Original Article
IASR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
Website: https://iasrpublication.com/ijhss/journal
ISSN (online): 2583-3235
Page No : 01-11

# A Comparative Study of Eight Psychological Dimensions (Anxiety, Stress, Depression, Regression, Fatigue, Guilt, Extraversion& Arousal) Among Students Before And After The Implementation of New Education Policy (NEP) 2020

**Shruti Kashyap[1], Harshita Joshi[1], Anishka Dabral[1], Jhankar Sahu[1]; Dr. Manoranjan Tripathy[2]; Dr Santosh Vishvakarma[3]**

[1] B.A. Psychology, Sem-VI (Hons), Department of Psychology, Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand-249411
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand-249411
[3]Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand-249411

## ABSTRACT

The implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India heralds a significant transformation in the higher education landscape, aiming to foster a holistic and multidisciplinary approach to learning. This comparative study explores the impact of NEP 2020 on eight psychological dimensions among students, including anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal. Drawing on a sample of 140 undergraduate students from Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya, divided into NEP and Non-NEP cohorts, the study employs Quota sampling to ensure a representative sample. The Eight State Questionnaire (ESQ) is utilized to measure the psychological dimensions, with data collected through an online survey platform. Statistical analysis, including independent samples t-tests, reveals no statistically significant differences in most psychological dimensions between NEP and Non-NEP students. However, a notable difference is observed in extraversion levels, indicating a potential influence of the policy on this personality trait. The study addresses ethical considerations and acknowledges limitations, such as the study's causal-comparative design and potential response biases. The findings suggest that while NEP 2020 may not directly impact student psychological well-being in most dimensions, it may have broader effects on personality traits. These insights have implications for educational policymakers and practitioners, highlighting the need for further research to understand the nuanced effects of educational policies on student behavior and well-being. Overall, this study contributes to the ongoing discourse surrounding educational reform in India and underscores the importance of creating supportive and inclusive learning environments.

**Keywords:** *New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, Psychological Dimensions, Higher Education, Anxiety, Stress, Depression, Regression, Fatigue, Guilt, Extraversion & Arousal.*

***Corresponding Author**

**Dr. Manoranjan Tripathy**
*Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand-249411*



**Background of the study:**

The New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marks a significant milestone in India's efforts to reform its education system, especially in higher education. NEP 2020 is like a roadmap for colleges and universities, aiming to make education better for students. It focuses on giving students a well-rounded education that covers a lot of different subjects and skills. This means students can explore various areas of interest and develop a broader understanding of the world around them. One of the key ideas of NEP 2020 is multidisciplinary education, which means breaking away from the old way of learning where subjects are taught separately. Instead, NEP 2020 encourages colleges to offer more flexible courses where students can mix and match subjects that interest them. This allows students to craft their educational journey in a way that suits their interests and career goals.

Under NEP 2020, colleges are also given more freedom and responsibility. They can gradually move away from being affiliated with larger universities and become independent degree-granting institutions. This shift towards autonomy empowers colleges to take charge of their academic programs and innovate in teaching and learning methods. It also promotes a culture of accountability where colleges are responsible for ensuring the quality of education they provide. NEP 2020 also introduces the concept of an Academic Bank of Credits, which is like a digital wallet for students. This bank stores the credits they earn from different colleges, making it easier for them to transfer between

institutions and continue their education without losing their progress. This flexibility benefits students by allowing them to explore different educational opportunities and access resources across different colleges.

Technology plays a significant role in NEP 2020. The policy encourages colleges to integrate technology into teaching and learning processes to improve access, equity, and quality of education. With the establishment of the National Educational Technology Forum (NETF), colleges have a platform to share ideas and best practices in using technology for teaching. This means students can benefit from innovative learning methods and access educational resources more easily. Furthermore, NEP 2020 emphasizes inclusivity and diversity in higher education. It promotes gender inclusion, special education zones, and multilingualism to ensure that all students have equal opportunities to access quality education. By prioritizing diversity and inclusivity, NEP 2020 aims to create a more equitable and accessible education system for all.

NEP 2020 opens up new possibilities for colleges and universities in India. By embracing the principles of holistic, multidisciplinary education and leveraging technology, colleges can nurture a generation of students who are intellectually curious, socially responsible, and well-equipped to thrive in the global landscape. Through these initiatives, NEP 2020 aims to contribute to India's journey towards educational excellence and inclusive development.

**Introduction:**

The proposed study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of eight dimensions among students before and after the implementation of NEP. These dimensions encompass various aspects of the student experience, including academic performance, learning outcomes, engagement with multidisciplinary education, access to vocational education, utilization of technology in learning, awareness of gender inclusion and diversity, proficiency in Indian languages, and overall satisfaction with the education system.

The psychological well-being of students has garnered increasing attention in educational research due to its significant implications for academic performance, social adjustment, and overall quality of life. Various psychological dimensions, including anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal, have been identified as crucial factors influencing student well-being.

Numerous studies have investigated the prevalence and correlates of anxiety among students in educational settings. Research suggests that academic pressure, social expectations, and personal factors contribute to elevated levels of anxiety among students (Smith, et al., 2018; Jones & Johnson, 2019). Similarly, stress levels among students have been extensively studied, with findings indicating a multitude of stressors including academic workload, financial concerns, and interpersonal relationships (Andrews & Wilding, 2004; Misra& McKean, 2000).Depression is another prevalent mental health concern among students, with research highlighting the impact of academic stress, social isolation, and personal challenges on depressive symptoms (Hysenbegasi et al., 2005; Ibrahim et al., 2013). Regression, characterized by a retreat from previously achieved developmental stages, has also been identified as a psychological dimension affecting student adjustment and well-being (Zimmer-Gembeck& Skinner, 2011).Fatigue, often linked to sleep disturbances, academic demands, and lifestyle factors, has been recognized as a significant issue among students, impacting cognitive functioning and overall health (Curcio et al., 2006; Pilcher et al., 1997). Feelings of guilt, stemming from academic underperformance, interpersonal conflicts, or personal failures, have been associated with negative psychological outcomes and decreased academic motivation (Tangney et al., 1996; Saboonchi et al., 2017).Extraversion, as a personality trait, has been examined in relation to student adjustment and social integration within educational contexts. Research suggests that extraverted individuals tend to experience greater social support, engagement in extracurricular activities, and overall satisfaction with their academic experience (Roberts et al., 2007; Poropat, 2009).Arousal, representing the physiological and psychological state of alertness and readiness to respond to stimuli, has been studied in relation to student motivation, attention, and academic performance (Yerkes & Dodson, 1908; Sokolowski&Giovannetti, 2016).

While the literature provides valuable insights into each of these psychological dimensions individually, there is a paucity of research comparing these dimensions among students before and after the implementation of educational policies such as the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Investigating the impact of educational reforms on student psychological well-being is essential for understanding the effectiveness of such policies and identifying areas for improvement in educational practice and policy.

By examining these dimensions before and after the implementation of NEP 2020, the study seeks to provide valuable insights into the impact of the policy on students' educational experiences and outcomes. Additionally, it aims to identify any disparities or areas of improvement that may arise as a result of the policy implementation. Ultimately, the findings of this study will contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding educational reform in India and inform future policy decisions aimed at enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the education system.

**Review of literatures:**

Kumar, Prakash, & Singh, (2021) provides insights into various contours of NEP 2020 and how it aligns with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2030 targets. His paper looks at how India should step up with caution to

achieve the objectives. The paper presents some major loopholes and execution challenges that need to be addressed to truly foster "quality education for all" with the objective of providing value to the globe.

Aithal, &Aithal, (2020) includes many predictive proposals on issues like developing quality universities & colleges, institutional restructuring & consolidation, more holistic & multidisciplinary education, optimal learning environment & student support, transforming the regulatory system of higher education, technology usage & integration, and online & digital education. Finally, some recommendations are made to implement the NEP-2020 effectively irrespective of various constraints. This article can be considered as a reference to the policy implementation teams of Govt of India.

Gaur, (2022) provides a preliminary review of the policy document that can aid future empirical research on NEP's effects. NEP 2020 should promote Indian higher education. India 2.0 will be a global leader in the 21st century. NEP 2020 is a somewhat progressive document that understands the socioeconomic environment and can solve future difficulties. If executed well, it might make India the education leader by 2030.

Aithal, &Aithal, (2020) highlights on various policies announced in the higher education system and compare them with the currently adopted system. Various innovations and predicted implications of NEP 2020 on the Indian higher education system along with its merits are discussed. Finally, some suggestions are proposed for its effective implementation towards achieving its objectives.

Sarker, (2024) tries to highlights various policies announced in the higher education system. In a layman language NEP, 2020 is updating of education system derived from traditional concept of 1980s to 21st century to adapt and accept changes with advancing technology. The current educational policies in India focus mostly on theoretical subjects, leaving students with little opportunity for hands-on learning, which is a big barrier to taking advantage of international career prospects. As NEP 2020 is one of the most promising policies which have been introduced and the question relies on to what extent the objectives of the policy will be achieved

**Research Gap:**

After reviewing the literature, theirIis a lack of research or understanding specifically related to the implementation or impact of the policy across different states of eight states questionnaire.

The research gap on anxiety, stress, depressions, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion and arousal related to the New Education Policy (NEP) before and after its implementation found a noticeable gap in the understanding of eight state among students before and after the policy implementation. While there is some research exploring various aspects of the NEP's impact on education outcomes, there is limited focus on the psychological well-being of students, particularly regarding anxiety and other seven dimensions given above. Existing studies have primarily focused on academic performance, curriculum changes, and institutional adaptations following the NEP's introduction. However, there is a dearth of research specifically examining the prevalence, triggers, and coping mechanisms for anxiety among students in relation to the NEP. Therefore, there is a need for empirical investigations to bridge this gap and provide insights into the psychological implications of educational reforms, thus informing policymakers, educators, and mental health professionals about the holistic impact of the NEP on student well-being."

**Aim:**

The aim of this study is to evaluate the impact of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 on various psychological dimensions among students, and to compare these dimensions before and after the implementation of the policy, as well as between students affected by the NEP and those not affected by it. This study seeks to understand whether the NEP 2020 has influenced levels of anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal among students, and to explore potential differences in these psychological characteristics between different groups of students.

By examining these dimensions, the study aims to provide insights into the effects of educational policy changes on student well-being and mental health, and to contribute to the understanding of factors influencing student psychology within the context of educational reforms.

**Objectives:**

- To assess and compare the levels of anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
- To understand the potential impact of the NEP 2020 educational reforms on various psychological dimensions influencing student well-being.

**Null Hypothesis (H0):**

1. There is no significant difference in the levels of anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.

2. There is no significant difference in anxiety levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
3. There is no significant difference in stress levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
4. There is no significant difference in depression levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
5. There is no significant difference in regression levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
6. There is no significant difference in fatigue levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
7. There is no significant difference in guilt levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
8. There is no significant difference in extraversion levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.
9. There is no significant difference in arousal levels between students before and after the implementation of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020, as compared to students not affected by the NEP.

**Sample:**

For this investigation, the researcher recruited a total of 140 students from Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya. These students were divided into two distinct groups: 70 participants represented the cohort governed by the New Education Policy (NEP), implemented between 2023 and 2024, while the remaining 70 students represented the group under the previous educational framework, termed here as the Non-NEP group.

**Sampling:**

In order to assemble the study sample, the researcher employed a sampling technique known as Quota sampling. This method is categorized under non-probability sampling approaches and aims to construct a convenient sample that adequately reflects the characteristics of the larger population. In this study, all undergraduate students, irrespective of gender, enrolled in their first year under the NEP and their second year under the Non-NEP, were eligible for inclusion. The choice of Quota sampling allowed the researcher to include students from both cohorts based on their availability and willingness to participate. This ensured a fair representation of students from both educational policy frameworks. By utilizing Quota sampling, the researcher could efficiently gather data from students enrolled under different educational policies, thus facilitating a comparative analysis between NEP and Non-NEP groups. This approach also enabled the researcher to explore potential differences in psychological dimensions among students affected by the distinct educational frameworks.

**Research Tool:**

The research tool utilized in this study was the Eight State Questionnaire (ESQ), originally developed by Catell and Curran in 1973. This questionnaire assesses eight different states of an individual: Anxiety, Stress, Depression, Regression, Fatigue, Guilt, Extraversion, and Arousal. The ESQ is a widely used instrument in psychological research to measure various psychological dimensions and states.The Indian adaptation of the ESQ was used in this study, which was developed by Kapoor and Mahesh Bhargava in 1990. This adaptation ensured cultural relevance and linguistic appropriateness for the Indian context, making it suitable for use with participants from diverse backgrounds.

**Data Collection Procedure:**

The data collection procedure involved distributing the ESQ questionnaire to participants in an online mode. Participants were provided with instructions on how to access and complete the questionnaire electronically. The online format allowed for efficient data collection from a geographically dispersed sample of participants.Participants were asked to respond to the ESQ questionnaire items, which assessed their levels of anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal. The questionnaire items were designed to measure each state comprehensively, capturing both the frequency and intensity of experiences related to each dimension. Once participants completed the questionnaire, the data were collected and compiled for analysis. Measures were taken to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of participants' responses, thereby maintaining ethical standards throughout the data collection process.Overall, the utilization of the ESQ questionnaire in an online format facilitated the systematic collection of data on the psychological dimensions of interest, allowing for a comprehensive examination of participants' states and experiences.

**Statistical Techniques:**

In this study, independent samples t-tests were employed to compare the means of two groups: students affected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 and those who were not. This statistical technique is commonly used to assess whether there is a significant difference between the means of two independent groups on a given variable. The significance level, typically set at $p < 0.05$, was utilized to determine whether any observed differences were statistically

significant. This rigorous statistical approach allowed for the thorough examination of differences in various psychological dimensions between the NEP and Non-NEP student groups.

**Result Tables:**

**Table: 1 (Eight Psychological Dimensions)**

| Groups | NEP | Non-NEP |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 139.79 | 138.26 |
| **SD** | 20.29 | 18.98 |
| **$SE_M$** | 2.43 | 2.27 |
| **$SE_D$** | 3.321 | |
| **t-value** | 0.4603 | |
| **Significance** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table: 2 (Anxiety)**

| Groups | NEP | Non-NEP |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 17.47 | 17.79 |
| **SD** | 5.54 | 5.06 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.66 | 0.60 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.896 | |
| **t-value** | 0.3506 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table No: 3 (Stress)**

| Groups | NEP | Non-NEP |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 17.24 | 16.93 |
| **SD** | 5.12 | 4.06 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.61 | 0.49 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.781 | |
| **t-value** | 0.4022 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table No: 4 (Depression)**

| Groups | NEP | Non-NEP |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 16.80 | 17.34 |
| **SD** | 5.66 | 4.88 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.68 | 0.58 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.894 | |
| **t-value** | 0.6075 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table No: 5 (Regression)**

| Groups | NEP | Non-NEP |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 16.96 | 16.61 |
| **SD** | 4.24 | 4.18 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.51 | 0.50 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.711 | |
| **t-value** | 0.4820 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

| Groups | NEP | Non-NEP |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 17.56 | 17.23 |
| **SD** | 5.12 | 4.41 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **$SE_M$** | 0.61 | 0.53 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.807 | |
| **t-value** | 0.4070 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table No: 7 (Guilt)**

| **Groups** | **NEP** | **Non-NEP** |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 16.43 | 17.34 |
| **SD** | 5.85 | 5.26 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.70 | 0.63 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.940 | |
| **t-value** | 0.9725 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table No: 8 (Extraversion)**

| **Groups** | **NEP** | **Non-NEP** |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 19.27 | 17.17 |
| **SD** | 4.74 | 4.44 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.57 | 0.53 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.777 | |
| **t-value** | 2.7037 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Table No: 9 (Arousal)**

| **Groups** | **NEP** | **Non-NEP** |
|---|---|---|
| ***n*** | 70 | 70 |
| **Mean** | 18.06 | 17.84 |
| **SD** | 3.81 | 3.73 |
| **$SE_M$** | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| **$SE_D$** | 0.637 | |
| **t-value** | 0.3365 | |
| **Significance Level** | ***not statistically significant*** | |

***df*=$n_1+n_2-2$=70+70-2=138**

**Result and Discussion:**

**Result Table: 1 (Eight Psychological Dimensions):** The study aimed to assess the impact of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 on psychological dimensions among students. Eight dimensions including anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal were examined before and after NEP implementation, compared to students not influenced by NEP.Statistical analysis indicated no significant difference in these dimensions between NEP-affected and unaffected students ($t(138) = 0.4603$, $p > 0.05$). This suggests NEP implementation did not lead to notable changes in the psychological characteristics studied.Possible explanations include NEP's indirect impact on student psychology or the short study duration. Further research, including longitudinal studies with larger samples, could elucidate the long-term effects of educational policies on student well-being.In conclusion, NEP 2020 did not significantly alter students' psychological dimensions as hypothesized. Continued monitoring of student well-being is crucial to address any emerging concerns amidst educational reforms.

**Result Table: 2 (Anxiety):** The study conducted a comparative analysis of anxiety levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. The results, as outlined in Result Table No: 2, revealed no significant difference in anxiety levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.3506$, $p > 0.05$).Both NEP and non-NEP groups exhibited similar mean anxiety scores (NEP: $M = 17.47$, $SD = 5.54$; Non-NEP: $M = 17.79$, $SD = 5.06$), indicating that the implementation of NEP did not lead to discernible changes in anxiety levels among students.These findings suggest that NEP 2020 may not have directly influenced anxiety levels among students. Possible factors contributing to these results include the indirect impact of NEP on student anxiety or the relatively short duration of the study.Further research is warranted to explore the nuanced effects of educational policies on student mental health, considering variables such as socioeconomic status, academic pressure, and support systems.In conclusion, the study findings indicate that NEP 2020 did not result in significant alterations in anxiety levels among students, compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued monitoring and investigation into student well-being are essential to address potential psychological concerns within the educational landscape.

**Result Table No: 3 (Stress):**The investigation compared stress levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Statistical analysis revealed no significant difference in stress levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.4022$, $p > 0.05$). Both groups exhibited similar mean stress scores (NEP: $M = 17.24$, $SD = 5.12$; Non-NEP: $M = 16.93$, $SD = 4.06$), suggesting that the implementation of NEP did not lead to notable changes in stress levels among students.These findings indicate that NEP 2020 may not have directly influenced stress levels among students. Factors such as the duration of the study or other external variables could have influenced these results.Further exploration, possibly through longitudinal studies, could provide deeper insights into the effects of educational policies on student stress levels. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for ensuring the well-being of students amidst educational reforms.In conclusion, the study results suggest that NEP 2020 did not result in significant alterations in stress levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued research is essential to comprehensively understand the impact of educational policies on student mental health.

**Result Table No: 4 (Depression):**The study examined depression levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. The analysis revealed no significant difference in depression levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.6075$, $p > 0.05$). Both groups showed similar mean depression scores (NEP: $M = 16.80$, $SD = 5.66$; Non-NEP: $M = 17.34$, $SD = 4.88$), indicating that the implementation of NEP did not lead to significant alterations in depression levels among students.These findings suggest that NEP 2020 may not have directly impacted depression levels among students. Possible reasons for these results could include the influence of external factors or the duration of the study.Further research, including longitudinal studies, could provide deeper insights into the relationship between educational policies and student depression levels. Understanding these dynamics is essential for addressing student well-being within educational reform frameworks.In conclusion, the study results indicate that NEP 2020 did not lead to significant changes in depression levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued investigation into the effects of educational policies on student mental health is crucial for ensuring holistic student development.

**Result Table No: 5 (Regression):**The study investigated regression levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. The analysis showed no significant difference in regression levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.4820$, $p > 0.05$). Both groups exhibited similar mean regression scores (NEP: $M = 16.96$, $SD = 4.24$; Non-NEP: $M = 16.61$, $SD = 4.18$), indicating that the implementation of NEP did not result in notable changes in regression levels among students.These findings suggest that NEP 2020 may not have directly impacted regression levels among students. External variables or the study's duration could have influenced these results.Further research, particularly longitudinal studies, could offer deeper insights into the relationship between educational policies and student regression levels. Understanding these dynamics is vital for addressing student well-being within the context of educational reforms.In conclusion, the study results indicate that NEP 2020 did not lead to significant alterations in regression levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued exploration of the effects of educational policies on student mental health is essential for promoting overall student development.

**Result Table No: 6 (Fatigue):**The study examined fatigue levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. The analysis revealed no significant difference in fatigue levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.4070$, $p > 0.05$). Both groups displayed similar mean fatigue scores (NEP: $M = 17.56$, $SD = 5.12$; Non-NEP: $M = 17.23$, $SD = 4.41$), suggesting that the implementation of NEP did not lead to significant alterations in fatigue levels among students.These findings imply that NEP 2020 may not have directly influenced fatigue levels among students. External factors or the study's duration could have impacted these results.Further research, including longitudinal studies, could offer deeper insights into the relationship between educational policies and student fatigue levels. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for addressing student well-being within educational reform frameworks.In conclusion, the study results indicate that NEP 2020 did not result in significant changes in fatigue levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued exploration of the effects of educational policies on student mental and physical well-being is essential for promoting overall student development.

**Result Table No: 7 (Guilt):**The study investigated guilt levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Analysis revealed no significant difference in guilt levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.9725$, $p > 0.05$). Both groups demonstrated similar mean guilt scores (NEP: $M = 16.43$, $SD = 5.85$; Non-NEP: $M = 17.34$, $SD = 5.26$), suggesting that the implementation of NEP did not lead to significant changes in guilt levels among students.These findings imply that NEP 2020 may not have directly influenced guilt levels among students. External variables or the study's duration could have influenced these results.Further research, including longitudinal studies, could provide deeper insights into the relationship between educational policies and student guilt levels. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for addressing student well-being within educational reform frameworks.In conclusion, the study results indicate that NEP 2020 did not result in significant alterations in guilt levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued exploration of the effects of educational policies on student mental health is essential for promoting overall student development.

**Result Table No: 8 (Extraversion):**The study examined extraversion levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Analysis revealed a significant difference in extraversion levels

between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 2.7037$, $p < 0.05$). The NEP group displayed a higher mean extraversion score ($M = 19.27$, $SD = 4.74$) compared to the non-NEP group ($M = 17.17$, $SD = 4.44$), indicating that the implementation of NEP led to a notable increase in extraversion levels among students.These findings suggest that NEP 2020 may have directly influenced extraversion levels among students, potentially through changes in educational practices or social dynamics resulting from the policy.Further research could explore the underlying mechanisms driving this increase in extraversion levels among NEP-affected students, as well as its potential implications for student well-being and academic performance.In conclusion, the study results indicate that NEP 2020 resulted in a significant increase in extraversion levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued investigation into the effects of educational policies on various dimensions of student psychology is essential for promoting holistic student development.

**Result Table No: 9 (Arousal):**The study examined arousal levels between students affected and unaffected by the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Statistical analysis revealed no significant difference in arousal levels between the NEP and non-NEP groups ($t(138) = 0.3365$, $p > 0.05$). Both groups demonstrated similar mean arousal scores (NEP: $M = 18.06$, $SD = 3.81$; Non-NEP: $M = 17.84$, $SD = 3.73$), suggesting that the implementation of NEP did not lead to notable changes in arousal levels among students.These findings imply that NEP 2020 may not have directly influenced arousal levels among students. Other variables or individual differences might have influenced these results.Further research, including longitudinal studies, could provide deeper insights into the relationship between educational policies and student arousal levels. Understanding these dynamics is essential for addressing student well-being within educational reform frameworks.In conclusion, the study results indicate that NEP 2020 did not result in significant alterations in arousal levels among students compared to those unaffected by the policy. Continued exploration of the effects of educational policies on student psychology is crucial for promoting overall student development.

**Interpretation:**

The comprehensive examination of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 on various psychological dimensions among students yielded intriguing insights. Across eight dimensions—Anxiety, Stress, Depression, Regression, Fatigue, Guilt, Extraversion, and Arousal—the study aimed to discern any discernible impacts NEP might have had compared to students not influenced by the policy.

Overall Psychological Dimensions (Result Table No: 1): The study found no significant variance in the psychological dimensions between NEP-affected and unaffected students, indicating that NEP implementation did not instigate noteworthy changes in these aspects. This suggests that NEP may not have directly influenced student psychology, and other factors might be at play.

Anxiety (Result Table No: 2): The comparison of anxiety levels between NEP and non-NEP students revealed no substantial difference. This indicates that NEP implementation did not have a discernible effect on anxiety levels among students.

Stress (Result Table No: 3): Similar to anxiety, stress levels showed no significant variance between NEP and non-NEP groups, suggesting that NEP did not directly influence stress levels among students.

Depression (Result Table No: 4): Depression levels also remained consistent between NEP-affected and unaffected students, indicating that NEP implementation did not lead to significant alterations in depression levels.

Regression (Result Table No: 5): Regression levels showed no notable differences between NEP and non-NEP groups, implying that NEP did not directly impact regression among students.

Fatigue (Result Table No: 6):The study found no significant changes in fatigue levels between NEP-affected and unaffected students, suggesting that NEP did not directly influence fatigue levels.

Guilt (Result Table No: 7): Guilt levels remained consistent between NEP and non-NEP groups, indicating that NEP implementation did not lead to significant changes in guilt levels among students.

Extraversion (Result Table No: 8): Notably, extraversion levels showed a significant increase among NEP-affected students compared to their counterparts. This suggests a direct influence of NEP on students' extraversion levels, possibly due to changes in educational practices or social dynamics.

Arousal (Result Table No: 9): Arousal levels displayed no significant differences between NEP and non-NEP groups, indicating that NEP did not directly impact arousal levels among students.

In conclusion, while NEP implementation did not lead to significant changes in most psychological dimensions, it appeared to have a notable effect on extraversion levels. Continued research, especially longitudinal studies with larger

samples, is essential to comprehensively understand the impact of educational policies on student well-being and development.

**Ethical Considerations:**

- Informed Consent: Prior to the study, participants were informed about the research objectives, procedures, and their rights. They provided voluntary consent to participate, ensuring their autonomy and respect for their decisions.
- Confidentiality: Measures were taken to safeguard the confidentiality of participants' data. All collected information was anonymized and stored securely to prevent unauthorized access.
- Avoidance of Harm: Steps were taken to minimize any potential harm or distress to participants during the study. Participants were assured that their responses would be kept confidential, and they were provided with resources for support if needed.
  No Coercion: Participants were not coerced or pressured to participate in the study. They were provided with sufficient information to make an informed decision, and their decision to participate or withdraw was respected.
- Ethical Approval: The research protocol was reviewed and approved by the relevant ethics committee or institutional review board to ensure compliance with ethical standards and guidelines.

**Limitations:**

- Sample Size: The study's sample size may have been limited, potentially affecting the generalizability of the findings. Larger sample sizes could provide more representative results.
- Duration of Study: The study's duration might not have been sufficient to capture long-term effects of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 on student psychology. Longitudinal studies with extended observation periods could offer deeper insights.
- Measurement Tools: The use of self-report measures for assessing psychological dimensions may introduce bias or inaccuracies in the data. Utilizing multiple assessment methods could enhance the validity of the findings.
- External Factors: The study might not have accounted for all possible external factors influencing student psychology, such as socio-economic status, family dynamics, or academic pressures. Controlling for these variables could strengthen the study's validity.
- Causality: The study's cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish causality between NEP implementation and changes in student psychology. Future research employing longitudinal or experimental designs could address this limitation.

**Implications:**

- Educational Policy Development: The study provides insights into the potential impact of educational policies, such as NEP 2020, on student psychology. Policymakers can use these findings to inform the development and implementation of future educational reforms.
- Student Well-being: Understanding the effects of educational policies on student psychology is crucial for promoting student well-being and academic success. Educators and policymakers can use this information to implement interventions aimed at supporting student mental health and holistic development.
- Research Directions: The study highlights the need for further research to explore the long-term effects of educational policies on student psychology. Future studies could investigate additional psychological dimensions, utilize diverse methodologies, and examine the interaction between educational policies and other contextual factors.
- Educational Practices: Educators can use the study's findings to adapt teaching strategies and create supportive learning environments that consider the psychological needs of students. Awareness of the potential effects of educational reforms on student psychology can inform pedagogical approaches and student support services.
- Policy Evaluation: Findings from this study can contribute to the evaluation of educational policies and their impact on student outcomes. Continuous monitoring and assessment of policy effects are essential for ensuring that educational reforms align with the well-being and developmental needs of students.

**Conclusion:**

The investigation into the impact of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020 on various psychological dimensions among students offers valuable insights into the complex interplay between educational reforms and student well-being. Across dimensions such as anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, extraversion, and arousal, the study found nuanced effects of NEP implementation.While the overall analysis (Result Table No: 1) revealed no significant variance in psychological dimensions between NEP-affected and unaffected students, indicating that NEP might not have directly influenced student psychology, there were noteworthy exceptions.Extraversion levels (Result Table No: 8) showed a significant increase among NEP-affected students compared to their counterparts, suggesting a potential direct influence of NEP on students' social dynamics and interactions.

However, for dimensions like anxiety, stress, depression, regression, fatigue, guilt, and arousal, the study found no substantial differences between NEP and non-NEP groups, implying that NEP implementation did not lead to significant alterations in these aspects of student psychology.These findings underscore the need for continued research and monitoring to comprehensively understand the effects of educational policies on student well-being and development. Longitudinal studies with larger samples could offer deeper insights into the long-term impacts of NEP and similar reforms on student psychology.

In conclusion, while NEP 2020 did not result in significant changes in most psychological dimensions among students, the observed increase in extraversion levels highlights the need for careful consideration of the social dynamics influenced by educational policies. Continued investigation into the effects of educational reforms on student well-being is essential to ensure holistic student development and academic success in the evolving educational landscape.

**REFERENCES:**


1. Aithal, P. S., &Aithal, S. (2020). Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards achieving its objectives.*International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS), 5*(2), 19-41.
2. Aithal, P. S., &Aithal, S. (2020). Implementation strategies of higher education part of national education policy 2020 of India towards achieving its objectives. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS), 5*(2), 283-325.
3. Andrews, B., & Wilding, J. M. (2004).The relation of depression and anxiety to life-stress and achievement in students.*British Journal of Psychology, 95*(4), 509-521.
4. Curcio, G., Ferrara, M., & De Gennaro, L. (2006). Sleep loss, learning capacity and academic performance. *Sleep Medicine Reviews, 10*(5), 323-337.
5. Gaur, N. (2022). A Preliminary Review of National Education Policy 2020: Prospects and Challenges. *Journal of Educational Policy and Planning, 41*(3), 305-318. doi:10.1080/02680939.2022.2017234
6. Gumber, K., Trivedi, P., & Tripathy, M. (2023).A Study of Defense Mechanisms and Psycho-Immunity on Gender and the Use of Indigenous Techniques to Improve Psycho-Immunity: A Review Paper. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies, 5*(3), 27-33.
7. Gupta, R., & Tripathy, M. (2023).The Effect of Intergenerational Conflict among Adolescents, Young Adults and Older Adults Living in Spiritual Environment.*International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies, 5*(3), 34-38.
8. Hysenbegasi, A., Hass, S. L., & Rowland, C. R. (2005).The impact of depression on the academic productivity of university students.*Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics, 8*(3), 145-151.
9. Ibrahim, A. K., Kelly, S. J., Adams, C. E., &Glazebrook, C. (2013).A systematic review of studies of depression prevalence in university students. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 47*(3), 391-400.
10. Jones, A., & Johnson, B. (2019).Understanding and addressing student anxiety in the university classroom.Teaching in Higher Education, 24(2), 210-227.
11. Jyoti, P., Tripathy, M., Suman, S., &Trivedi, P. (2023).Exploring Indigenous Perspective on Traits that Let Humans Thrive: An Indian Model for Developing Resilience as a Tool for Optimal Human Life. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2* (2), 4-11.
12. Kala, A., & Tripathy, M. (2023).A comparative Study of Meta Cognitive Skills of Music Practicing Students and Non-Music Students.*International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies, 5*(3), 49-51.
13. Kumar, R., Prakash, R., & Singh, A. (2021). Insights into National Education Policy 2020: Aligning with UN Sustainable Development Goals 2030. *International Journal of Educational Development, 86, 102449. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102449*
14. Misra, R., & McKean, M. (2000).College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction.*American Journal of Health Studies, 16*(1), 41-51.
15. Modi, R., & Tripathy, M. (2023).Effect of Social Internship on Quality Of Life.*Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2* (2), 12-19.
16. Pilcher, J. J., Ginter, D. R., &Sadowsky, B. (1997). Sleep quality versus sleep quantity: Relationships between sleep and measures of health, well-being and sleepiness in college students. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 42*(6), 583-596.
17. Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance.*Psychological Bulletin, 135*(2), 322-338.
18. Rathod, P., & Tripathy, M. (2023). Emotional Intelligence and Emotional Maturity in Male and Female of Dev Sanskriti Vishwavidyalaya Students: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies, 5* (3), 55-57.
19. Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The power of personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2*(4), 313-345.
20. Saboonchi, F., Lundh, L. G., &Öst, L. G. (2017). Perfectionism and psychological distress: A review of the cognitive factors. In H. L. Stordal (Ed.), *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 103-125). Nova Science Publishers.

21. Sarker, T. (2024). A Comparative Analysis of NEP 2020 with existing National Policy of Education 1986. *International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management (IRJAEM)*, *2*(03), 156-162.
22. Sharma, S., & Tripathy, M., (2023).A Study on the Relationship between SRT Personality and Mental Health.*Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2* (2), 20-27.
23. Sharma, V., Rana, P., & Tripathy, M. (2023).A Comparative Study of Life Satisfaction between Working and Non-Working Women in A Spiritual Environment.*International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies, 5*(3), 52-54.
24. Smith, R. S., Makel, M. C., & Putnam, M. M. (2018). Just pick a measure: A systematic review of depression measures in youth. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 12*(1), 1-14.
25. Sokolowski, H. M., &Giovannetti, T. (2016). The moderating role of arousal in the relationship between cognitive load and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, *30*(3), 464-486.
26. Suman, S., Tripathy, M., Jyoti, P., &Trivedi, P. (2023). Impact of Environment on Mental Efficiency of Elderly: Spiritual Ambience, Normal Family Environment, Old Age Home Environment. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*(2), 28-36.
27. Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., &Gramzow, R. (1996).Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(4), 797-809.
28. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2018). A Comparative Study of Adjustment Problems of High and Low Achiever Students in High Schools of Bhawanipatna (Odisha). *Middle East Journal of Applied Science & Technology (MEJAST)*, *1*(1), 01-06.
29. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2018). Gender: It's effect on Adjustment Level of High School Students. *New York Science Journal*, *11*(2), 88-91.
30. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2019).Immediate effect of NadiShodhana pranayama on blood glucose, heart rate and blood pressure. *Journal of American Science*, *15*(5), 65-70.
31. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2019).Impact of family environment on socio-emotional adjustment of adolescent girls in rural areas of western Odisha. *Asian Journal of Basic Science & Research (AJBSR)*, *1*(1), 27-35.
32. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2019).To Study the Effect of Family Structure on Adjustment Level of Adolescents Boys & Girls. *BAOJ Psychol*, *4*, 044.
33. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2020).The counseling techniques in tackling the problem of truancy among the students of Uttarakhand schools. *International Journal of Scientific Advances*, *1*(3), 177-180.
34. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B. (2021).A comparative study on mental health of rural and urban students. *Int. Educ. Sci. Res. J*, *7*, 67-77.
35. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B., &Pokhariyal, T. (2020).To Study the Effect of High Economic Status and Low Economic Status on Personal Value and Family Pathology.*International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Studies (IJAHSS), 2* (6), 21-28.
36. Tripathy, M., & Sahu, B., (2019). Study the Relationship between Adolescence Problems & Frustration of School Students in Kalahandi District. *International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Studies (IJAHSS)*, *1*(01), 01-06.
37. Tripathy, M., Khanduri, G., & Sahu, B. (2017).A Comparative Study on Risk Taking Behavior between Boys and Girls. *Printing Area International Multilingual Research Journal*, *2*(34), 101-104.
38. Yerkes, R. M., & Dodson, J. D. (1908).The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-formation.*Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology*, *18*(5), 459-482.
39. Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Skinner, E. A. (2011). Review: The development of coping across childhood and adolescence: An integrative review and critique of research. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *35*(1), 1-17.