problems faced by students
5	Problems faced by Teacher
6	Problems faced by school Management
7	Problems faced by parents

Features of National Education Policies (1968, 1986/92, 2020)

Feature	NEP 1968	NEP 1986 (Revised 1992)	NEP 2020
Primary Goal	National Integration: Focus on equalising opportunities and scientific temper.	Modernisation & Equity: Focus on women's empowerment and disadvantaged groups.	Holistic & Digital: Focus on 21st-century skills, critical thinking, and global competence.
Structure	10+2+3 pattern recommended for a uniform national system.	Formalised the 10+2+3 structure across the country.	5+3+3+4 structure, including 3 years of preschool (ECCE).
Key Reforms	Three-Language Formula: Emphasis on regional, Hindi, and English.	Operation Blackboard: Improved infrastructure and rural primary education.	National Research Foundation: Focus on multidisciplinary research and innovation.
Schooling Age	Formal schooling began at Age 6 .	Maintained formal entry at Age 6 .	Formal education (Foundational stage) begins at Age 3 .
Language	Focused on national unity through language building.	Focus on standardizing regional languages.	Mother Tongue as medium of instruction up to Grade 5.
Assessment	Traditional descriptive annual examinations.	Yearly exams; shift towards continuous evaluation began.	Formative Assessment: Shift from rote learning to competency-based testing.
Funding	First to recommend 6% of GDP for education.	Reaffirmed the 6% of GDP target.	Reaffirms and commits to achieving the 6% of GDP target.

Advantages of National Education Policies (1968, 1986/92, 2020)

Feature	NEP 1968	NEP 1986 (Revised 1992)	NEP 2020
Core Advantage	National Integration: Created a unified education system post-independence.	Modernization & Equity: Focused on technical skills and reaching marginalized groups.	Future-Readiness: Focuses on 21st-century skills, creativity, and critical thinking.
Access & Reach	Strived for compulsory education for all children up to age 14.	Launched " Operation Blackboard " to provide basic facilities to primary schools.	Universalization (Ages 3-18): Includes preschool, aiming to bring 2 crore out-of-school children back.
Curriculum Flexibility	Introduced the standard 10+2+3 structure for national consistency.	Increased vocationalization and established Navodaya Vidyalayas for rural talent.	No Hard Streams: Students can mix subjects like Physics with Music; uses a 5+3+3+4 structure.
Equality & Inclusion	Aimed to equalize opportunities across diverse cultural fabrics.	Prioritized education for women, ST/SC, and minorities to bridge social gaps.	Introduced Gender Inclusion Funds and Special Education Zones for disadvantaged groups.
Higher Education	Focused on building a pool of trained human resources .	Democratized education through the Open University system (e.g., IGNOU).	Multiple Entry/Exit: Students can leave with a certificate/diploma and return via an Academic Bank of Credit .
Technology & Research	Emphasized science and research to build a scientific temper.	Introduced computer literacy at the secondary level for the first time.	Digital Integration: Focuses on coding from Class 6 and creates a National Research Foundation .
Assessment	Focused on traditional examinations for standard	Maintained year-end exams while improving quality	Competency-Based: Shift away from rote

Problems Faced by Students Under Each Policy

Feature	NEP 1968	NEP 1986 (Revised 1992)	NEP 2020
Academic Pressure	High focus on rote memorization and rigid science-math subjects.	Intense pressure from standardized board exams and marks-based competition.	Confusion during the transition to competency-based testing and new curriculum structures.
Language Barriers	Struggle with the Three-Language Formula and imposition of Hindi in non-Hindi states.	Difficulty transitioning from regional languages to English-only higher education .	Potential gap in English proficiency for higher education due to mother-tongue instruction until Grade 5.
Infrastructure & Access	Acute shortage of schools ; students often had to travel long distances for primary education.	Despite "Operation Blackboard," many rural schools remained under-equipped with basic labs or toilets.	A widening " Digital Divide " where students without internet or devices cannot access e-learning.
Vocational & Skills	Lack of vocational training , making graduates "theoretically strong but practically unskilled".	Knowledge-Jobs disparity ; vocational courses were often seen as "second-rate" or inferior.	Lack of trained trainers and resources for new skills like coding or carpentry from Class 6.
Equity Issues	Massive gender and caste gaps in enrollment; education was often an "elitist" privilege.	High dropout rates at the secondary level, especially among marginalized and rural communities.	

Problems Faced by Teachers (1968, 1986/92, 2020)

Feature	NEP 1968	NEP 1986 (Revised 1992)	NEP 2020
Workload & Duties	Burdened with massive non-teaching duties (census, elections) for the first time.	Overwhelmed by multigrade teaching (one teacher for multiple classes) due to staff shortages.	High administrative pressure to maintain Digital Records and "U-DISE" data entry.
Training	Lack of standardized training ; many teachers	Rapid shift to " Child-Centered "	Requirement to teach Coding and

& Skills	were under-qualified for the new 10+2 system.	learning without providing practical classroom tools.	Vocational skills without having prior expertise or training.
Resources	Acute shortage of textbooks and teaching aids ; relied entirely on chalk-and-talk.	"Operation Blackboard" equipment was often poor quality or never reached rural schools.	The "Digital Divide" : Teachers in rural areas lack high-speed internet and smart-boards to teach the new curriculum.
Salary & Status	Despite recommendations, low pay scales led to low morale and "brain drain" from the profession.	Growth of Para-teachers (contractual staff) created job insecurity and lowered professional standards.	Performance-based tenure and constant "Continuous Professional Development" (CPD) adds mental stress.
Language Issues	Forced to implement the Three-Language Formula without being multilingual themselves.	Difficulty in teaching modern science/math in regional languages due to a lack of translated terms.	Pressure to teach in Mother Tongue while simultaneously preparing students for English-medium competitive exams.
Autonomy	Highly centralized control ; teachers had zero say in the curriculum or textbooks.	Rigid evaluation patterns forced teachers to focus only on finishing the syllabus for board exams.	Expected to be "Mentors" and "Facilitators" , yet still bound by strict state-level standardized testing.

Problems Faced by School Management (1968, 1986/92, 2020)

Feature	NEP 1968	NEP 1986 (Revised 1992)	NEP 2020
Structural Transition	High cost of shifting from fragmented systems to the uniform 10+2+3 structure .	Managing the sudden influx of students due to Universal Primary Education goals.	Massive overhaul required to transition from 10+2 to the 5+3+3+4 structure .
Infrastructure	Extreme scarcity of funds to build basic classrooms and science labs.	Maintaining equipment provided under "Operation Blackboard" without recurring grants.	High capital investment needed for ICT labs, smart classrooms , and high-speed internet.
Staffing & Hiring	Difficulty finding qualified subject experts for the new	Managing the rise of contractual/Para-teachers to fill vacancies	Shortage of specialized instructors for

specialized +2 stage. while maintaining quality. vocational crafts (coding, pottery, etc.) from Class 6.

Compliance & Regulation Dealing with **centralized control** and lack of autonomy in curriculum decisions. Increased **bureaucratic interference** and complex "Recognition" norms for private schools. Pressure to comply with the new **National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST)**.

Financial Burden Dependence on inconsistent **state grants**, leading to delayed salaries and maintenance. Balancing **low fee structures** (in many states) with the need to modernize facilities. Loss of revenue from the "**No hard streams**" rule (harder to bundle premium science kits/fees).

Language & Textbooks Sourcing and distributing **textbooks in regional languages** as per the 3-language formula. Lack of quality **technical/scientific literature** in regional languages for secondary levels. Logistical nightmare of providing **Mother Tongue instruction** in urban, multi-lingual classrooms.

Assessment Systems Rigid **annual exam logistics** that put immense pressure on school administration. Managing the shift to **Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE)** without enough staff. Shifting to **Holistic Progress Cards** and competency-based testing requires re-training all staff.

Problems Faced by Parents (1968, 1986/92, 2020)

Feature	NEP 1968	NEP 1986 (Revised 1992)	NEP 2020
Financial Strain	High costs of transitioning to the new 10+2+3 structure.	Increasing tuition fees as private coaching culture began to emerge.	High costs of digital devices and internet for the hybrid/online learning model.

Language Confusion Anxiety over the **Three-Language Formula** and its impact on migration. Conflict between choosing **Regional Languages** vs. the rising demand for **English**. Worry that **Mother Tongue** instruction till Grade 5 might delay English fluency for competitive exams.

Career Uncertainty Lack of clarity on **vocational paths**, leading parents to stick to traditional degrees. Intense "**Rank Culture**" and pressure from standardized board exams (10th and 12th). Confusion over **Multiple Entry/Exit** points and whether "Certificates" hold market value.

Accessibility Severe **shortage of schools**; parents had to send young children to distant towns. Difficulty securing admission in **Navodaya** or quality government schools due to high competition. Difficulty finding schools that actually offer the "**No Hard Streams**" subject combinations.

Participation **Zero involvement**; parents were seen as silent stakeholders with no say in schooling. Pressure to support children through **CCE (Continuous Evaluation)** without being trained themselves. Expectation to be "**At-home Mentors**", which is hard for working or non-educated parents.

Infrastructure Poor **safety and hygiene** standards in the newly built rural schools. Concern over **lack of basic amenities** like clean drinking water and separate toilets for girls. The "**Digital Divide**"; parents in rural areas struggle to provide tech support for "smart" homework.

Conclusion

The above study gave the views of the parents and teachers on the effect that the government policies have on the students. It is not only difficult for the parents and students to frequently adjust to these reforms but is problematic for the teachers also who have to understand and adjust themselves to the changes. Other problem is faced by the school management who has to be continuously in touch with the changing format. This not only is responsible of loss of man-power and resources but it is very difficult to change the data frequently and train the staff both administrative as well as teaching to go along with the new trend. As far as possible, the Government should introduce reforms to better the already existing policies. A complete elimination that too during the mid - session creates confusion and panic amongst everyone from the students to the staff. It is certainly, important to keep in pace with the education system globally, but whatever good format/policy is being followed should be continued. Indian education system has been

accepted and appreciated globally specially in Science, Math's and Technology. We should try to keep up this reputation. The Government should focus only on the reforms, which are essential, globally in demand and do constructive work in the already existing policies.

References

1. Rajshree, P. K. (2013): A Comparative Study of Stress of Class X Students under Grading and Numerical Marking System of Evaluation. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications.
2. Mallikarjun, B. (2001): Language (S) In The School Curriculum: Challenges of The New Millenium. Language in India, 1:4.
3. Anthony, H. (2016): CBSE move to three- language format proves burdensome. The Hindu, MUMBAI.
4. Chanda, R. and Parruk, A. G. (2014): Indian School Education System, an Overview British Council India.
5. Srivastava, V. P.; Srivastava, Ankita and Gambhir, Sonia (2018): Curricular aspect with Special Focus on Skill Development. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Rehab. Conserv. IX (1): 28—34. DOI: 10.31786/09756272.18.9.2.205; EOI: 10.11208/essence.18.9.2.205
6. Singh, Shweta; Sinha, Kanchan Lata and Agrawal, V. P. (2018): Empowering Women through Higher Education.
7. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Rehab. Conserv. IX (1): 17—22. DOI: 10.31786/09756272.18.9.2.203;
8. EOI: 10.11208/essence.18.9.2.203
9. Matta, Gagan and Kumar, Avinash (2017): Health Risk, Water Hygiene, Science and Communication. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Conser. Rehab. VIII (1): 179 – 186.
10. Matta, Gagan and Kumar, Avinash (2017): Role of Science and Communication in health and hygiene: A case Study. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Conser. Rehab. VIII (2): 95 – 101.
11. Srivastava, Vandita (2018): Role of Skill Enhancement Courses & Under-Graduate Research in Physics in Shaping the Future of Young Aspirants and Contributing to Country's Scientific Achievements, Economic Growth & Social.
12. Development. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Rehab. Conserve. IX (1): 64—71. DOI: 10.31786/09756272.18.9.2.210; EOI: 10.11208/essence.18.9.2.210
13. Tripathi, Ramna and Kumar, Akhilesh (2018): Importance and Improvements in Teaching-Learning process through Effective Evaluation Methodologies. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Rehab. Conserve. IX (1): 7—16. DOI: 10.31786/09756272.18.9.2.202; EOI:10.11208/essence.18.9.2.202
14. Singh, Aileesha (2016): The Impact of Environmental Awareness on Teachers' Attitude towards Environmental Education. ESSENCE Int. J. Env. Rehab. Conserve. VII (2): 69 – 72.
15. Kandwal, Nagendra Prasad (2017): Role of Supreme Court in Sustainable Development of Environment and its protection in India (To Study of Uttarakhand State). VIII (1): 92 – 97.