Scientific Research Publishing

Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2025, 13(8), 599-619
https://www.scirp.org/journal/jss
ISSN Online: 2327-5960
ISSN Print: 2327-5952

Curriculum Is the Road to Success in Teacher Education: A Survey of the Perspectives of Principals and Lecturers regarding the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Curriculum's Alignment with the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 Concerning Teachers and Teacher Education

Sunitha Dasari[1], Lalitha Juttukonda[1], Sujatha Busi[1], Rojina Prusty[2], Ramakrishna Avvaru[1,3]

[1]University College of Education, Osmania University, Hyderabad, India
[2]Department of Education, Osmania University, Hyderabad, India
[3]ICSSR (2024-2026), GoI, Hyderabad, India
Email: avvaruramakrishna@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Dasari, S., Juttukonda, L., Busi, S., Prusty, R., & Avvaru, R. (2025). Curriculum Is the Road to Success in Teacher Education: A Survey of the Perspectives of Principals and Lecturers regarding the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Curriculum's Alignment with the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 Concerning Teachers and Teacher Education. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 13,* 599-619.
https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2025.138038

Received: July 14, 2025
Accepted: August 22, 2025
Published: August 25, 2025

Abstract

The curriculum serves as a critical tool for aligning teacher preparation with evolving social, economic, and cultural demands, fostering educators who are responsive to both local contexts and national goals. Indian and international perspectives converge in acknowledging that the curriculum extends beyond a mere academic framework; it functions as a strategic guide for aspiring teachers aiming for professional excellence. This study aims to examine teacher educators' perspectives to assess the alignment of the B.Ed. curriculum with the NEP 2020. The literature review highlights unique national pathways and shared challenges, linking theoretical frameworks to practical applications, ensuring teacher readiness and support, addressing geographic disparities, and aligning training with policy goals. The research utilizes a survey methodology. A Google form has been created that includes a questionnaire with 24 items for teachers and 13 items for teacher education, as well as feedback and reflections from teacher educators on the B.Ed. curriculum. The questionnaire exhibits a reliability coefficient of 0.87 and a validity coefficient of 0.93. This tool is administered to principals and lecturers from the University, along with those

from government and private colleges of education affiliated with Osmania, Telangana, Mahatma Gandhi, and Palamuru Universities in Telangana State, India. The sample size is 89. The model, i.e., questionnaire, is a good fit as indicated by exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Findings are derived through quantitative and thematic analysis. The results indicate a congruence between the B.Ed. curriculum and the NEP 2020 for teachers and teacher education elements. In addition to these two components, EFA identified four additional components. The B.Ed. curriculum addresses the six components of NEP 2020: teacher education, school and classroom administration, the teaching profession, school environment, teachers, and Indian knowledge systems. Curriculum feedback reveals a favorable evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness, underscoring the need for targeted implementation efforts to meet established standards. The B.Ed. curriculum aligns with critical issues, including competency-based education, pedagogical frameworks, demand-driven approaches, school-based initiatives, and peer-collaborative professional development. This study may contribute to the existing literature on teacher education practices. The techniques employed in this research may serve as a framework for other researchers conducting similar studies.

Keywords

B.Ed. Curriculum, National Education Policy 2020, Teacher Education, Continuous Professional Development, Context-Sensitive Pedagogies

1. Introduction

The curriculum serves as the fundamental basis for teacher education. It functions not just as a catalogue of topics to be taught but as a dynamic framework that delineates the knowledge, abilities, attitudes, and teaching methodologies vital for prospective educators. An effectively structured curriculum is essential for equipping teachers who are proficient in their subject matter and skilled in promoting critical thinking, creativity, and comprehensive development in their pupils. This introductory analysis examines the widespread conviction that a strong curriculum is essential for success in teacher education, incorporating ideas from both Indian and global viewpoints.

The importance of a precisely designed curriculum in teacher preparation has been constantly emphasized by numerous educational commissions and policy texts in India. Indian educational reforms consistently assert that a standardized, quality-oriented curriculum is essential for sustaining uniform excellence throughout various teacher education institutes, thus ensuring that graduates fulfill national standards (NCTE, 2009). The curriculum is regarded as an essential instrument for aligning teacher preparation with the changing social, economic, and cultural demands of the nation, cultivating educators attuned to local contexts and national objectives (MoE, 2020). Numerous Indian frameworks endorse a curriculum that transcends rote memorization, urging future educators to participate in

critical reflection, action research, and ongoing professional development (Justice Verma Commission, 2012). Indian sources emphasize the necessity of a curriculum that effectively merges theoretical knowledge with practical classroom experiences, thus guaranteeing that educators are adequately prepared for real-world situations (NCTE, 2009). The curriculum is frequently regarded as a tool to equip educators to address the varied learning requirements of all students, thereby advancing inclusive education and mitigating inequities (MoE, 2020).

International educational organizations advocate for curricula that provide teachers with essential skills for the modern world, including digital literacy, collaboration, problem-solving, and adaptability (OECD, n.d.). Numerous international frameworks advocate for curricula that support experimentation with various teaching methodologies, thereby enhancing innovative and effective instructional practices (UNESCO, 2024). The curriculum plays a crucial role in preparing teachers with global awareness, intercultural understanding, and the capacity to educate globally competent citizens, as emphasized by international perspectives (OECD, 2018). International curricula often incorporate components that promote teacher engagement with educational research, facilitating evidence-based decision-making in classrooms (Glenn et al., 2012). The curriculum plays a crucial role in fostering a robust professional identity and ethical standards among teachers, highlighting their responsibilities and accountability as professionals (UNESCO, 2024).

Both Indian and international perspectives align in recognizing that the curriculum transcends a simple academic outline; it serves as a strategic roadmap guiding aspiring teachers toward professional excellence. The comprehensive design, thoughtful implementation, and continuous evolution are essential for developing educators who can transform educational landscapes and shape successful futures for future generations.

The study's research question is: How will teacher educators reflect on the B.Ed. curriculum? What challenges do they encounter in the implementation of the B.Ed. curriculum? What feedback or suggestions will be provided regarding the B.Ed. curriculum? From this point forward, "B.Ed. curriculum" will be referred to simply as "curriculum" in the subsequent paragraphs.

This study offers several notable contributions to the current literature. This study addresses a significant gap in research by examining the views of principals and lecturers in colleges of education regarding the alignment of the curriculum with the teachers and teacher education components outlined in the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP, 2020). Secondly, to our knowledge, no current study has investigated the perspectives of teacher educators regarding the alignment of teachers and teacher education components with NEP 2020. This investigation emphasizes the significance of curriculum and offers insights into developing a curriculum that meets the needs of 21st-century students. Thirdly, the perspectives of teacher educators offer valuable insights into the alignment of the curriculum with NEP 2020, aimed at enhancing the teaching-learning environment and en-

suring quality education. This study aims to empirically assess perspectives on the curriculum following its implementation and the conclusion of the two-year period. Telangana's geographic context offers unique perspectives on enhancing the quality of teacher education.

2. Literature Review

Teacher Education in India

The calibre of educators and the efficacy of teacher training are fundamental to the advancement of any educational system. In India, education functions as a vital mechanism for social and economic transformation, leading to considerable scholarly focus on the roles of teachers and teacher education. Teacher education in India has undergone significant changes due to various policy interventions. The Kothari Commission (1964-66) was one of the earliest to highlight the importance of professionalizing teacher education, advocating for integrated teacher training and a national framework for establishing teacher standards. The National Policy on Education (NPE 1986) and its 1992 review emphasized the significance of high-quality pre-service and in-service training for educators. The NEP 2020 has proposed significant reforms, advocating for integrated four-year B.Ed. programs and emphasizing teacher autonomy, professional development, and competency-based education (GoI, 2020).

The status and quality of teacher education institutions (TEIs) in India have been the subject of numerous studies, which indicate a prevalent issue of inadequate quality among many TEIs. NCTE (2009, 2010) indicates that numerous private Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) are deficient in infrastructure, qualified faculty, and appropriate pedagogical frameworks. The Justice Verma Commission Report (2012) highlighted the commercialization of teacher education and advocated for stringent regulatory frameworks and enhanced academic standards. Pre-service teacher education programs in India frequently face challenges related to outdated curricula, insufficient practicum components, and a deficiency in reflective teaching models. Kumar (2005) indicates that student-teachers often interact with abstract theoretical content, lacking opportunities to relate it to practical classroom situations. The absence of contextualization in curriculum and assessment diminishes professional preparedness. In-service teacher professional development is characterized by inconsistency and fragmentation in continuous professional development (CPD) for in-service educators. Clarke & Dhamija (2013) and Ramachandran et al. (2018) indicate that the majority of in-service training programs are characterized by a top-down approach, lack relevance to classroom challenges, and are frequently viewed as tokenistic. Demand-driven, school-based, and peer-collaborative professional development is essential.

Recent literature has increasingly concentrated on the socio-cultural and identity dimensions of teachers. Researchers Nambissan (2010) and Batra (2005) contend that the identities of teachers are influenced by structural constraints, encompassing factors such as caste, gender, location, and systemic hierarchies. Em-

powering teacher agency necessitates the consideration of overarching factors such as trust, autonomy, and recognition. The integration of technology in teacher education has been facilitated by digital initiatives such as DIKSHA, SWAYAM, and NISHTHA, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although these platforms provide scale and accessibility, research (e.g., Sinha, 2021) warns against the assumption of digital inclusion and emphasizes the necessity for blended, context-sensitive pedagogies. Significant challenges confronting teacher education in India encompass fragmented policy implementation, insufficient connection between theory and practice, inadequate mentoring and supervision, and a lack of research in the field. Scholars recommend the following measures: enhancing Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) via accreditation and quality control (Azim Premji Foundation, 2014); fostering practice-based teacher education; and supporting teacher-led research and reflective practice.

The following section reviews studies on the implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) (2020) in teacher education.

Madhumita and Ananya (2025) examined the importance of the NEP 2020, focusing on its recommendations for teacher education and the role of educators in addressing the diverse educational needs of the country to foster a Viksit Bharat. In contrast, Gangadharan and Thangavel (2024) analyzed the potential benefits and drawbacks of implementing the NEP 2020, evaluating its implications for the future of education in India. Ashokkumar et al. (2025) conducted a thorough analysis of the NEP 2020, examining its alignment with global educational trends, focus on competency-based progression, and potential effects on student learning outcomes, teacher training, and educational infrastructure.

Sujata and Rajhans (2025) conducted a critical examination of teacher readiness within the framework of NEP 2020, emphasizing the strategies designed to equip educators with the necessary skills and knowledge for effective implementation. The discussion focused on continuous professional development, technology integration, and digital literacy, emphasizing their importance in promoting quality and inclusive education. She examined the alignment of these strategies with the broader objectives of NEP 2020, ensuring an adaptive, student-centered learning environment that addresses diverse educational needs. The NEP 2020 in India highlights the importance of multidisciplinary education and the integration of technology to equip students for complex challenges (Kalivani & Sethudharishini, 2024). The study conducted by Anchal (2025) reveals that while numerous teachers possess differing degrees of comprehension regarding NEP 2020, a limited number are adept at implementing it in their daily classroom practices. Given the aforementioned considerations, professional development training sessions are necessary to support NEP 2020, particularly in areas such as multidisciplinary learning, print media and digital literacy, as well as vocational education and training that incorporates technology in learning. Rajasekaran and Sreedevi (2024) examined the complex concept of teacher resilience, highlighting its essential significance in education.

Jeyanthi and Prawnya (2024) identified significant transformative effects on students, teachers, and institutional frameworks. However, the successful implementation of the policy is often limited by infrastructural disparities, resource allocation, teaching quality, and socio-cultural attitudes towards multidisciplinary learning. Deivam and Philomina (2024) identified multiple challenges associated with the implementation of NEP 2020, including insufficient educational funding, lack of infrastructure and resources, a shortage of trained teachers, the provision of quality education in remote areas, and the necessity for effective collaboration among stakeholders. Kulal et al. (2024) examined the perspectives of students, teachers, and experts to analyze their views on the promises and challenges associated with the policy. Experts typically express a favorable assessment of NEP 2020, commending its comprehensive vision. Students value the flexibility provided by multiple entry-exit options and the introduction of new credit systems. Teachers express a need for additional training to effectively instruct on the varied subjects and skills specified in the policy.

The literature suggests that despite advancements in policy reforms and technological interventions, teacher education in India continues to face systemic challenges. A comprehensive transformation necessitates structural modifications alongside a redefinition of the teacher's role, shifting from a passive recipient of training to an empowered agent of educational change.

3. Methods

3.1. Design and Participants

The study employs a survey method. Survey research designs are methodologies in quantitative research where a researcher administers a survey to a sample to elucidate the opinions of the population (Creswell, 2016). This procedure involved the collection of quantitative data through questionnaires, followed by statistical analysis to identify trends in responses and to evaluate research questions or hypotheses. Researchers interpret the data by correlating the results of the statistical test with previous research studies. This survey examines the correlation between the dependent variable, which includes the alignment of the curriculum with NEP 2020, and the independent variables, namely university, gender, designation, age, and experience of the teacher educators. The emphasis is placed on understanding a population rather than on correlating variables or forecasting results.

Principals and lecturers from the University, as well as government and private colleges of education affiliated with Osmania, Telangana, Mahatma Gandhi, and Palamuru Universities, participated in the study. This study was conducted from December 2024 to March 2025.

The total sample size is 89, as indicated in **Table 1** below. This study includes teacher educators from the colleges of education at four universities and their affiliated colleges. Osmania University accounts for the highest percentage of teacher educators at 82%, with the remainder distributed among the other three universities. This is likely due to the greater number of colleges of education under

the jurisdiction of Osmania University compared to the other three universities. The above table indicates that the percentage of males exceeds that of females, with values of 53.9% and 46.1%, respectively. The study reveals that lecturers constitute 69.7% of the participants, while principals of the colleges of education account for 31.3%. The age group 41 - 50 years constitutes the highest sample at 52.8%, while the age group 21 - 30 years represents the lowest sample at 2.2%. The age groups of 31 - 40 years and 51 - 60 years each comprise similar percentages, specifically 22.5%.

Table 1. Demographic information of the participants (N = 89).

	Number	%
Gender		
Male	48	53.9
Female	41	46.1
Age		
21 - 30 years	2	2.2
31 - 40 years	20	22.5
41 - 50 years	47	52.8
51 - 60 years	20	22.5
Experience		
1 - 10 years	34	38.2
11 - 20 years	49	55.1
21 - 30 years	6	6.7
Designation		
Lecturer	62	69.7
Principal	27	30.3
University		
Osmania	73	82
Telangana	2	2.2
Mahatma Gandhi	4	4.5
Palamuru	10	11.2
Total	89	

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Process and Procedure for Data Collection

A questionnaire consisting of 24 items for teachers and 13 items for teacher education, along with feedback and reflections from teacher educators regarding the curriculum, has been developed as a Google Form. This form has been distributed through the WhatsApp groups of the colleges of education affiliated with Osmania,

Telangana, Mahatma Gandhi, and Palamuru universities in Telangana State. Source: https://www.osmania.ac.in/ucedu/syllabus/B.Ed%20Curriculum%202023-2025.pdf. The entire group received a Google Form requesting their participation in the research, which aims to assess the alignment of the teacher education curriculum with NEP 2020, thereby enhancing the teaching-learning environment and ensuring quality education. Oral consent was obtained from the teacher educators, and those who agreed have responded via the Google Form and participated in the research study.

3.2.2. Instrumentation

The two chapters, specifically focusing on teachers and teacher education within the NEP 2020, are utilized to develop a tool for assessing the perspectives of principals and lecturers regarding the alignment of the curriculum with the NEP 2020 guidelines. The questionnaire demonstrates content validity as it is derived from an official authentic source (NEP, 2020, MHRD, GoI), with page numbers provided for each item. The responses on the questionnaire can be strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), neutral (N), agree (A), or strongly agree (SA), and the scoring is 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, respectively.

Table 2. Reliability statistics Cronbach's alpha.

Constructs	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Teacher	24	0.942
Teacher education	13	0.790

Table 2 above presents the results of the Cronbach Alpha reliability test, which assesses the internal consistency of the constructs in the study. The constructs demonstrate reliability when the Cronbach's alpha exceeds 0.70. The results indicate that the teacher scale, consisting of 24 items (alpha = 0.942), and the teacher education scale, comprising 13 items (alpha = 0.790), demonstrate reliability.

A test must demonstrate reliability to be considered valid. A highly reliable test consistently serves as a valid measure of a specific function (Garrett, 1985). The reliability coefficient of this questionnaire is 0.87, while its validity is 0.93, derived from the square root of the reliability coefficient.

The mean distribution of the findings is conducted as follows. To ascertain the minimum and maximum length of the 5-point Likert scale, the range is computed as (5 − 1 = 4), which is then divided by five, the highest value of the scale, resulting in (4 ÷ 5 = 0.80). Subsequently, the minimum value on the scale, designated as one, was incorporated to determine the maximum of this cell. The dimensions of the cells are specified below:

1) Scores ranging from 1 to 1.80 indicate strong disagreement.
2) The range from 1.81 to 2.60 indicates disagreement.
3) The range from 2.61 to 3.40 indicates a degree of accuracy.
4) From 3:41 to 4:20 indicates agreement.

5) From 4:21 to 5:00 indicates strong agreement.

(Source: https://www.researchgate.net/post/Which-method-should-I-use-to-present-the-Mean-of-a-5-point-Likert-scale)

The mean score of the items on the questionnaire is given below (Table 3).

Table 3. Mean scores for teachers and teacher education components of the NEP 2020 in the curriculum.

S.No.	Mean score	S.No.	Mean score	S.No.	Mean score	S.No.	Mean score	S.No.	Mean score
Teachers component						Teacher education component			
1	3.9	11	3.7	21	3.9	25	4.1	35	4.0
2	3.9	12	3.8	22	4.0	26	4.0	36	4.1
3	3.9	13	3.8	23	3.9	27	3.9	37	3.8
4	3.9	14	3.8	24	4.1	28	4.0		
5	4.0	15	4.0			29	4.0		
6	3.5	16	4.0			30	4.0		
7	4.0	17	3.9			31	3.6		
8	3.9	18	4.0			32	4.4		
9	4.0	19	4.0			33	3.6		
10	3.9	20	3.9			34	3.9		
Average mean score					3.9	Average mean score			3.9
Total mean score						3.9			

The average score for teachers and teacher education components is 3.9. The overall mean score of the questionnaire is 3.9. The participants demonstrated agreement with all items on the questionnaire, as indicated by a range of 3.41 to 4.20. The curriculum is aligned with the NEP 2020 concerning teachers and teacher education components. The statements with the highest agreement emphasize the need to appropriately integrate environmental awareness and sensitivity into conservation and sustainable development, ensuring that environmental education is an integral component of school curricula. This integration aims to shape the next generation and enhance teaching-learning processes for quality education. The statements with the least agreement include: "Knowledge about school complexes that have counsellors, trained social workers, technical and maintenance staff to further support teachers and create an effective learning environment; Teachers' understanding of their roles as members of the School Management Committees/School Complex Management Committees; Teachers' explicit inclusion of developing a caring and inclusive culture in their schools for effective learning and the benefit of all stakeholders; and the use of technology platforms such as SWAYAM/DIKSHA for online teacher training."

3.3. Questionnaire Item Load

The existence of the items formulated in the study in practical application is un-

certain. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted utilizing principal component analysis and varimax rotation. The minimum factor loading criterion was established at 0.50. The communality of the scale, indicating the variance in each dimension, was assessed to ensure acceptable levels of explanation. The findings indicate that all communalities exceeded 0.50.

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett's test.

KMO and Bartlett's test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.903
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. chi-square	2744.774
	df	666
	Sig.	0.000

A crucial step involved assessing the overall significance of the correlation matrix using Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which measures the statistical likelihood that the correlation matrix contains significant correlations among its components. The results (Table 4) were significant, χ^2 (n = 89) = 2744.774 ($P < 0.001$), indicating their appropriateness for further analysis. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy (MSA), indicating the suitability of the data for factor analysis, was 0.903. Data with MSA values exceeding 0.500 are deemed suitable for factor analysis. The analysis produced a factor solution comprising seven factors for the scale, which explained 71.935 percent of the variation in the data.

In this initial exploratory factor analysis, six items (Q4, Q6, Q9, Q15, Q19, and Q37) did not significantly load on any dimension. These items are: Q4—Inspire the best to enter the teaching profession; Q6—Strengthening Teacher Eligibility Tests (TETs) in terms of content and pedagogy; Q9—A technology-based comprehensive teacher-requirement planning forecasting exercise; Q15—Teachers to teach in the manner they find most effective for students in their classrooms; Q19—Prepare highest-quality teachers; and Q37—The use of technology platforms such as SWAYAM/DIKSHA for online training of teachers. Consequently, these six items were excluded from subsequent analysis.

The authors conducted the EFA again, excluding these items. The findings of this analysis identified a six-dimensional structure as theoretically outlined in the NEP 2020 document (pages 20 - 23; 42 - 43). The KMO statistic was 0.919. The six dimensions accounted for 71.723 percent of the variance among the study items. Bartlett's Test of sphericity was significant, and all communalities exceeded the threshold of 0.500. The six factors identified in this exploratory factor analysis correspond with the theoretical proposition outlined in this research (see Appendix). Factor 1 comprises items Q12, Q20, Q22, Q23, Q24, Q25, Q26, Q27, Q28, Q29, Q31, Q33, Q34, Q35, and Q36, which pertain to teacher education. Factor 2 comprises items Q13, Q14, Q16, Q17, Q18, and Q21, which represent school and classroom management. Factor 3 comprises items Q3, Q5, Q7, and Q8, which

pertain to the teaching profession. Factor 4 includes items Q10 and Q11, which pertain to the school environment. Factor 5 encompasses items Q1 and Q2 related to teachers. Factor 6 encompasses item Q32, which pertains to Indian knowledge systems. Table 5 presents the factor loadings.

Table 5. EFA results.

Item	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Q1					0.780	
Q2					0.678	
Q3			0.566			
Q5			0.631			
Q7			0.729			
Q8			0.558			
Q10				0.749		
Q11				0.722		
Q12	0.542					
Q13		0.539				
Q14		0.680				
Q16		0.774				
Q17		0.712				
Q18		0.731				
Q20	0.623					
Q21		0.538				
Q22	0.726					
Q23	0.691					
Q24	0.687					
Q25	0.672					
Q26	0.774					
Q27	0.690					
Q28	0.739					
Q29	0.583					
Q30	0.654					
Q31	0.536					
Q32						0.599
Q33	0.547					
Q34	0.795					
Q35	0.855					
Q36	0.680					

Factor loadings are alternatively known as factor-variable correlations. Factor loadings represent the correlations between variables and factors. A model is considered a good fit if less than 50 percent of the nonredundant residuals, in this instance 23 percent, have absolute values exceeding 0.05. Therefore, the model, specifically the questionnaire, is appropriate. This questionnaire serves as a tool for subsequent analysis.

3.4. Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses formulated for the study are:

1) The perspective of teacher educators regarding the alignment of the B.Ed. curriculum with the NEP 2020 will be favorable.

2) Teacher educators categorized by gender, age, experience, designation, and university will not exhibit significant differences in their perspectives regarding the alignment of the B.Ed. curriculum with the NEP 2020.

4. Analysis of the Results

4.1. Quantitative Analysis

4.1.1. Tests of Normality (Table 6)

Table 6. Normality tests for the teacher educators group.

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Perceptions of the B.Ed. curriculum	0.110	89	0.010	0.934	89	0.000

[a]Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, the data for the perceptions on the B.Ed. curriculum is not normally distributed, as indicated by *P*-values less than 0.05 for the variable. This rejection of the null hypothesis of normality means that non-parametric statistical tests must be used for further analysis.

4.1.2. Hypotheses Testing

Hypotheses 1

Table 7 indicates that a majority of teacher educators have positively evaluated the 2023 revised B.Ed. curriculum of Telangana state, noting its alignment with the NEP 2020. A total of 82.0% of respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement, while 14.6% remained neutral. A minority, comprising 3.5%, expressed disagreement or strong disagreement. The chi-square value is reported as 113.19 (4), with a *P*-value of 0.000 at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, a significant difference exists between the observed distribution and the expected distribution. The discussion indicates that a majority of teacher educators believe that the B.Ed. curriculum aligns with the NEP 2020 and is advantageous for trainee teachers in enhancing their skills for future teaching roles.

Table 7. One sample chi-square for the teacher educators' viewpoint about the curriculum and the components of NEP 2020.

Responses	Observed	Expected	Residual	Percentage	chi-square	df	Sig.
Strongly Disagree	1	17.8	−16.8	1.1			
Disagree	2	17.8	−15.8	2.2			
Neutral	13	17.8	−4.8	14.6	113.19	4	0.000
Agree	56	17.8	38.2	62.9			
Strongly Agree	17	17.8	−0.8	19.1			
Total	89			100.0			

Hypothesis 2

Table 8. Mann-Whitney U test for gender and designation-wise viewpoints about the components of NEP 2020.

Gender	*N*	Mean Rank	*U*	*Z*	*P*
Male	48	48.09	835.50	−1.420	0.156
Female	41	41.38			
Designation					
Lecturer	62	62	751.50	−0.887	0.375
Principal	27	27			

Note: N = 89 for each variable (Gender and Designation).

A Mann-Whitney U test (Table 8) was conducted to investigate whether a significant difference exists between gender and designation with the perception of the B.Ed. curriculum. The *P*-values 0.156 and 0.375 for gender and designation, respectively, are greater than the chosen significance level of 0.05.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test (Table 9) was performed to examine whether teacher educators from different universities, age groups, and experience levels had varying perceptions on the B.Ed. curriculum. The *P*-values 0.947, 0.690, and 0.454 for university, age, and experience, respectively, are greater than the 0.05 significance level. Since the *P*-values are greater than the alpha values, the null hypothesis stating that "teacher educators categorized by gender, age, experience, designation, and university will not exhibit significant differences in their perspectives regarding the alignment of the B.Ed. curriculum with the NEP 2020" is accepted.

4.3. Thematic Analysis

Teacher educators have offered diverse reflections on the curriculum. Their reflections are organized into distinct themes to enhance comprehension.

4.3.1. Curriculum Content and Structure

Numerous individuals have expressed concerns regarding the scope, volume, and

Table 9. Kruskal-Wallis H test for university, age, and experience-wise viewpoints about the components of NEP 2020.

	N	Mean Rank	χ^2	*df*	*P*
University					
Osmania	73	44.60	0.367	3	0.947
Telangana	2	40.00			
Mahatma Gandhi	4	44.25			
Palamuru	10	49.25			
Age					
21 - 30 years	2	24.00	1.467	3	0.690
31 - 40 years	20	44.75			
41 - 50 years	47	46.33			
51 - 60 years	20	44.23			
Experience					
1 - 10 years	34	48.75	1.578	2	0.454
11 - 20 years	49	43.47			
21 - 30 years	6	36.25			

Note: N = 89 for each variable (University, Age, and Experience).

manageability of the curriculum, particularly in the areas of educational psychology and pedagogy. A limited number of individuals have expressed concern regarding the total quantity of theory papers, highlighting recommendations for reduction and the need to address overlaps (e.g., Indian Ethos). A teacher educator noted that the syllabus comprises 24 theory papers, making it challenging to complete within the allocated time and diminishing the workload associated with record-keeping. Instances of repetition have been identified, such as in the areas of philosophical foundations, policy and history of education in India, and guidance and counselling, along with recommendations for conciseness. Furthermore, many participants expressed concerns regarding the relevance of the curriculum content and necessary inclusions. They recommended aligning the curriculum with competitive examinations such as the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET) and the District Selection Committee (DSC), as well as incorporating the contributions of social reformers, including Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and Jyotirao Phule.

4.3.2. Pedagogical Approaches and Practical Components

They emphasized the importance of practical and experiential learning components, highlighting the necessity for increased laboratory activities in science, enhanced practicum for technology integration and Artificial Intelligence (AI), improved monitoring of school internships, and modifications to peer teaching plans and school observation records. According to a teacher educator, "Period plans should be reduced to 30 during school internship." Furthermore, they appreciated plans for the internship period, including integrated lesson plans aimed

at holistic development, encompassing the whole child and socioemotional learning, and proposed displaying teaching aids and clinical teaching practice.

4.3.3. Assessment Methodologies

The emphasis is placed on assessment and evaluation methodologies, including recommendations for conducting pedagogy practical examinations only once, treating educational psychology practicum as an internal assessment, minimizing overall record work, and recognizing the beneficial effects of record moderation. A few teacher educators specifically requested that Value Added and Ability Enhancement Courses be assessed as practicum instead of theory.

4.3.4. Operational Aspects and Curriculum Strengths

Concerns were raised regarding the curriculum structure and new components, particularly the dissertation requirement, with suggestions for simplification or removal at the undergraduate level, and appreciation for the introduction of Value Added and Ability Enhancement Courses. Furthermore, they highlighted the importance of enhancing the effectiveness of biometric attendance in ensuring syllabus coverage and monitoring student attendance, while also acknowledging the beneficial incorporation of environmental conservation and value inculcation.

Feedback on the curriculum indicates a positive assessment of its efficiency and effectiveness, highlighting the necessity for focused implementation efforts to achieve its standards. Finally, a consolidated reflection from one participant stated, "Review the content, condense the topics, and avoid repetitions to implement the curriculum according to the prescribed standards and ensure timely completion of the syllabus."

5. Concluding Remarks

The findings from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that the items are organized into six distinct factors, which also encompass the original components related to teachers and teacher education. The factors identified include: Factor 1—Teacher education; Factor 2—School and classroom management; Factor 3—Teaching profession; Factor 4—School environment; Factor 5—Teachers; and Factor 6—Indian knowledge systems. The model, specifically the questionnaire, aligns well with the objectives.

The results demonstrate that the curriculum aligns with the NEP 2020. The views of teacher educators on how well the curriculum aligns with the NEP 2020, revealing a significant difference. The perspectives of teacher educators regarding the alignment of the curriculum with the NEP 2020, were not influenced by factors such as gender, age, experience, designation, or the universities they attended. This discovery is consistent with the National Education Policy (2020).

Secondly, teacher educators express concerns regarding the scope, volume, and manageability of the curriculum, particularly in educational psychology and pedagogy subjects. They recommend aligning the curriculum with competitive examinations, such as the TET and the DSC. Emphasis was placed on practical and

experiential learning components (NCTE, 2009), highlighting the necessity for enhanced laboratory activities in science, increased practicum for technology integration and AI (as noted by OECD, 2018), improved supervision of school internships, and modifications to peer teaching plans and school observation records. Teacher educators have highlighted assessment and evaluation methodologies, including recommendations for conducting pedagogy practical exams once, treating psychology practicum as internal assessment, minimizing overall record work, and recognizing the benefits of record moderation. Additionally, concerns have been raised regarding the curriculum structure and new components, particularly the dissertation requirement (as noted by Glenn et al., 2012; Justice Verma Commission, 2012), while the positive inclusion of environmental conservation and value inculcation has been acknowledged. Teacher educators have generally offered favourable evaluations of the curriculum's efficiency and effectiveness, emphasizing the necessity for focused implementation efforts to achieve its standards (related to the findings of Mayer, Cotton, & Simpson, 2017).

Thirdly, the curriculum is aligned with key issues such as competency-based education, pedagogical frameworks, demand-driven approaches, school-based initiatives, and peer-collaborative professional development. It emphasizes digital inclusion and the necessity for blended, context-sensitive pedagogies. This finding responds to the concerns articulated by Kumar (2005). The digital initiatives implemented align with the findings of Sinha (2021).

This study's findings yield several practical implications for policymakers and academic institutions. The teacher educators observed that the curriculum effectively addresses the issues related to teachers and the components of teacher education outlined in NEP 2020. Second, there have been positive remarks regarding pedagogy, the school-college relationship, and policy-making. The curriculum integrates contemporary trends in teacher education, including Digital Infrastructure for Knowledge Sharing (DIKSHA), Study Webs of Active-learning for Young Aspiring Minds (SWAYAM), blended learning, and the use of AI tools in education. This addresses both personalized learning and the professional development of educators. The perspectives of teacher educators suggest the necessity of working efficiently and remaining vigilant to fulfill their responsibilities. This is further enhanced by the evaluation tasks assigned to students. The dissertation and research areas facilitate the advancement of educational research, as articulated by Zhao & Liao (2024). A notable outcome of the curriculum is that most teacher educators originate from rural backgrounds and institutions. This finding pertains to the contextual equity of the study conducted by Roberts (2023). This study's content may enhance the current literature on teacher education practices. The techniques utilized in this research may provide a framework for other researchers undertaking analogous studies.

6. Study Limitations and Future Directions

This study offers important insights; however, its limitations must be considered when interpreting the results. The emphasis on Telangana State indicates that the

findings may not be generalizable to other regions in India, given the differences in social, economic, and educational contexts. Furthermore, regional variations in the execution of NEP 2020 were not taken into account. Future research may expand to encompass additional States' curricula or adopt a national perspective, thereby offering a comprehensive understanding of the curriculum's alignment with NEP 2020. Additionally, it may elaborate on potential avenues for investigating regional variations, examining the mechanisms of curriculum transaction impacts, and performing comparative studies.

Acknowledgements

Authors acknowledge ICSSR, Govt. of India, New Delhi. Our special thanks to our mentor and teacher Prof. V. Sudhakar, Professor (Retd.) Former Dean, School of Education, EFLU, Hyderabad for guiding us in drafting and finalizing the curriculum. We thank Prof. T. Mrunalini, Prof. Ravindranath K. Murthy, Dr. P. Shankar, Dr. G. Durgesham, Dr. D. Dharma Teja and Dr. J. Krishnaiah, all from the Department of Education, Osmania University, Hyderabad, for their active participation in providing feedback and finalizing the curriculum. Authors also thank the teacher educators for responding to the questionnaire, without whom the study would not have been possible. Their data gave us insights into understanding how well the teacher education curriculum is aligned with NEP 2020 to improve the teaching-learning environment and provide quality education.

Ethical Approval and Informed Consent Statement

We shared the nature of the research and gave a brief explanation of the study to the Chairperson, Board of Studies in Education and to the teacher educators. We ensured confidentiality and anonymity by assigning numbers to the participants. The whole group was sent the Google Form asking them to take part in the research and it will help them and the authors in understanding how well the teacher education curriculum is aligned with NEP 2020 to improve teaching learning environment and provide quality education. Oral consent was given by the teacher educators, and those who are willing have responded on the Google Form and have become part of the research study. Before going on to the items, they were asked to recall and describe the courses they taught (the type of course, the total number of pupils that attended the lesson). They were made aware that they might end the study at any moment.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting these findings are available within the article or upon request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Anchal, A. (2025). Teacher Preparedness in the Era of NEP 2020: Challenges, Understanding and the Role of Training. *Educational Metamorphosis, 3,* 85-89. https://phnmcollege.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/13-EM-Vol-3-No-2.pdf

Ashokkumar, T., Russel Raj, T., Rajadurai, A., Abishini, A. H., & Anchani, A. H. (2025). Analyzing the Impact of the New Educational Policy 2020: A Comprehensive Review of India's Educational Reforms. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 108,* Article ID: 102515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2024.102515

Azim Premji Foundation (2014). *Status of Teacher Education in India*.

Batra, P. (2005). Voice and Agency of Teachers: Missing Link in National Curriculum Framework. *Economic and Political Weekly, 40,* 4347-4356.

Clarke, P., & Dhamija, N. (2013). *Professional Development of Teachers in India*.

Creswell, J.W. (2016). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (p. 376). Pearson India Education Services Pvt. Ltd.

Deivam, M., & Philomina, M.J. (2024). NEP 2020: A New Horizon for Indian Education with Opportunities and Challenges. In R. Kingston, & N. Devaki (Eds.), *Implementation of NEP, 2020: Challenges and Opportunities in Teacher Education* (p. 69). Shanlax Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384978033

Gangadharan, A., & Thangavel, K. (2024). The Future of Indian Education: Evaluating the Potential of the New Education Policy 2020. In R. Kingston, & N. Devaki, (Eds.), *Implementation of NEP, 2020: Challenges and Opportunities in Teacher Education* (p. 47). Shanlax Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384978033

Garrett, H. E. (1985). *Statistics in Psychology and Education* (p. 360). Vakils, Feffer and Simons Ltd.

Glenn, M., McDonagh, C., Sullivan, B., Roche, M., & Morgan, M. (2012). *Practice-Based Research Encompassing Professional Development Project: Revised Final Report*. The Teaching Council of Ireland.

Government of India (GoI) (2020). *National Education Policy, 2020*. Ministry of Education (MoE).

Jeyanthi, R., & Prawnya, V. (2024). Redefining Education: Key Changes and Innovation in NEP 2020. In R. Kingston, & N. Devaki (Eds.), *Implementation of NEP, 2020: Challenges and Opportunities in Teacher Education* (p. 114). Shanlax Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384978033

Justice Verma Commission (2012). *Report of the High-Powered Commission on Teacher Education*. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

Kalivani, P., & Sethudharishini, S. C. (2024). Integrating NEP 2020, Multidisciplinary Education, Zoology Teaching, and Technology. In R. Kingston, & N. Devaki (Eds.), *Implementation of NEP, 2020: Challenges and Opportunities in Teacher Education* (p. 128). Shanlax Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384978033

Kulal, A., N., A., Dinesh, S., Bhat, D. C., & Girish, A. (2024). Evaluating the Promise and Pitfalls of India's National Education Policy 2020: Insights from the Perspectives of Students, Teachers, and Experts. *Sage Open, 14,* 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241279367

Kumar, K. (2005). *Political Agenda of Education*. Sage Publications.

Madhumita, B., & Ananya, B. (2025). Understanding the Significance of NEP 2020 and Teacher Education in Viksit Bharat@2047. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 11,* 1100-1104. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra19895

Mayer, D., Cotton, W., & Simpson, A. (2017). *Teacher Education in Australia*. Oxford Research Encyclopaedia.

Ministry of Human Resource Development (2012). *Justice Verma Commission Report*.

Nambissan, G. B. (2010). *Education and the Reproduction of Social Inequality in India*.

National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) (2009). *National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education: Towards Preparing Professional and Humane Teachers*. NCTE.

National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) (2009, 2010). *Annual Reports*.

National Education Policy (NEP) (2020). https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) (2018). *PISA 2018 Global Competence: Global Competence for an Inclusive World*. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) (n.d.). *Future of Education and Skills 2030*. https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/

Rajasekaran, P., & Sreedevi, P.S. (2024). Enhancing Teacher Resilience: The Impact of Indian's National Educational Policy 2020. In R. Kingston, & N. Devaki (Ed.). *Implementation of NEP, 2020: Challenges and Opportunities in Teacher Education* (p. 163). Shanlax Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384978033

Ramachandran, V. et al. (2018). *Teachers in the Indian Education System*. NUEPA.

Roberts, P. (2023). Closing Divide for Rural Students. *The Guardian*. https://theguardian.com/

Sinha, S. (2021). *Digital Teaching and the Indian School System*. Contemporary Education Dialogue.

Sujata, B., & Rajhans, N. (2025). Enhancing Teacher Readiness: Professional Development and Digital Integration under NEP 2020. *International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation, 10,* 137-150. https://www.ijrti.org/papers/IJRTI2503225.pdf

UNESCO (2024). *Global Report on Teachers: Addressing Teacher Shortages and Transforming the Profession*. UNESCO.

Zhao, P., & Liao, W. (2024). Professionalisation of Initial Teacher Education in China: 1974-2024. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 50,* 907-923. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2024.2415386

Appendix: The Questionnaire

The B.Ed. Curriculum (2023-2025) enable:

Q.No.	Item	Factor
1	Teachers pass on their knowledge, skills, and ethics optimally to students (p. 20)	5
2	The quality and motivation of teachers to reach the desired standards (p. 20)	5
3	Restore high respect for teachers and the high status of the teaching profession (p. 20)	3
4	Inspire the best to enter the teaching profession (p. 20)	-
5	Required motivation and empowerment of teachers (p. 20)	3
6	Strengthening Teacher Eligibility Tests (TETs) in terms of content and pedagogy (p. 20)	-
7	Passion and motivation for teaching (p. 20)	3
8	Comfort and proficiency in teaching in the local language (p. 20)	3
9	A technology-based comprehensive teacher-requirement planning forecasting exercise (p. 21)	-
10	To provide proper service environment and culture of schools to maximize the ability of teachers to do their jobs effectively (p. 21)	4
11	Elaborate knowledge about school complex in order that teachers at very small schools work with larger school complex communities, sharing best practices with each other and working collaboratively to ensure that all children are learning (p. 21)	4
12	Knowledge about school complex which have counsellors, trained social workers, technical and maintenance staff, etc. to further support teachers and help create an effective learning environment (p. 21)	1
13	Teachers know their role as members of the school management committees/school complex management committees (p. 21)	2
14	Teachers to explicitly include developing a caring and inclusive culture at their schools, for effective learning and benefit of all stakeholders (p. 21)	2
15	Teachers to teach in the manner they find most effective for students in their classrooms (p. 21)	-
16	Teachers to focus on socio-emotional learning (p. 22)	2
17	Novel approaches to teaching that improve learning outcomes in their classrooms (p. 22)	2
18	A system of multiple parameters for proper assessment of performance—peer reviews, attendance, commitment and other forms of service to the school and the community (p. 22)	2
19	Prepare highest-quality teachers (p. 22)	-
20	The expectations of the role of the teachers at different levels of expertise/stage, and the competencies required for that stage (p. 22)	1
21	Time-tested as well as the most recent techniques in pedagogy, including pedagogy with respect to foundational literacy and numeracy, multilevel teaching and evaluation, teaching children with disabilities, teaching children with special interests or talents, use of educational technology, and learner-centred and collaborative learning (p. 23)	2
22	Strong practicum training in the form of in-classroom teaching at local schools (p. 23)	1
23	The practice of the fundamental duties (Article 51A) of the Indian constitution along with other constitutional provisions while teaching any subject or performing any activity (p. 23)	1
24	Appropriately integrate environmental awareness and sensitivity towards its conservation and sustainable development, so that environment education becomes an integral part of school curricula (p. 23)	1

Continued

25	To shape the next generation (p. 42)	1
26	Multidisciplinary perspectives and knowledge, formation of dispositions and values, and development of practice under the best mentors (p. 42)	1
27	Grounding in Indian values, languages, knowledge, ethos, and traditions including tribal traditions, while also being well-versed in the latest advances in education and pedagogy (p. 42)	1
28	To realize Educationally sound, multidisciplinary and integrated teacher education programs (p. 42)	1
29	Multidisciplinary inputs, and education in high-quality content as well as pedagogy (p. 42)	1
30	Collaboration with other departments such as psychology, philosophy, sociology, neuroscience, Indian languages, arts, music, history, literature, physical education, science and mathematics (p. 42)	1
31	Teaching of cutting-edge pedagogy (p. 43)	1
32	Grounding in sociology, history, science, psychology, early childhood care and education, knowledge of India and its values/ethos/art/traditions (p. 43)	6
33	Networking of government and private schools to work closely with (p. 43)	1
34	Student-teach along with participating in other activities such as community service, adult and vocational education (p. 43)	1
35	Strengthening multidisciplinary education of teachers and provide rigor in conceptual development (p. 43)	1
36	Enriched teaching-learning processes for quality education (p. 43)	1
37	The Use of technology platforms such as SWAYAM/DIKSHA for online training of teachers (p. 43)	-

Note: Items which do not go with any of the six factors (constructs) load well together are Q4, Q6, Q9, Q15, Q19 and Q37. Factor 1—Teacher education; Factor 2—School and classroom management; Factor 3—Teaching profession; Factor 4—School environment; Factor 5—Teachers; and Factor 6—Indian knowledge systems.