Chapter 4:

Data Analysis and Interpretation

4.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Understanding the demographic characteristics of respondents is important, as factors such as gender, teaching experience, subject specialization, and grade level taught may influence teachers' perspectives on syllabus reduction under NEP 2020. These variables help provide a clearer context for analyzing their opinions. In this study, responses were collected from 55 teachers working in central government schools in Bhopal, including Kendriya Vidyalaya (KVs), Navodaya Vidyalaya (NVSs), and Eklavya Model Residential Schools (EMRSs). The following tables present the distribution of respondents based on gender, years of teaching experience, subjects taught, and the level of classes they handle. This background information supports a deeper understanding of how different teaching backgrounds may shape views on curriculum reforms.

Table 4.1: Gender-wise Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Female	21	38.18%
Male	34	61.82%
Total	55	100.00%

Out of the total 55 respondents, 34 were male teachers (61.82%) and 21 were female teachers (38.18%). This shows that more male teachers participated in the study. Both male and female viewpoints are included in the data.

Table 4.2: Teaching Experience of Respondents

Years of Teaching Experience	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Less than 5 years	18	32.73%
5–10 years	10	18.18%
10–20 years	20	36.36%
More than 20 years	7	12.73%

The teachers who responded to the survey have a range of teaching experience. 36.36% of them have been teaching for 10 to 20 years, while 32.73% have less than 5 years of experience. A smaller number of teachers have 5 to 10 years (18.18%) and 12.73% has more than 20 years of experience. This spread ensures inputs from both new and experienced teachers.

Table 4.3: Teaching Grades

Level Taught	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Classes 6^{th} –8^{th}	6	10.91%
Classes 9^{th} &10^{th}	12	21.82%
Classes 11^{th} &12^{th}	37	67.27%
Total	55	100.00%

Among the respondents, the majority (67.27%) are teaching classes 11^{th} and 12^{th}. About 21.82% are teaching classes 9^{th} and 10^{th}, while only 10.91% are teaching middle school (classes 6^{th} to 8^{th}). This shows that most of the data comes from teachers working at the secondary and senior secondary level.

Table 4.4: Subject Expertise of Respondents

Subjects	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Sciences	13	23.64%
Social Sciences	16	29.09%
Mathematics	14	25.45%
Languages	12	21.82%
Total	55	100%

A variety of subject experts took part in the study. 29.09% of them are from Social Sciences, 25.45% from Mathematics, 23.64% from Sciences, and 21.82% from Languages. This variety helps in presenting views from different academic backgrounds.

The demographic profile of the respondents shows that teachers from different genders, subject areas, teaching levels, and experience groups have participated in the study. This diversity helps in understanding the broader perspective of teachers on syllabus reduction as mentioned in the NEP 2020.

4.2 Awareness about NEP 2020 and the Syllabus Reduction Policy

In order to understand the level of awareness among teachers regarding the syllabus reduction policy proposed under the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020), respondents were asked whether they were familiar with this aspect.

Table 4.5: Awareness about the Syllabus Reduction Policy under NEP 2020

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage
No	2	3.64%
Yes	53	96.36%
Total	55	100.00%

Out of the total 55 participants, 53 teachers, which accounts for 96.36% of the sample, reported that they were aware of the syllabus reduction policy. Only 2 teachers, representing 3.64% of the respondents, indicated that they were not aware of such a policy. This suggests that a large majority of teachers working in central government schools in Bhopal have at least heard about the concept of syllabus reduction under NEP 2020, even though the revised textbooks reflecting this change have not yet been implemented in classrooms.

To understand how teachers came to know about the syllabus reduction policy, the questionnaire allowed multiple responses, this allows the respondent to list out all the channel of their knowledge.

Table 4.6: Sources of Awareness about Syllabus Reduction Policy under NEP 2020.

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Training programs/workshops	26	27.66
Discussions with peers	21	22.34
Official circulars or memos	29	30.85
Personal research	18	19.15

Among the 55 respondents who answered this question, the most frequently mentioned sources of awareness were training programs/workshops (mentioned by 26 teachers) and official circulars or memos (mentioned by 29 teachers). Personal research was mentioned by 18 respondents, and discussions with peers were cited 21 times. The data reveals that while many teachers learned about the policy through informal ways like peer discussions or self-initiated research, the structured and official mediums such as training and circulars played a leading role in spreading awareness. The responses suggest that most of the teachers were made aware of the syllabus reduction policy through structured and official channels such as government notifications and teacher training sessions.

Peer discussions and personal efforts to understand the policy also contributed, but to a lesser extent. This pattern highlights the significant role of professional communication and institutional efforts in building policy-level awareness among teachers. It also reflects a growing sense of responsibility among educators to stay informed about national educational reforms that may affect classroom practices in the future. However, when asked whether they had received any formal training to implement the reduced syllabus, the responses revealed a significant gap.

When it is asked that whether they have received any kind of formal training for implementing syllabus reduction. Out of the 55 teachers surveyed, only 12 respondents (21.82%) stated that they had received any kind of formal training, while a majority of 43 teachers (78.18%) said that they had not received any. The table 4.7 shows the results.

Table 4.7: Teachers' Responses on Receiving Formal Training for Implementing Syllabus Reduction

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage
No	43	78.18%
Yes	12	21.82%
Total	55	100.00%

This indicates that even though awareness of the syllabus reduction policy is high, a large number of teachers still lack the formal training required for its practical implementation. This finding points to a potential area for improvement in policy execution and capacity building at the ground level.

4.3 Perceptions about Syllabus Reduction

This section explores teachers' perceptions regarding the reduction of syllabus as recommended under the NEP 2020. Teachers' viewpoints are essential in assessing the practical relevance and success of such reforms, as they are the ones directly responsible for implementing these changes in the classroom. Their understanding, beliefs, and experiences not only influence how effectively a new policy is adopted but also shape the learning experiences of students.

The table 4.8 presents teachers' opinions on whether they feel this reduction will promote better conceptual understanding among students. Their responses help to assess how a lighter curriculum is perceived in terms of improving the quality and depth of student learning. The mean score of 3.20, along with a median and mode of 4 ("Agree"), indicates that most teachers tend to agree that syllabus reduction can support deeper conceptual understanding. Nearly half of the respondents (49.1%) either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, suggesting a positive perception toward focusing on core concepts rather than extensive content.

Table 4.8: Teachers' Opinion on Whether Syllabus Reduction Promotes Deeper Conceptual Understanding

Responses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	7	12.7%
Disagree	13	23.6%
Neutral	8	14.6%
Agree	16	29.1%
Strongly Agree	11	20%
Total	55	100.00%

However, 36.4% of teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 14.6% remained neutral. This shows that a significant portion of educators are either unsure or concerned about the actual impact of a reduced syllabus. These mixed responses highlight the need

for proper implementation, training, and resources to ensure that conceptual learning is not compromised.

Table 4.9 presents teachers' views on whether reducing the syllabus will help lower the academic pressure experienced by students. Their responses reflect how educators perceive the link between curriculum load and student well-being.

Table 4.9: Teachers' Opinion on Whether Syllabus Reduction Will Decrease Academic Pressure on Students

Responses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	6	10.91%
Disagree	4	7.27%
Neutral	4	7.27%
Agree	18	32.73%
Strongly Agree	23	41.82%
Total	55	100.00%

The mean score for this item is approximately 3.88, with the median and mode both at 5 ("Strongly Agree"), indicating a clear consensus among teachers that syllabus reduction can help ease academic pressure. A large majority (41.82%) strongly agreed and 32.73% agreed. This suggests strong support for the idea that a lighter curriculum can reduce stress and workload for students. In contrast, only 18% of teachers disagreed or remained neutral, showing that concerns about this outcome are minimal. This strong agreement highlights that most educators view syllabus reduction as a positive step toward improving students' mental well-being and creating a more balanced academic environment. It reflects alignment with NEP 2020's emphasis on reducing rote pressure and fostering joyful learning.

Table 4.10 presents teachers' anticipated responses on how syllabus reduction might influence their teaching practices in the future. As the policy has not yet been fully implemented, the data reflects expectations rather than actual classroom experiences.

Table 4.10: Anticipated Influence of Syllabus Reduction on Teaching Practices

Responses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Allowed for more interactive sessions	26	47.27%
Increased focus on practical applications	30	54.55%
Introduced more activities focused on critical thinking	24	43.64%
Reduced flexibility in lesson planning	8	14.55%
No significant change	5	9.09%
Unable to connect with prior experience of students	1	1.82%

Most teachers expect that syllabus reduction will lead to positive changes in their teaching approach. About 54.55% anticipate greater focus on practical applications, 47.27% foresee more interactive sessions, and 43.64% expect to introduce more critical thinking activities. These responses suggest that teachers believe a reduced curriculum will allow them to shift from content-heavy instruction toward more activity-based and student-centered learning. However, some concerns remain. 14.55% of respondents predict reduced flexibility in lesson planning, while a small number foresee no significant change (9.09%) or potential difficulty in connecting lessons with students' prior experiences (1.82%). Overall, the responses indicate that teachers are largely optimistic about the instructional possibilities that may come with syllabus reduction, though a few remain cautious about its practical implementation.

Table 4.11 presents teachers' views on whether students are currently engaging more in self-directed learning. The responses help to understand how educators perceive changes in student autonomy and independent learning habits, possibly in anticipation of or in alignment with NEP 2020 principles.

Table 4.11: Teachers' Belief About Increase in Self-Directed Learning Among Students

Responses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
No	17	30.91%
Yes	38	69.09%
Total	55	100.00%

A clear majority of teachers (69.09%) believe that students are now engaging more in self-directed learning, while 30.91% do not share this view. This indicates a strong perception that students are becoming more independent in their learning processes, possibly due to reduced external academic pressure, or evolving pedagogical approaches due to rationalised syllabus. However, the one-third who disagreed suggests that self-directed learning is not yet a consistent or widespread habit among all students. These differences may depend on factors like school environment, teacher support, access to resources, or student motivation. Overall, the data reflects optimism among teachers regarding the growing role of self-driven learning in the current educational context.

4.4 Impact on Critical Thinking

This section presents teachers' perspectives on whether syllabus reduction can create more room for fostering such skills in the classroom. Table 4.12 reflects how teachers anticipate the role of a reduced syllabus in promoting critical thinking among students. The responses are based on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

The average score of 3.60, along with a median 3 and mode of 4, suggests that teachers generally agree that syllabus reduction may provide more room for developing students' critical thinking skills. Nearly 49.09% of teachers selected either Agree or Strongly Agree, indicating a positive outlook on the potential of reduced content to support

deeper and more analytical learning. However, around 29.09% of respondents disagreed (choose Strongly Disagree or Disagree), and 21.82% remained neutral, showing that not all educators are fully confident in this outcome. This indicates that while the trend is favorable, some teachers feel that critical thinking will not automatically improve just because the syllabus is reduced.

Table 4.12: Teachers' Opinion on Whether Reduced Syllabus Will Foster Critical Thinking

Responses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	6	10.91%
Disagree	10	18.18%
Neutral	12	21.82%
Agree	15	27.27%
Strongly Agree	12	21.82%
Total	55	100.00%

The table 4.13 presents responses from teachers on the types of activities they would likely use to promote critical thinking if the syllabus is reduced. This was a multiple selection question, allowing teachers to choose more than one method they anticipate using.

Table 4.13: Anticipated Activities to Promote Critical Thinking

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Group discussions	40	72.73%
Debates	23	41.82%
Problem-solving tasks	43	78.18%
Role-playing	26	47.27%
Case studies	30	54.55%
Outdoor activities	1	1.82%
story telling	1	1.82%
Models	1	1.82%
Drawing and speech giving	1	1.82%

The data shows that the most commonly selected strategies for fostering critical thinking were problem-solving tasks (78.18%), group discussions (72.73%), and case studies (54.55%). These were followed by role-playing (47.27%) and debates (41.82%). These selections suggest that a significant number of teachers recognize these classroom methods as effective in engaging students in analysis, reasoning, and collaborative thinking. The relatively high response rates for these strategies reflect a preference for activities that align with curriculum goals while encouraging deeper student involvement.

Less frequently selected approaches included outdoor activities, storytelling, model-making, and drawing/speech-giving, each chosen by only one respondent. This indicates that such methods are not widely prioritized by the surveyed teachers when planning for critical thinking development. Overall, the responses suggest a focus on structured, discussion and problem-based learning strategies when considering ways to integrate critical thinking into teaching practices.

The table 4.14 shows how teachers anticipate the impact of syllabus reduction on students' critical thinking abilities. The responses reflect a range of expectations, from improvement to decline, based on future implementation.

Table 4.14: Teachers' Views on the Effect of Syllabus Reduction on Students' Critical Thinking Skills

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Declined significantly	1	1.82%
Declined slightly	8	14.55%
Improved significantly	16	29.09%
Improved	22	40.00%
No change	8	14.55%
Total	55	100.00%

A majority of teachers believe that syllabus reduction will lead to improvement in students' critical thinking. About 69.1% of respondents expect improvement—40% said it will improve, and 29.1% said it will improve significantly. This suggests that many educators associate a lighter syllabus with more time and flexibility to engage students in higher-order thinking tasks. However, 16.4% of teachers feel there will be a decline (slight or significant), while 14.5% foresee no change. These responses indicate that although most teachers are optimistic, some remain cautious about whether reduced content alone can enhance thinking skills. The findings highlight the importance of effective teaching strategies to fully realize the benefits of curriculum reform.

4.5 Views on Exam Preparedness

This section explores teachers' perspectives on how syllabus reduction might influence students' readiness for competitive exams. As these exams often require conceptual clarity and self-study, understanding the perceived impact of a lighter syllabus is essential. The table 4.15 represents teachers' responses on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) regarding whether syllabus reduction would allow students to concentrate better on core concepts needed for competitive examinations.

Table 4.15: Teachers' Opinion on Whether Syllabus Reduction Will Help Students Focus on Fundamental Concepts for Competitive Exams

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	6	10.91%
Disagree	16	29.09%
Neutral	6	10.91%
Agree	16	29.09%
Strongly Agree	11	20.00%
Total	55	100.00%

The responses are mixed, with a slight leaning toward agreement. Around 49.1% of teachers selected 4 or 5, showing optimism that syllabus reduction may help students focus more on essential concepts relevant to competitive exams. This indicates a belief that reduced content might free up time for deeper learning or exam-specific preparation. However, a substantial 40% of respondents chose 1 or 2, suggesting concern that syllabus reduction might actually leave out critical material or disrupt exam alignment. The mean of 3.18 and a bimodal distribution reflect a divided viewpoint, indicating that teachers hold varying assumptions depending on how well the reduced syllabus matches competitive exam standards.

Table 4.16: Teachers' Views on Whether Syllabus Reduction Will Increase Pressure on Students for Private Coaching or Self-Study

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	10	18.18%
Disagree	11	20.00%
Neutral	9	16.36%
Agree	15	27.27%
Strongly Agree	10	18.18%
Total	55	100.00%

The table 4.16 explores whether teachers believe syllabus reduction will lead students to depend more heavily on private coaching or self-study. The most commonly selected response was 4 (Agree), chosen by 15 respondents, or 27.27%. Additionally, 45.45% of teachers selected 4 or 5, reflecting concern that syllabus reduction may increase students' reliance on private coaching or self-study. On the other hand, 38.18% selected ratings 1 or 2, showing a notable portion of teachers who disagree with this view. A small group (16.36%) remained neutral.

The mean score of 3.07 reflects the overall average opinion of the teachers, which lies slightly above the neutral midpoint of the scale. This suggests a general inclination among respondents toward agreeing that students may face added pressure to rely on

private coaching or self-study when the syllabus is reduced. The median score of 3 indicates that the central tendency of the responses is neutral, meaning that half of the teachers rated the pressure as higher, while the other half rated it as lower or unchanged. The mode, which is 4, was the most frequently selected option, showing that a significant number of teachers agree with the statement. Together, these three measures show a mixed but slightly leaning-agree perception, suggesting that while not all teachers are convinced, many anticipate an increase in students' dependence on external academic support under a reduced syllabus framework.

The table 4.17 represents teachers' opinions on whether additional academic support—such as extra classes or supplementary materials—will be necessary to meet the demands of competitive exams under a reduced syllabus. A clear majority of teachers—65.5% (ratings 4 and 5)—believe that additional support will be required to compensate for any academic gaps caused by syllabus reduction, particularly in preparing for competitive exams. This reflects concern that the reduced content alone may not be sufficient to meet exam standards. Only 23.6% of respondents disagreed (ratings 1 and 2), while a small portion (10.9%) remained neutral. The mean of 3.55 and dominant mode of 4 indicate that most teachers anticipate the need for structured academic reinforcement if syllabus reduction is implemented, especially for exam-focused students.

Table 4.17: Teachers' Views on the Need for Additional Support to Bridge the Gap Between Reduced Syllabus and Competitive Exams

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	5	9.09%
Disagree	8	14.55%
Neutral	6	10.91%
Agree	23	41.82%
Strongly Agree	13	23.64%
Total	55	100.00%

Table 4.18 explores the specific challenges that teachers believe students may face when preparing for competitive exams under the reduced syllabus. Since competitive exams often go beyond the school curriculum, it is important to understand any gaps or difficulties that might arise from a lighter syllabus structure. This was a multiple selection question, where teachers could select more than one challenge, they expect students to face while preparing for competitive exams under a reduced syllabus. The most cited concern was lack of exposure to advanced topics (selected by 63.64% of teachers), indicating that many educators fear essential exam-relevant content may be excluded from a reduced curriculum. Over-dependence on external coaching (43.64%) was another prominent concern, suggesting that teachers worry students might turn to private tuition to make up for the gaps.

Table 4.18: Anticipated Challenges for Students Preparing for Competitive Exams Under the Reduced Syllabus

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Lack of exposure to advanced topics	35	63.64%
Over-dependence on external coaching	24	43.64%
Inadequate time for exam-specific practice	16	29.09%
None of above	6	10.91%

A smaller group (29.09%) pointed to inadequate time for exam-specific practice. While only 6 teachers (10.91%) believed students would face no additional challenges. Overall, the responses reflect a cautious outlook, with most teachers emphasizing the need for careful implementation to avoid unintended setbacks in students' exam preparedness.

4.6 Implementation Challenges

This section highlights the practical challenges that teachers anticipate while implementing a reduced syllabus in real classroom settings. Understanding these potential barriers is essential for ensuring that policy changes, such as those proposed under NEP 2020, are not only theoretically sound but also practically feasible. Teachers play a central role in curriculum delivery, and their insights provide valuable input into the kinds of institutional, pedagogical, or resource-related issues that may arise during implementation. Gathering feedback from teachers helps policymakers and school administrators identify specific areas requiring additional support, such as teacher training, availability of learning materials, or curriculum design adjustments.

Table 4.19: Anticipated Challenges in Implementing the Reduced Syllabus

Responses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Insufficient training	22	40.00%
Lack of resources	20	36.36%
Difficulty in covering essential topics	27	49.09%
Resistance from parents or students	7	12.73%
Nothing	3	5.45%
Comparison of available previous material on internet	1	1.82%
Knowledge gaps	1	1.82%

To better understand these ground-level realities, teachers were asked to share the kinds of difficulties they foresee once the reduced syllabus is officially introduced. Since this was a multiple selection question (table 4.19), respondents were allowed to choose more than one challenge, reflecting their professional experience and classroom-based observations. This approach enabled a more refined view of potential implementation hurdles.

Among the anticipated challenges, difficulty in covering essential topics was selected most frequently (49.09%), followed by insufficient training (40%) and lack of resources (36.36%). These responses indicate that teachers are concerned about maintaining academic depth and delivery quality even within a reduced framework.

A few teachers also foresee resistance from parents or students (12.73%) and mentioned unique concerns such as the loss of knowledge due to content cuts and issues with comparing old and new materials online. Only 5.45% believed they would face no major challenges. Overall, the responses highlight the need for proper orientation, resource planning, and communication before the reduced syllabus is introduced.

4.7 Teachers' Suggestions for Improving Implementation and Fostering Critical Thinking

To gain deeper insight into how teachers perceive the practical implementation of syllabus reduction and its influence on critical thinking, two open-ended questions were included in the survey. Their responses provided valuable qualitative data highlighting real-world classroom needs and policy-level gaps.

A large number of teachers emphasized the need for regular and subject-specific training programs. Many respondents felt that current training efforts were inadequate or misaligned with the NEP 2020 goals. Teachers expressed that orientation sessions and continuous professional development—especially focused on practical implementation strategies and NEP-aligned pedagogy—are essential. Alongside training, several teachers requested guidance from subject experts, noting that clear objectives, examples of concept-based teaching, and curriculum-aligned assessments would support smoother implementation.

Many responses also pointed to the importance of teaching resources and infrastructure. Teachers stated that to promote critical thinking under a reduced syllabus, they would need updated textbooks, workbooks, supplementary materials, and teaching-learning materials (TLMs). Others requested access to real-life examples, case studies, audio-visual tools, and content-rich material that promotes exploration beyond textbooks. These resources, they believed, would help engage students more deeply and promote reflective thinking. Some also mentioned that practical challenges, like lack of classroom equipment or raw materials for experiments, prevent them from creating hands-on learning environments. Teachers also emphasized the importance of ensuring that reduced content doesn't leave learning gaps, especially in preparation for competitive exams.

There was also strong support for interactive, student-centered learning. Teachers suggested incorporating activity-based learning, flipped classrooms, field visits, and daily-life problem solving into teaching strategies. A few recommended integrating critical thinking objectives directly into each subject and across the exam system. Teachers also advocated for reducing class strength and improving the student–teacher ratio, as it would allow for more individual attention and deeper engagement with students' ideas.

In addition to classroom and curriculum changes, some teachers raised systemic concerns such as the burden of non-teaching duties, lack of parental support, and inconsistent syllabus frameworks across states. These challenges, they believed, hinder both implementation and the fostering of critical thinking in classrooms.

4.8 Conclusion

The analysis of the collected data reveals that most teachers are aware of the syllabus reduction policy under NEP 2020, though formal training for its implementation remains limited. Teachers generally perceive syllabus reduction as a positive step toward reducing academic pressure and creating space for conceptual understanding and critical thinking. Many expressed readiness to adopt activity-based and student-centered teaching methods if provided with adequate resources and guidance.

However, concerns remain regarding students' preparedness for competitive exams, the need for additional support materials, and challenges related to training and infrastructure. While the overall outlook is optimistic, successful implementation will depend on systemic support, policy alignment with assessments, and teacher capacity-building initiatives.