



SRIJANSHODH2026-15

Calligraphy as a Pedagogical Bridge: Reviving India's Written Heritage through Art-Integrated Learning under NEP 2020

Raghunita Gupta

Founder and Managing Director

The Calligraphy Foundation (Independent Institution), New Delhi, India

Contact No.: +91 93507 44119 | Email ID: raghunitagupta@gmail.com

Abstract

India possesses one of the world's richest calligraphic and scribal traditions, spanning Devanagari, Nastaliq, and dozens of regional scripts, yet calligraphy remains almost entirely absent from its formal school education. This paper argues that calligraphy deserves recognition as a living Indian Knowledge System and a high-value instrument of art-integrated pedagogy under the National Education Policy 2020. Methodologically, the paper is a conceptual and practice-informed policy analysis combining narrative literature synthesis, policy document analysis, comparative curricular analysis of Japan and China, and reflective practitioner evidence; it distinguishes throughout between published research findings, conceptual inference, practitioner observation, and proposal. The argument rests on three pillars. First, policy alignment: NEP 2020 explicitly mandates art-integrated, experiential learning and the infusion of Indian Knowledge Systems across the curriculum, and the National Curriculum Framework for School Education 2023 and CBSE's art-integration circulars provide the operative implementation machinery, creating a natural institutional home for structured calligraphy education. Second, cognitive evidence: recent neuroscience, including high-density EEG studies of children and young adults, demonstrates that writing by hand produces far more elaborate brain connectivity patterns than typing, supporting memory, attention, and fine motor development in the developing brain; this evidence is treated here as mechanistic rationale for structured script practice rather than as demonstrated outcomes of calligraphy instruction. Third, global precedent: Japan retains shosha and shodo within its national elementary curriculum, and China's Ministry of Education made calligraphy a required course in primary and middle schools in 2013, positioning script practice as both cultural transmission and cognitive training. India, despite an older and more diverse scribal heritage, has no comparable framework. Drawing on the author's practice-based experience designing calligraphy curricula, teacher training programmes, and school partnerships through The Calligraphy Foundation, the paper proposes an implementable model for integrating calligraphy into Indian classrooms: an age-graded progression organised as a national layer of common, script-independent competencies and a regionally adaptable script layer responsive to India's multiscrypt ecology, art-integrated lesson design linked to language and heritage learning, and a teacher capacity-building pipeline consistent with NEP structures. The framework is explicitly practice-derived and provisional,



and requires empirical validation. The paper concludes that calligraphy education offers India a rare triple return: preservation of endangered script heritage, developmental benefit for learners, and a culturally rooted pathway for operationalising the IKS vision of NEP 2020 within everyday schooling.

Keywords: Calligraphy education, NEP 2020, Indian Knowledge Systems, art-integrated pedagogy, multiscript pedagogy, script heritage

1. Introduction

Writing is among the oldest and most consequential technologies of Indian civilisation. From the Brahmi inscriptions of the Mauryan period to the manuscript cultures of palm leaf and birch bark, from the calligraphic refinement of Nastaliq under Indo-Persian patronage to the disciplined letterforms of Devanagari, Sharada, Grantha, and dozens of regional scripts, India developed not merely systems of notation but sophisticated traditions of the written form as an object of knowledge, aesthetics, and transmission. The scribe, the lipikara, and the katib occupied recognised positions within Indian knowledge ecosystems, and the training of the writing hand was understood as intellectual and artistic formation, not clerical routine.

Contemporary Indian schooling has largely lost this inheritance. Handwriting is treated as a functional skill to be acquired incidentally in early primary years and thereafter ignored, or is approached through informal channels such as commercial handwriting improvement classes and graphology, neither of which engages the artistic, cognitive, or heritage dimensions of the written form. Calligraphy, where it survives, does so as a decorative hobby or a professional niche in design, rather than as a structured educational discipline with a defined pedagogy, progression, and teacher preparation pathway.

This paper argues that this neglect is both an educational loss and a missed policy opportunity. The National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) mandates art-integrated and experiential learning across the curriculum and calls for the systematic infusion of Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS) into schooling (Ministry of Human Resource Development [MHRD], 2020). Calligraphy sits precisely at the intersection of these two mandates: it is simultaneously an art form, a heritage practice, a language-linked discipline, and, as a growing body of neuroscience suggests, a powerful stimulus for the developing brain. The paper develops this argument through three evidence pillars (policy alignment, cognitive research, and international precedent), integrates practitioner evidence from The Calligraphy Foundation, an Indian organisation working in this field since 2021, and proposes an implementable framework for bringing calligraphy into Indian classrooms.

The central research objective is therefore to establish calligraphy as a legitimate instrument of art-integrated pedagogy and a living Indian Knowledge System under NEP 2020, and to translate that argument into a practical model for schools. Three research questions organise this objective. RQ1: To what extent can structured calligraphic practice be theoretically and institutionally situated within art-integrated learning and Indian Knowledge Systems under contemporary Indian education policy? RQ2: What evidence from handwriting research, calligraphic studies, and international curricular models supports the educational consideration of structured script practice, and what are the limits of that evidence? RQ3: What curricular and teacher preparation framework could support the context-sensitive integration of calligraphy within Indian schools? Sections 4 to 7 address RQ1 and RQ2, Sections 8 and 9 address RQ3, and Section 10 returns to each question explicitly.



The paper is a conceptual and practice-based contribution. It does not report controlled empirical findings; where classroom experience is invoked, it is explicitly framed as practitioner observation, and directions for future empirical research are identified.

2. Conceptual Definitions and Evidentiary Boundaries

The argument depends on distinctions that everyday usage blurs, so the paper's key terms are fixed at the outset. Handwriting denotes the everyday production of legible script for functional communication. Penmanship denotes the disciplined cultivation of regular, well-formed everyday handwriting. Calligraphy denotes the deliberate artistic practice of letterforms as a discipline, involving formal knowledge of a script's construction, tools, rhythm, proportion, and composition, and pursued for aesthetic, expressive, and cultural ends beyond functional legibility. Script study denotes analytical engagement with writing systems, their structures, and their histories. Script heritage denotes the accumulated traditions, artefacts, practices, and transmitted skills surrounding a community's writing systems. Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), as used in NEP 2020, denotes India's traditions of knowledge in the sciences, arts, and practices, together with their characteristic modes of transmission. Art-integrated learning, following CBSE usage, denotes a cross-curricular pedagogy in which artistic processes serve as the medium for learning concepts across subjects, as distinct from standalone art instruction.

These distinctions carry evidentiary weight, and the paper maintains them throughout. Research on handwriting concerns handwriting; it can inform the theoretical rationale for calligraphy education because the two practices share manual letter production, but it is not direct evidence about calligraphy instruction, which involves distinct tools, aims, and levels of formal control. Conversely, evidence about calligraphy within one script tradition is not automatically evidence about another. Accordingly, the cognitive literature reviewed in Section 4 is treated as mechanistic rationale, the Chinese calligraphy literature as suggestive rather than generalisable to Indian scripts, and practitioner material as hypothesis-generating rather than evaluative.

3. Methodological Approach

This study is a conceptual policy analysis informed by narrative literature synthesis, comparative curricular analysis, and reflective practitioner evidence. It is not, and does not present itself as, a controlled empirical intervention study.

The literature synthesis drew on peer-reviewed research on handwriting and neural engagement, research on Chinese calligraphic handwriting, foundational art education theory, and heritage education frameworks. Sources were selected for their direct bearing on the mechanisms, outcomes, or frameworks invoked in the argument, and every empirical claim is tied to its specific study population and task. The policy analysis examined NEP 2020, the National Curriculum Framework for School Education 2023 (NCF-SE 2023), and CBSE circulars on art-integrated learning, as the operative documents governing where a new curricular component could enter Indian schooling. Japan and China were selected for comparative analysis because they are the two large systems that institutionalise calligraphic or script practice within national curricula, offering contrasting models of curricular location and purpose against which India's absence can be analysed; they are compared across curricular location, learner stage, pedagogical objective, teacher preparation, and cultural purpose.



Practitioner evidence derives from the educational work of The Calligraphy Foundation between September 2021 and mid-2026, spanning school workshops, adult professional programmes, teacher training, and collaborations with universities and cultural institutions. Observations were accumulated reflectively by the author and colleagues during teaching, and documented photographically; systematic assessment instruments, writing-sample protocols, and structured feedback collection were not employed during this period, a limitation stated plainly in Section 10. Throughout the paper, practitioner material is kept rhetorically separate from published findings. The study claims to establish a defensible rationale, a policy mapping, and a provisional framework; it does not claim to establish causal educational effects.

4. Literature Review

Because the argument draws on several kinds of evidence of differing strength, the review is organised against an explicit evidence architecture, set out in Table 1, which specifies what each level of evidence can and cannot establish. The stratification is applied consistently in the sections that follow.

Table 1. Evidence architecture of the study.

Level	Evidence type and examples	What it can and cannot establish
Level A	Mechanistic evidence: manual letter production, visual-motor engagement, neural activation during handwriting (James & Engelhardt, 2012; Askvik et al., 2020; Van der Weel & Van der Meer, 2024; Mangen & Velay, 2010)	Can establish plausible mechanisms of cognitive and motor engagement. Cannot by itself establish educational achievement or outcomes of calligraphy instruction.
Level B	Proximal educational outcomes: letter recognition, handwriting fluency, visual attention, motor control, structured writing behaviour (James & Engelhardt, 2012; Mueller & Oppenheimer, 2014; Kao, 2006)	Can be discussed where directly evidenced, tied to the specific population, script, and task studied. Transfer across scripts and settings requires validation.
Level C	Distal educational outcomes: memory, creativity, academic achievement, cultural belonging, long-term development	Treated with substantial caution. Presented only as propositions or directions for future research, not as established effects of calligraphy education.

4.1 Handwriting and the developing brain

A substantial body of research in cognitive neuroscience and educational psychology indicates that the act of writing by hand engages the brain in ways that typing does not. Embodied cognition research frames writing as a perceptual-sensorimotor process in which manual action and perception are reciprocally dependent (Mangen & Velay, 2010). James and Engelhardt (2012) found that in pre-literate five-year-old children, brain regions associated with the “reading circuit” were recruited during letter perception only after children had practised printing letters by hand; typing and tracing the same letters did not produce this effect. This suggests that the self-generated motor act of forming letterforms contributes directly to the neural foundations of literacy.



High-density EEG research extends this finding into later childhood and adulthood. Askvik, van der Weel, and van der Meer (2020), studying twelve-year-old children and young adults, found that handwriting produced far more elaborate and widespread brain connectivity patterns than keyboard writing, in networks associated with learning and memory. A subsequent study confirmed that handwriting, but not typewriting, leads to widespread connectivity in theta and alpha bands across parietal and central regions, and its authors explicitly recommended that children receive a minimum of handwriting instruction in school (Van der Weel & Van der Meer, 2024). In parallel, Mueller and Oppenheimer (2014) demonstrated that university students taking notes by hand showed stronger conceptual understanding than those typing, indicating that the benefits of the writing hand persist well beyond initial literacy acquisition. Consistent with Table 1, these studies concern handwriting rather than calligraphy, and establish neural and behavioural engagement rather than demonstrated outcomes of calligraphy instruction; they are invoked here as mechanistic rationale for structured script practice.

4.2 Calligraphy as disciplined practice: evidence from the Chinese tradition

Research on Chinese calligraphic handwriting (CCH), associated principally with Henry S. R. Kao, provides the closest empirical analogue to what structured calligraphy education might offer. Across several decades of studies, CCH practice has been associated with heightened visual attention and concentration, physiological slowdown (decelerated respiration and heart rate), emotional relaxation, and improvements in selective attention, with applications reported in educational and therapeutic settings (Kao, 2006; Kao, Xu, & Kao, 2021). While this literature concerns the Chinese brush tradition specifically, its underlying mechanism, namely sustained attentional control exercised through precise, rhythmic movement, is common to calligraphic practice across scripts, including Devanagari and the broad-edge and pointed-pen traditions taught in India. That transfer is an assumption requiring empirical test rather than a finding; it remains an open empirical question, and is identified in Section 10 as a priority for future research.

4.3 Art education theory and the case for art integration

The theoretical case for arts in education is long established. Read (1943) argued that art should be the basis of education because aesthetic activity integrates perception, feeling, and intellect in the growing child. Dewey (1934) located artistic experience at the centre of meaningful learning, and Eisner (2002) demonstrated that the arts cultivate distinctive cognitive capacities, including qualitative judgement, attention to nuance, and the ability to work within constraints. Calligraphy exemplifies these capacities with unusual clarity: the calligrapher works within the strict constraints of a script's ductus while exercising judgement over rhythm, proportion, and composition. Art integration, as distinct from standalone art instruction, uses artistic processes as a pedagogical medium for learning across subjects. Calligraphy is naturally art-integrative because its subject matter is language itself: letterforms connect directly to phonology, orthography, literature, history, and cultural studies.

4.4 Script heritage as intangible cultural heritage and Indian Knowledge System

UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) recognises knowledge, skills, and practices transmitted across generations as heritage requiring active safeguarding, with education named as a principal instrument. India's scribal and calligraphic traditions meet this definition precisely: they are embodied skills, transmitted historically through guru-shishya



and ustad-shagird lineages, and several are now endangered as professional scribal communities decline. Scholarship on Indian palaeography and manuscript culture documents the depth of these traditions, yet there has been little systematic effort to translate them into contemporary pedagogy. Within the IKS framework of NEP 2020, which encompasses Indian arts, crafts, and knowledge transmission systems, calligraphy has a strong claim to recognition; it is a living knowledge tradition with historical depth, a defined body of technique, and contemporary applicability.

This claim is made analytically rather than by label. Scholarship on knowledge traditions identifies recurring characteristics: embodied skill acquired through prolonged practice; a technical vocabulary; transmission through apprenticeship and sustained teacher-learner relationships; intergenerational continuity; codified material knowledge of tools and surfaces; and cultural situatedness, in which the practice carries meaning beyond its immediate function. Indian scribal and calligraphic traditions exhibit each characteristic: the training of the scribal hand was embodied and prolonged; traditions surrounding Devanagari, Sharada, Grantha, and other scripts developed technical vocabularies of stroke and form; the lipikara of manuscript culture and the katib of Indo-Persian scribal culture learned within recognised apprenticeship structures; manuscript production encoded material knowledge of palm leaf, birch bark, paper, inks, and reeds; and the written word carried religious, courtly, and communal significance far beyond notation.

The Indian case is distinctive in its plurality. The Brahmi lineage alone gave rise to script families spanning Devanagari, Bengali, Gurmukhi, Gujarati, Odia, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam, each with its own formal logic and manuscript aesthetic, while the Perso-Arabic tradition produced highly refined calligraphic cultures in Urdu, Persian, and Arabic, sustained by professional katibs into the twentieth century. The arrival of print, and later of digital composition, progressively displaced these professional communities without any compensating transfer of their knowledge into the education system. What was once transmitted through structured apprenticeship now survives largely in individual practitioners and family lineages. This is exactly the condition of endangerment that the UNESCO framework anticipates, and exactly the condition in which formal education becomes the decisive instrument of safeguarding. The historical outline given here follows the established general narrative of Indian palaeographic and manuscript scholarship; the paper does not itself contribute historical research, and finer-grained historical claims are deliberately avoided.

An emerging Indian instructional literature shows both the vitality of practice and the precise location of the gap. Aksharaya, an organisation devoted to Indic letterforms, has produced instruction manuals for calligraphy across nine Indian scripts, including Devanagari, Urdu, Gujarati, Gurmukhi, Kannada, Bangla, Tamil, Malayalam, and Odia, covering tools, guidelines, basic strokes, and letter construction (Aksharaya, n.d.). Palav (2021), in a structured workbook format, takes the learner of Devanagari calligraphy from foundational strokes to commercial application. These materials demonstrate that codified, teachable Indian calligraphy pedagogy exists. What they address, however, is the individual learner and enthusiast; none is framed for school curriculum integration, teacher preparation, or staged progression across grades. The present paper is positioned exactly at that unoccupied junction between practitioner codification and the education system.



5. Policy Context: NEP 2020, NCF-SE 2023, Art Integration, and Indian Knowledge Systems

NEP 2020 provides an unusually hospitable policy environment for calligraphy education. Three provisions are directly relevant. First, the policy defines art-integration as a cross-curricular pedagogical approach that uses art and culture as the basis for learning concepts across subjects, and directs that art-integrated education be embedded in classroom transactions at every level, both for joyful learning and for imbibing the Indian ethos (MHRD, 2020). Second, the policy mandates the incorporation of Indian Knowledge Systems across the curriculum, including Indian arts and traditions of knowledge transmission. Third, its emphasis on experiential learning, multidisciplinary, and vocational exposure from the middle stage creates space for skill-based disciplines taught through practice.

Implementation machinery already exists. The National Curriculum Framework for School Education 2023 operationalises this architecture, establishing art education as a curricular area directed at creativity, aesthetic sensibility, and cultural literacy, and organising secondary schooling into subject groups in which art education holds a defined place (NCERT, 2023). The Central Board of Secondary Education introduced Art-Integrated Learning in affiliated schools through Circular Acad-12/2019, issued detailed guidelines through Circular Acad-22/2019, and made art-integrated project work mandatory for Classes I to X through Circular Acad-33/2020 (CBSE, 2019, 2020). NCERT has also published stage-wise guidelines for art-integrated learning. What is absent is not the mandate but the content pipeline: schools are asked to integrate art but are given few structured, culturally rooted disciplines with defined progressions and trained teachers through which to do so. Calligraphy can fill exactly this gap. A calligraphy module simultaneously serves the art-integration requirement, the IKS requirement, and the language curriculum, an alignment few other art forms achieve as directly. The policy question is therefore not whether space exists but where precisely a calligraphy component would enter. Table 2 maps each component of the framework proposed in Section 9 to its pedagogical purpose, curricular location, and enabling provision. The mapping shows that no new curricular category is required: every component attaches to an existing provision.

Table 2. Mapping of proposed calligraphy components to India's existing curricular architecture.

Proposed component	Pedagogical purpose	Curricular location	Relevant policy provision
Foundational script practice (movement, stroke, spacing, legibility)	Structured graphomotor and visual organisation skills	Language classes, Preparatory and Middle stages	NEP 2020 experiential learning; NCF-SE 2023 language curricular area
Script heritage modules (regional and classical scripts)	Cultural literacy and heritage understanding	Art education; social science linkages	NEP 2020 IKS infusion; NCF-SE 2023 cultural literacy aims in art education
Art-integrated calligraphy projects	Cross-curricular learning through artistic process	Mandatory art-integrated project work, Classes I to X	CBSE Circulars Acad-12/2019, Acad-22/2019, Acad-33/2020
Calligraphy as elective discipline	Sustained artistic and pre-vocational development	Secondary stage optional group	NCF-SE 2023 art education group; NEP 2020 vocational exposure



Proposed component	Pedagogical purpose	Curricular location	Relevant policy provision
Teacher preparation modules	Capacity for delivery at each stage	In-service training; B.Ed. electives	NEP 2020 continuous professional development provisions

6. Global Precedents: Japan and China

International comparison shows that treating script practice as a curricular discipline is neither novel nor impractical; two of the world's largest education systems already do so.

In Japan, shosha (structured penmanship and brush writing) is embedded within the national language curriculum at the elementary and lower secondary levels under the national Course of Study issued by MEXT, and shodo (artistic calligraphy) continues as an elective and as one of the most widespread school club activities (MEXT, 2017). Japanese practice is instructive in two respects: script instruction is located inside the language subject rather than treated as an optional art, and it persists throughout compulsory schooling rather than ending in early primary years.

In China, the Ministry of Education issued guidelines in 2013 requiring calligraphy education in primary and middle schools, with dedicated weekly instruction in the senior primary grades and elective provision at senior secondary level; the policy was framed explicitly as a response to declining handwriting in the digital era and as cultural transmission (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2013). The Chinese case demonstrates that a state can deliberately re-institutionalise calligraphy at scale, addressing teacher supply through training mandates and standardised materials.

The comparative point for India is pointed. Neither system is script-simple: Japanese writing combines kanji with two kana syllabaries, and Chinese schooling operates across a standard script and considerable regional linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, both systems could institutionalise script practice around a single shared national writing standard. India's situation is structurally different: a federal education system serving many official scripts, in which no single script sequence could be nationally appropriate. Japan and China each sustain curricular calligraphy on the foundation of essentially one dominant script tradition, whereas India, with a far older and more diverse scribal heritage spanning multiple script families, has no equivalent framework at any level of schooling. The instructive comparison is therefore between two relatively centralised curricular solutions and India's multilingual, multiscript ecology, which requires an adaptable model rather than a transplanted one. The gap is not one of heritage or of policy intent, both of which India possesses in abundance, but of institutional design: progression models, teaching materials, and trained teachers. This structural difference directly motivates the two-layer design proposed in Section 9.

7. The Indian Gap: Between Heritage and Classroom

Three features characterise the current Indian situation. First, invisibility in curriculum: no Indian board prescribes calligraphy or structured script study at any stage, and handwriting instruction typically ends by Grade 3 without technical foundation in stroke, rhythm, or form. Second, distorted public framing: in the absence of an educational discipline, public engagement with handwriting in India has been channelled into commercial handwriting improvement services and graphology, framings that treat



writing as remediation or personality inference rather than as art, skill, and heritage. Third, absence of a teacher pipeline: art teachers receive no preparation in calligraphic technique or pedagogy, so even willing schools lack the human capacity to deliver instruction. Any credible integration model must therefore address curriculum design, public reframing, and teacher preparation together.

The persistence of this gap has identifiable structural causes. Indian school curricula inherited a colonial-era hierarchy in which drawing and penmanship were subordinate clerical skills rather than intellectual disciplines, and the intense examination orientation of contemporary schooling leaves little room for practices whose benefits are developmental rather than immediately testable. Art education itself remains under-resourced, with many schools lacking dedicated art teachers at all; a discipline requiring specific technical preparation is doubly disadvantaged. These constraints are real, but they are also precisely the constraints NEP 2020 was written to address, through its rebalancing of curriculum toward experiential learning and its explicit protection of arts and heritage content. It is against this triple gap, and this newly favourable policy climate, that the practitioner evidence in the next section should be read.

8. Practitioner Evidence: The Calligraphy Foundation

The arguments above would remain abstract without evidence that structured calligraphy education can actually be designed, taught, and received well in Indian institutional settings. This section presents the work of The Calligraphy Foundation (TCF) as practitioner evidence. The author is the founder of the organisation; the account that follows is offered transparently as practice-based experience and reflective observation, not as independent evaluation. Consistent with Table 1, the material in this section is hypothesis-generating rather than evaluative, and the positionality risks it carries are addressed in Section 10.3.

8.1 Organisational context

The Calligraphy Foundation, established in September 2021 and headquartered in New Delhi, works to promote awareness, education, structured learning, and professional development in calligraphy. Since its establishment, it has trained approximately fifty calligraphy teachers through its six-month Calligraphy Teacher Training Programme (CTTP), reached more than five thousand learners through workshops, professional programmes, and community initiatives, and collaborated with approximately seven to eight universities and numerous schools, principally across Delhi NCR. School workshops have been conducted in approximately fifty schools across Delhi; a typical workshop engages around fifty students, and schools frequently invite repeat batches, so that a single school may see two hundred to two hundred and fifty students taught across several sessions. Beyond schools, workshops have been conducted with the National Book Trust during its camps and events, and at the Rashtrapati Bhavan Museum, where participation has often exceeded eighty participants per session. Through its teacher network, the organisation's learning community now extends to Bengaluru, Hyderabad, other parts of Karnataka, Punjab, and additional regions. These figures are approximate and are cited to indicate scale of practice rather than as audited metrics.



8.2 Teaching model and programme structure

TCF teaches a deliberately plural range of scripts and styles: monoline calligraphy, brush pen calligraphy, Copperplate (English Roundhand), Italic, Devanagari calligraphy, regional Indian scripts, and other specialised styles. This plurality is pedagogically significant: it demonstrates that Indian and Western script traditions can be taught within a single progressive framework, moving from monoline foundations (stroke, rhythm, spacing) toward scripts demanding greater tool control and formal knowledge. Learners include art teachers, school educators, women restarting professional careers, beginners, aspiring calligraphy teachers, graphic designers, visual communication professionals, artists, and design students. Professional programmes admit learners from eighteen years; school programmes begin from Grade 4, at approximately nine years of age. This entry point is itself a finding of practice: TCF has conducted sessions for children as young as four, and observed consistently that learners below approximately nine years require a substantially different teaching approach, as the technical concepts of stroke, proportion, and spacing are comparatively difficult for them to grasp. The Grade 4 threshold adopted in the framework of Section 9 therefore rests on repeated classroom experience; it is proposed on that basis, not validated. Faculty development draws on sustained study with international master calligraphers across scripts, including a mentor specialising in the history of Roman calligraphy, alongside continuing engagement with the international calligraphy community and its instructional literature.

Programme architecture is differentiated by learner need: the six-month CTP for teacher preparation; foundation and mastery programmes of approximately four months; and institutional workshops custom-designed from single-day formats to intensive modules of fifteen to twenty days. Customised modules of this kind have been delivered at institutions including Chitkara University and Banaras Hindu University. The existence of a functioning teacher training programme is particularly relevant to the policy argument of this paper, since teacher supply is the binding constraint on any curricular integration of calligraphy in India.

8.3 Educational and cultural collaborations

TCF's institutional engagements, described here as educational and cultural collaborations rather than formal research partnerships, indicate growing institutional receptivity to calligraphy education in India. The organisation has conducted multiple workshops introducing university students to calligraphy at Delhi Technological University; has held workshops, seminars, artist demonstrations, and exhibitions at the Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts (IGNCA); and has conducted workshops at the National Museum, New Delhi, which later collaborated on Akshar Mahotsav, a flagship TCF initiative celebrating letterforms that has contributed substantially to public awareness of calligraphy education in India. Additional engagements include the National Institute of Fashion Technology (NIFT), Pearl Academy, Chitkara University, Banaras Hindu University, the National Book Trust, the Rashtrapati Bhavan Museum, and numerous schools across Delhi NCR, among them Ramjas School, through its Summer School programme, and Bal Bharati Public School, which has invited the organisation on three to four occasions; such repeat invitations are themselves an indicator of perceived value, though of perceived value rather than of measured learning effectiveness. Akshar Mahotsav, held annually since 2022 and reaching its fifth edition in 2026, features multiple workshops and sessions across aspects of calligraphy and lettering, attracts an overall footfall of approximately 2,500 to 3,000 visitors, and has served as a platform for launching new Indian calligraphy publications. These engagements are



conducted on an invitation basis; the organisation has not yet entered into formal memoranda of understanding, a gap acknowledged in Section 10 as a next step in institutional maturation. That national cultural institutions of this standing have repeatedly hosted calligraphy programming nonetheless suggests that the heritage claim advanced in this paper resonates within India's own cultural establishment.

8.4 Classroom observations from school practice

TCF conducts handwriting and introductory calligraphy workshops in schools, with the objective of introducing students and teachers to structured handwriting, movement, rhythm, spacing, stroke control, and artistic letterforms. School sessions typically run thirty to forty minutes within the school timetable, for students from Grade 4 upward, in ordinary classrooms without specialised materials. This constraint has itself shaped the pedagogy toward focused, single-concept sessions, and it is analytically informative: any curricular framework for Indian schools must function within short periods, large classes, and minimal equipment, and the framework of Section 9 is designed accordingly. Instruction is deliberately participatory: students ask questions, discuss difficulties encountered with particular scripts, and receive individual guidance within the session. The following observations, drawn reflectively from this practice and documented photographically rather than through systematic assessment records, are practitioner observations; they are not statistically validated findings, and they are offered as grounded hypotheses for the future research agenda set out in Section 10.

Across school workshops, facilitators consistently observed that students grew visibly more confident in their writing over the course of even short programmes, and that most students had never previously been introduced to the technical foundations of letterforms: that strokes have direction and order, that spacing and rhythm can be taught, and that legibility is a learnable structure rather than an innate trait. Teachers frequently remarked that they had not previously encountered a systematic pedagogy for handwriting and calligraphy, and expressed appreciation for the structured methodology, suggesting that the absence identified in Section 7 is felt within schools themselves. Principals and school leaders responded to the programmes as an innovative educational initiative developed in India, indicating institutional openness at the leadership level.

Perhaps the most significant observation concerns reframing. Participants typically arrived viewing handwriting either as a purely functional activity or through the lens of graphology; through the workshops, many began to view calligraphy instead as an educational discipline that develops legibility, motor control, aesthetic awareness, and creative expression. This observed shift in understanding is precisely the conceptual move this paper argues Indian education policy should make at the system level.

These observations generate testable hypotheses rather than conclusions: that structured script instruction from approximately Grade 4 is developmentally better matched than earlier introduction; that short, regular, single-concept sessions can produce measurable gains in legibility and writing fluency; and that structured calligraphy exposure shifts student and teacher conceptions of writing. None has been tested; together they define the empirical agenda of Section 10.5.

9. A Proposed Framework for Integration

Drawing together the policy analysis, research evidence, international precedent, and practice experience above, this section proposes a three-component framework for integrating calligraphy into Indian schooling. The framework is designed to be implementable within existing NEP structures rather than requiring new curricular categories. It is provisional and practice-derived, and requires empirical validation; nothing in it should be read as scientifically established.

Component 1: Age-graded, two-layer script progression. The design premise follows from Section 6: India requires an adaptable model rather than a single national script sequence. The progression is therefore organised in two layers. The national foundational layer specifies competencies that are script-independent: posture, grip, tool handling, stroke direction and order, movement and rhythm, spacing, legibility, proportion, composition, and visual organisation. The regional script layer specifies the script content through which those competencies are exercised, and is deliberately left to regional determination, responsive to linguistic context, cultural context, and local script heritage. A learner in Punjab might progress through Gurmukhi, a learner in Kerala through Malayalam, a learner in Bengal through Bangla, each acquiring the same foundational competencies through different letterforms. Instruction should begin at Grade 4, once foundational literacy and fine motor readiness are established, and proceed from monoline foundations to scripts of increasing technical demand. Table 3 outlines an indicative progression derived from TCF's practice model.

Table 3. Indicative two-layer, age-graded calligraphy progression for Indian schools (derived from The Calligraphy Foundation's practice model; practice-derived and requiring empirical validation).

Stage	Learner level	National foundational layer (common competencies)	Regional script layer (adaptable component)
Stage 1	Grades 4 to 5 (approx. 9 to 11 years)	Posture, grip, tool handling; stroke direction and order; rhythm and movement; spacing and legibility, through monoline forms	Letterforms of the child's first or regional language script (e.g., Devanagari, Gurmukhi in Punjab, Bangla in Bengal, Kannada in Karnataka), introduced through basic construction
Stage 2	Grades 6 to 8	Stroke contrast, proportion, composition; visual organisation; introduction to broad-edge tool behaviour	Regional script calligraphy deepened; exposure to a second Indian script; heritage modules linked to local manuscript and inscriptional traditions and to language and history learning
Stage 3	Grades 9 to 12	Advanced composition; comparative script analysis; design application; portfolio development	Specialisation by learner choice: regional script mastery, Devanagari or Nastaliq traditions, or comparative study including Italic and Copperplate as contrasting tool-and-form systems
Adult	18 years and above	Full competency range; pedagogy and professional development	Full script range; teacher training and certification pathway (e.g., six-month teacher training)



Two design choices require justification. First, the Grade 4 entry point derives from repeated practitioner experience (Section 8.2) and is consistent with the general developmental claim that technical script concepts presuppose established basic literacy; it is proposed, not validated, and stage boundaries should be treated as adjustable parameters in pilot studies. Second, the inclusion of Italic and Copperplate at Stage 3 within an IKS-oriented framework is deliberate and comparative rather than inconsistent: these traditions offer sharply contrasting tool behaviours, stroke modulation logics, and construction principles against which Indian scripts can be analytically compared, in the same way that language education profits from comparative grammar. The framework's centre of gravity remains Indian scripts.

Component 2: Art-integrated lesson design. Calligraphy modules should be designed as art-integrated learning in the CBSE sense, linked to language, history, and heritage content: writing poetry being studied in the language class, rendering historical scripts encountered in the history syllabus, and undertaking script heritage projects that satisfy the mandatory art-integrated project requirement of Circular Acad-33/2020. This positions calligraphy not as an additional subject competing for timetable space but as a delivery medium for existing curriculum, the design principle most likely to secure school adoption.

Component 3: Teacher capacity pipeline. No integration can outrun teacher supply. The framework therefore proposes a three-tier pipeline: short orientation modules for serving art and language teachers to deliver Stage 1 foundational content; certificate-level preparation on the model of TCF's six-month CTP; and, in time, elective papers in calligraphy pedagogy within B.Ed. and fine arts programmes at partner universities. The feasibility of the middle tier is demonstrated by the approximately fifty teachers already trained through CTP; the university collaborations described in Section 8 indicate plausible institutional homes for the third tier. The scalability and quality assurance of all three tiers remain open implementation research questions.

Assessment within this framework should be process-oriented and portfolio-based, consistent with NEP 2020's shift toward competency-based and formative assessment and with the direction of NCF-SE 2023. Learners would maintain a practice portfolio documenting progression in stroke control, consistency, spacing, and composition, assessed against stage-appropriate descriptors rather than a single terminal product. This approach honours the nature of calligraphy as a discipline of gradual refinement, gives teachers a workable instrument that does not add examination burden, and generates exactly the longitudinal record of learner development that the future research agenda in Section 10.5 requires.

For future versions of this framework, a schematic figure showing the three components converging on the classroom would strengthen presentation, and is recommended for the journal-length development of this paper.

10. Discussion, Limitations, Ethics, and Research Agenda

10.1 Findings in relation to the research questions

On RQ1, the analysis indicates that structured calligraphic practice can be coherently situated within contemporary Indian policy. Analytically, Indian calligraphic traditions satisfy the recurring characteristics of an Indian Knowledge System (Section 4.4); institutionally, every component of the proposed framework maps onto an existing provision of NEP 2020, NCF-SE 2023, or CBSE's art-



integration machinery (Section 5, Table 2). The theoretical and institutional situation is therefore strong, and the barrier is content and capacity rather than policy space.

On RQ2, the supporting evidence is real but stratified. Mechanistic research establishes that manual letter production engages perception, motor action, and brain networks in distinctive ways; behavioural research ties manual production to proximal outcomes in specific populations; the Chinese calligraphy literature suggests attentional and affective benefits of disciplined script practice within its own tradition; and two national systems demonstrate institutional feasibility at scale. Together these provide a plausible basis for curricular consideration. They do not demonstrate educational outcomes of calligraphy instruction in Indian settings, and the paper's argument nowhere depends on pretending otherwise.

On RQ3, the two-layer framework with tiered teacher preparation constitutes the paper's constructive answer, and its principal originality lies in taking India's multiscript reality as a design foundation rather than an obstacle. Where Japan and China institutionalised script practice around shared national standards, the framework proposes uniform competencies with regionally determined script content, a structure with no international template. Its provisional character is not a weakness but its research value: it specifies exactly what pilot studies should test.

10.2 Limitations

The argument of this paper is deliberately conservative in its empirical claims and ambitious in its institutional ones. The cognitive evidence reviewed in Section 4 establishes that handwriting engages the developing brain in distinctive and educationally valuable ways, and the Chinese calligraphy literature suggests that disciplined script practice carries attentional and affective benefits; but no controlled study has yet examined calligraphy instruction in Indian schools using Indian scripts, and the transfer of Chinese calligraphy findings to Indian scripts is assumed as plausible rather than shown. The practitioner observations reported in Section 8 are consistent with the research literature, yet they remain observations: unblinded, unmeasured, and drawn from self-selected institutional settings. The historical argument rests on the established general narrative of Indian scribal culture and awaits fuller engagement with palaeographic scholarship.

Two organisational limitations should be stated plainly. First, TCF has not yet systematically collected before-and-after writing samples or structured feedback instruments; its documentation is photographic. Instituting a simple artefact-collection protocol, with consent, in forthcoming school workshops is the single cheapest step toward evidentiary strength and is planned as immediate practice. Second, institutional engagements have so far proceeded by invitation without formal memoranda of understanding; formalising at least one school and one university partnership would create the stable field sites that the research agenda below requires.

The principal limitation of the present paper is thus its evidentiary asymmetry: strong published evidence for handwriting in general, promising but non-Indian evidence for calligraphy specifically, and practice-based evidence only for the Indian case. The paper's contribution is to assemble these strands into a coherent policy argument and an implementable model, and to specify exactly which empirical work would confirm or correct it.



10.3 Ethics and positionality

The practitioner observations reported in Section 8 derive from ordinary educational activity: workshops delivered at the invitation of schools and institutions, under the supervision and permissions frameworks of the host institutions. No personally identifiable learner data, assessment records, or writing samples were collected or are reported, and no individual child is identified or described. Photographic documentation of workshops was undertaken within host institutions' usual permission practices. The future empirical work proposed below will require formal research ethics review, informed consent from parents or guardians, child assent, and data protection protocols, and is planned on that basis.

The author is the founder and managing director of The Calligraphy Foundation, whose work supplies the practitioner evidence and whose teacher training programme is cited as a feasibility prototype. This proximity creates evident risks of observer bias, confirmation bias, and institutional interest in the paper's conclusions. The paper manages these risks by declaring them, by confining practitioner material to hypothesis-generating status, by declining to report effectiveness claims, and by proposing that future empirical studies be conducted with independent university partners and independent outcome measurement.

10.4 Research agenda

Four lines of future research follow directly. First, controlled classroom studies of structured calligraphy instruction in Indian schools, measuring legibility, writing fluency, sustained attention, and attitudes toward writing, with appropriate comparison groups and independent assessors. Second, replication of the CCH attentional findings using Devanagari and at least one other Indian script, testing the transferability assumption identified in Section 4.2. Third, developmental studies of the proposed Grade 4 entry point and stage boundaries. Fourth, implementation research on the teacher pipeline: what preparation suffices for a serving art teacher to deliver Stage 1 instruction competently, and how is quality maintained at scale? Portfolio-based assessment, if adopted, would supply the longitudinal data infrastructure for much of this agenda. The Calligraphy Foundation's school network offers a natural field site for such studies, ideally in partnership with university education departments, and the author invites such collaboration.

11. Conclusion

India stands in an anomalous position: a civilisation with one of the deepest and most diverse scribal heritages in the world, a national education policy that explicitly demands art-integrated learning and the revival of Indian Knowledge Systems, and yet no place for calligraphy in its classrooms. This paper has argued that the anomaly is resolvable. The policy mandate exists in NEP 2020, NCF-SE 2023, and CBSE's implementation machinery; the cognitive case is supported by a growing neuroscience literature on the writing hand, treated here as mechanistic rationale rather than demonstrated effect; the institutional feasibility is demonstrated by Japan and China at system scale and, within India, by five years of practice through The Calligraphy Foundation across schools, universities, and national cultural institutions. What remains is deliberate institutional design: an age-graded, regionally adaptable progression, art-integrated lesson models, and a teacher pipeline, for which this paper has offered a concrete starting framework, provisional in status and specified precisely enough to be tested. Reintegrating the trained writing hand into Indian education would return to learners a discipline that



may develop attention, motor control, aesthetic judgement, and cultural belonging at once; few available interventions serve the letter and the spirit of NEP 2020 so completely.

References

- Aksharaya. (n.d.). Calligraphy instruction manuals for Indic scripts [Instructional series: Devanagari, Urdu, Gujarati, Gurmukhi, Kannada, Bangla, Tamil, Malayalam, and Odia]. Aksharaya.
- Askvik, E. O., van der Weel, F. R., & van der Meer, A. L. H. (2020). The importance of cursive handwriting over typewriting for learning in the classroom: A high-density EEG study of 12-year-old children and young adults. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1810.
- Central Board of Secondary Education. (2019). Art-Integrated Learning: Guidelines (Circulars Acad-12/2019 and Acad-22/2019). CBSE.
- Central Board of Secondary Education. (2020). Mandatory Art-Integrated Project work for Classes I to X (Circular Acad-33/2020). CBSE.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. Minton, Balch & Company.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. Yale University Press.
- James, K. H., & Engelhardt, L. (2012). The effects of handwriting experience on functional brain development in pre-literate children. *Trends in Neuroscience and Education*, 1(1), 32–42.
- Kao, H. S. R. (2006). Shufa: Chinese calligraphic handwriting (CCH) for health and behavioural therapy. *International Journal of Psychology*, 41(4), 282–286.
- Kao, H. S. R., Xu, M., & Kao, T. T. (2021). Calligraphy, psychology and the Confucian literati personality. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 33(1), 54–72.
- Mangen, A., & Velay, J.-L. (2010). Digitizing literacy: Reflections on the haptics of writing. In M. H. Zadeh (Ed.), *Advances in haptics* (pp. 385–401). IntechOpen.
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2013). Guidelines for calligraphy education in primary and secondary schools [中小学书法教育指导纲要]. MOE.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT). (2017). Course of Study for elementary schools [学習指導要領]. MEXT.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Government of India.
- Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note-taking. *Psychological Science*, 25(6), 1159–1168.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2023). National Curriculum Framework for School Education 2023. NCERT.
- Palav, A. (2021). *Devanagari B2C: Basic to commercial application of calligraphy*. Achyut Palav School of Calligraphy.
- Read, H. (1943). *Education through art*. Faber and Faber.
- UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*. UNESCO.
- Van der Weel, F. R., & Van der Meer, A. L. H. (2024). Handwriting but not typewriting leads to widespread brain connectivity: A high-density EEG study with implications for the classroom. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1219945.