

# GENERAL WELL-BEING OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS

By

**A.S. ARUL LAWRENCE**

*Assistant Professor, School of Education, Tamil Nadu Open University, Chennai, India.*

*Date Received: 12/12/2016*

*Date Revised: 03/02/2017*

*Date Accepted: 09/03/2017*

## **ABSTRACT**

*General well-being is the quality of life of a person/individual in terms of health, happiness and prosperity rather than wealth. The present study aims to probe the General Well-being of Higher Secondary Students. In this normative survey study, the investigator has selected a sample of 200 higher secondary school students who were studying 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> standards from four different schools in Cheranmahadevi Educational District, Tirunelveli by convenient sampling technique. General Well-Being Scale (GWBS) constructed and standardised by Kalia and Deswal (2011) was used for collecting data. The collected data were analyzed by using SPSS Package. For analysis, the data mean, standard deviation, t-test and ANOVA were employed as the statistical techniques. Findings show that higher secondary students significantly differ in their general well-being in terms of gender, location of school, type of school, and nature of school. They do not differ in their general well-being in terms of type of family.*

*Keywords: General Well-Being, General Wellness, Higher Secondary Students.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

The concept of well-being originated from positive psychology. The focus of positive psychology is to study the improvement in the lives of individuals. The term 'well-being' is mostly used for specific variety of goodness, e.g. living in a good environment being of worth for the world, being able to cope with life, enjoying life, etc. Well-being has been also defined as a dynamic state characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between individual's abilities, needs and expectation, and environmental demands of opportunities (Levi, 1987). Well-being is connotative as a harmonious satisfaction of once desire and goals (Checola, 1975). Shoben (1957) and Bremer (1996) suggest that there are intricate relationships among biological, social, emotional, and spiritual ingredients which form footing for well-being.

General well-being as a construct refers to the harmonious functioning of the physical as well as psychological aspects of the personality, giving satisfaction to the self and benefit to the society (Siwach, 2000). General Well-Being is defined as encompassing people's cognitive and effective evaluations of their lives

(Karatzias, et al., 2006). Other terms have been used, interchangeably with the general well-being term, included health (Emmons and King, 1988) and quality of life (Wikipedia).

## **1. Review of Related Studies**

Parmar (2016) found that there is a significant difference in the general well-being among male and female students in the field of performing arts. It means that the general well-being of male students is better than that of female students in the field of performing arts. Meena (2015) found that there is no significant difference of general well-being between arts and commerce students of rural area and there no significant difference of general well-being between arts and commerce students of urban area of senior secondary schools. Another finding indicates that there is significant difference of general well-being of students of rural and urban area of senior secondary schools. Maharishi & Kumar (2013) found that emotional intelligence is not significantly related to general well-being of government welfare residential school children, there is no significant difference in emotional intelligence and general well-being of

students based on their gender of government welfare residential school children. Baskaran, et al. (2013) found that there is a significant difference in general well-being of school students among different communities. Singh & Udainiya (2009a) found that neither family type nor gender had significant effect on the measure of well-being. Mitra (2015) found that general well-being was positively correlated with positive cognitive emotion regulation, presence of meaning in life, and the 11 of the 12 ego functions. Tiwari & Ojha (2014) found that there is a significant difference between boys and girls in their general well-being. Gujral, et al. (2012) found that there is a significant correlation between Emotional Intelligence and general well-being. Karatzias, et al. (2006) found that age and gender were not significantly associated with general well-being. Karatzias (2006) found that there is a positive association between age and well-being.

## 2. Need for the Study

Adolescence is a vital stage of physical and mental growth of the human body and indicates the transitional period from childhood to adulthood. It is characterized by rapid changes in the overall aspects of the individual personality such as physical, mental, emotional, social, and moral facets. It is a time that requires attention, protection and meeting of special needs of adolescents. When needs are unmet during this phase, it affects the individual, family, community, society, and nation at large. Well-being is a concept that encompasses a well-rounded, balanced, and comprehensive experience of life. It includes health in social, physical, mental, emotional, career, and spiritual domains (Wilner, 2011). Feelings of well-being are fundamental to the overall health of an individual, enabling them to successfully overcome difficulties and achieve what they want out of life. Past experiences, attitudes and outlook can all impact well-being as can physical or emotional trauma following specific incidents. Schools play a vital role in promoting the intellectual, physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development and well-being of adolescents, and in ensuring the nation's ongoing economic prosperity and social cohesion. Children with learning and developmental disorders may

experience considerably more stress than typically developing children and this can impact in their well-being. Schooling should not just be about academic outcomes, but that it is about well-being of the 'whole child'. The second is that students who have higher levels of well-being tend to have better cognitive outcomes at school. Many students get discouraged and depressed as their well-being is poor. Moreover, a person who enjoys well-being is more focused, organized and oriented towards their work in a positive approach. It focuses on areas related to coping self, creative self, essential self, physical self, and social self to determine how well a student interact with and function within their environment. Wellness contributes to academic achievement through a quality, safe learning and working environment. Therefore, the investigator tried to investigate a study on the below title.

## 3. Operational Definition of the Key Terms

- General Well-Being is the quality of life of a person/individual in terms of health, happiness, and prosperity rather than wealth. In this study, the investigator means the quality of higher secondary schools students' life in the physical, emotional, social, and school aspects.
- Higher Secondary Students refers to the students studying the Higher Secondary Course (HSC), i.e., 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> standards after the completion of their SSLC / 10<sup>th</sup> standard.

## 4. Objectives

- To find out whether there is any significant difference between boys and girls in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- To find out whether there is any significant difference between rural and urban school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- To find out whether there is any significant difference among government, government aided, and self-financing school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- To find out whether there is any significant difference between nuclear and joint family students in their

general well-being and its dimensions.

- To find out whether there is any significant difference among boys', girls' and co-education school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

## 5. Hypotheses

- **H<sub>0</sub>1:** There is no significant difference between boys and girls in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- **H<sub>0</sub>2:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- **H<sub>0</sub>3:** There is no significant difference among government, government aided and self-financing school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- **H<sub>0</sub>4:** There is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family students in their general well-being and its dimensions.
- **H<sub>0</sub>5:** There is no significant difference among boys', girls' and co-education school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

## 6. Methods and Procedures

In this normative survey study, the investigator has selected a sample of 200 higher secondary school students who were studying 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> standards from four different schools in Cheranmahadevi Educational District, Tirunelveli in the state of Tamil Nadu, India, by convenient sampling technique. For collecting data, General Well-Being Scale (GWBS) was used, which was constructed and standardised by Kalia and Deswal (2011). The scale consisted of 55 items represented in four subscales: physical well-being, emotional well-being, social well-being, and school well-being. It is a self-reported five point scale included positive and negative items ranging from 'strongly disagree', 'disagree', 'undecided', 'agree', and 'strongly agree'. Keeping in view, the objectives design of the study and the collected data were analyzed by using SPSS Package. For analysis, the data mean, standard deviation, t-test, and ANOVA were employed as the statistical techniques. The analysed data were analysed and tabulated as below:

## 7. Analysis of Data

- **H<sub>0</sub>1:** There is no significant difference between boys and girls in their general well-being and its dimensions.

It is inferred from Table 1 that, variable differed significantly with respect to gender of higher secondary students except the dimension of social well-being. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between boys and girls in their general well-being and its dimensions physical well-being, emotional well-being, and school well-being.

- **H<sub>0</sub>2:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

It is inferred from Table 2 that, variable differed significantly with respect to location of school of higher secondary students except the dimension of physical well-being and social well-being. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between rural and urban school students in their general well-being and its dimensions physical well-being, emotional well-being, and school well-being.

- **H<sub>0</sub>3:** There is no significant difference among

General Well-Being	Boys (N = 96)		Girls (N = 104)		t'-Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Physical Well-Being	42.13	6.720	40.22	5.811	2.148*
Emotional Well-Being	49.92	10.328	44.53	10.058	3.736**
Social Well-Being	66.34	10.745	64.34	11.026	1.302
School Well-Being	47.82	8.512	43.09	8.840	3.853**
Total	206.21	27.876	192.09	25.977	3.708**

\* - significant at 0.05 level    \*\*-Significant at 0.01 level

**Table 1. Significance Difference between Boys and Girls in their General Well-being and its Dimensions**

General Well-Being	Rural (N = 101)		Urban (N = 99)		t'-Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Physical Well-Being	41.83	6.295	40.42	6.299	1.580*
Emotional Well-Being	5.36	10.064	42.79	9.149	6.297**
Social Well-Being	66.64	10.173	63.93	11.505	0.079
School Well-Being	48.61	7.871	42.04	8.865	5.548**
Total	208.45	25.208	189.09	26.919	5.250**

\*\*-. Significant at 0.01 level

**Table 2. Significance difference between rural and urban school students in their general well-being and its dimensions**

General Well-Being	Type of School						F - value	Groups differed significantly
	Government (N = 71)		Govt. Aided (N = 65)		Self-finance (N = 64)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Physical Well-Being	40.42	6.228	41.52	6.416	41.53	6.355	0.697	None
Emotional Well-Being	49.34	10.728	48.32	10.475	43.42	9.433	6.280**	(1&3), (2&3)
Social Well-Being	63.39	9.991	67.14	11.422	65.55	11.178	2.043	(1&2)
School Well-Being	45.51	7.714	47.89	9.590	42.63	9.005	5.828**	(1&3), (2&3)
Total	198.66	24.903	204.88	29.950	192.98	27.574	3.024**	(2&3)

\* - Significant at 0.05 level \*\*Significant at 0.01 level

**Table 3. Significant Difference among Government, Government Aided and Self-financing School Students in their General Well-being and its Dimensions**

government, government aided, and self-financing school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

It is inferred from Table 3 that, variable differed significantly with respect to type of school of higher secondary students except the dimension of physical well-being. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference among government, government aided, and self-financing school students in their general well-being and its dimensions emotional

General Well-Being	Nuclear (N = 149)		Joint (N = 51)		t'-Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Physical Well-Being	41.68	6.034	39.53	6.906	2.120*
Emotional Well-Being	47.79	10.264	46.02	11.249	0.861
Social Well-Being	66.25	10.392	62.53	11.986	2.119*
School Well-Being	45.49	8.587	44.98	10.134	0.349
Total	200.85	26.732	193.06	30.073	1.740

\* - Significant at 0.05 level

**Table 4. Significance Difference between Students from Nuclear and Joint Family in their General Well-being and its Dimensions**

General Well-Being	Nature of School						F - value	Groups differed significantly
	Boys' (N = 75)		Girls' (N = 84)		Co-Education (N = 41)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Physical Well-Being	38.95	6.022	43.19	5.840	40.93	6.555	9.748**	(1&2), (2&3)
Emotional Well-Being	42.28	8.633	48.02	9.615	54.10	11.171	20.705**	(1&2), (2&3), (1,3)
Social Well-Being	62.53	10.859	67.93	10.191	64.98	11.385	5.066*	(1&2)
School Well-Being	42.36	8.496	46.61	9.287	48.29	7.747	7.657**	(1&2), (1,3)
Total	185.99	24.545	205.76	26.963	208.29	26.591	14.847**	(1&2), (1,3)

\* - Significant at 0.05 level \*\*Significant at 0.01 level

**Table 5. Significant Difference among Boys', Girls' and Co-education School Students in their General Well-being and its Dimensions**

well-being, social well-being and school well-being.

- $H_{04}$ : There is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

It is inferred from Table 4 that, variable not differed significantly with respect to type of family of higher secondary students except the dimensions of physical well-being and social well-being. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, there is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family students in their general well-being and its dimensions emotional well-being and school well-being.

- $H_{05}$ : There is no significant difference among boys', girls' and co-education school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

It is inferred from Table 5 that, variable differed significantly with respect to nature of school of higher secondary students. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference among

boys', girls' and co-education school students in their general well-being and its dimensions.

## 8. Findings and Discussion

There is a significant difference between boys and girls in their general well-being and its dimensions such as physical well-being, emotional well-being and school well-being. When the mean scores are compared, boys ( $M=206.21$ ) are better than girls ( $M=192.09$ ) in their general well-being. This may be due to the fact that boys have better physical self-concept than girls (Basque, 2009) and girls have the disorders stemming out from looks. This finding affirms the findings of Deswal & Sahni (2015), Zhang Yong, et al. (2015), Kakkar (2015) and contradicts the findings of Karatzias, et al. (2006), Singh and Udainiya (2009b), Maharishi and Kumar (2013), Baskaran, et al. (2013), Bhosale & Patankar (2014) and Vishal & Mahesh (2016).

There is a significant difference between rural and urban school students in their general well-being and its dimensions physical well-being, emotional well-being and school well-being. When the mean scores are compared, rural students ( $M=208.45$ ) are better than urban students ( $M=189.09$ ) in their general well-being. This may be due to the fact that rural students has the access to avail natural resources and they have the possibility to ensure sustainability of life that can lead to secure, healthy, stress-free and happiest life. Moreover, they are having the possibility to have cordial relationship with others due to the social setup of villages. This finding supports the findings of Deswal & Sahni (2015) and Sharma (2015) and opposes the finding of Baskaran, et al. (2013).

There is a significant difference among government, government aided, and self-financing school students in their general well-being and its dimensions emotional well-being, social well-being and school well-being. On comparing the mean scores, government aided school ( $M=204.88$ ) students are better than government ( $M=198.66$ ) and self-financing ( $192.98$ ) school students. This may be due to the fact that government school students may lack infrastructural facilities such as toilet, laboratory, classroom, etc., lack of participation in the co-

curricular (NSS, NCC, YRC, RRC, Nature Club, Sports, Students Parliament, Exhibition, etc.), and extra-curricular (educational tour, cultural events, etc.) activities and they are having more freedom. On the other hand, self-financing students even though got all the instructional and infrastructural facilities, active participation in the co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities; they are forced to concentrate on their studies in order to get high marks and they are always kept an eagle eye by the teachers and parents. Furthermore, they are demanded to crack the medical and engineering entrance examinations. Simultaneously, the students who are studying in government aided schools have all the facilities and have the freedom to do whatever they think, which leads to a happy and healthy life. This finding contravenes the finding of Vishal & Mahesh (2016).

There is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family students in their general well-being and its dimensions emotional well-being and school well-being. This finding corroborates the finding of Singh and Udainiya (2009).

There is a significant difference among boys', girls' and co-education school students in their general well-being and its dimensions. On comparing the mean scores, the students studying co-education ( $208.29$ ) schools are better than girls' ( $205.76$ ) and boys' ( $185.99$ ) schools. This may be due to the fact that, co-education is the most important all over the world because it brings healthy interaction and competition between boys and girls and helps to understand each other with confidence. It helps to breakdown the misconceptions of each sex about the other and provides an excellent foundation for the development of realistic, meaningful, and long-lasting relationships in their life. This finding supports the finding of Maharishi and Kumar (2013).

## Conclusion

From this study it is concluded that, higher secondary students significantly differ in their general well-being in terms of gender, location of school, type of school, and nature of school. They do not differ in their general well-being in terms of type of family. Girls are lower in their general well-being than the boys. The students from rural

area, government aided and co-education schools are better in their general well-being. According to Amato (1994), Young adults with low well-being may encounter lower levels of happiness, satisfaction, and self-esteem, while experiencing high levels of distress. Similarly, Flouri & Buchanan (2003) pointed out that adolescents who possess low psychological well-being or psychological distress may also exhibit characteristics of low levels of happiness and self-efficacy, along with high levels of depression. Hence, it is important that the well-being of adolescence should be improved with the proper strategies designed by both teachers and parents. In responding to the well-being needs of students, education systems and school communities in many parts of the world have adopted a health promotion focus in keeping with recommendations made by the World Health Organisation (WHO).

This study has provided an insight of the general well-being of higher secondary students. It has been well demonstrated by the prior studies in this field, that a meaningful and purposeful life enhances the general well-being of persons/individual. With a better understanding of general well-being within adolescents, various counselling or educational implications can be derived for assisting adolescents to develop holistically in terms of body, mind, and spirit as they venture into the world of adulthood.

### Limitations of the Study

- This study was limited to the four different schools in Cheranmahadevi Educational District, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu.
- The survey method was employed and the General Well-Being Scale (GWBS) by Kalia and Deswal was used to collect the data.
- A sample of 200 higher secondary school students who studying 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> standard were included in this study.
- The investigators used only the variable well-being in the dimensions of physical, emotional, social and school well-being.

### References

- [1]. Amato, P.R., (1994). "Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being in early adulthood". *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 56, No. 41, pp. 1031-1042.
- [2]. Baskaran, U., Chinchu, C., Ganesh Kumar, J., and Maharishi, R., (2013). "After-effects of inter-caste tension as a form of violence against children – A triangulation study". *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 66-72. Retrieved from [http://ijepr.org/doc/V2\\_Is2\\_May13/ij12.pdf](http://ijepr.org/doc/V2_Is2_May13/ij12.pdf)
- [3]. Basque, (2009). "Boys have greater psychological well-being than girls, due to better physical self-concept, study finds". *Basque Research*. Retrieved from [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/02/090203081618.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/02/090203081618.htm)
- [4]. Bhosale, U.V., and Patankar, S.D., (2014). "General well-being in adolescent boys and girls". *Golden Research Thoughts*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1-4.
- [5]. Bremer, B., (1996). "Phylogenetic studies within Rubiaceae and relationships to other families based on molecular data". *Opera Botanica Belgica*, Vol. 7, pp. 33-50.
- [6]. Checola, N.G., (1975). *The Concept of Happiness* (Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan University (1974)), Bissff. Abst International.
- [7]. Deswal, Anita and Sahni, Madhu, (2015). "General well-being in adolescents on the basis of gender and locale". *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science and English Language*, Vol. 2, No. 7, pp. 2001-2013. Retrieved from <http://www.srjis.com/>
- [8]. Emmons, R.A., and King, L.A., (1988). "Conflict among personal surviving: Immediate and longterm implications for psychological and physical well-being". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 54, No. 6, pp. 1010-1018.
- [9]. Flouri, E., and Buchanan, A., (2003). "The role of father involvement and mother involvement in adolescents' psychological well-being". *British Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 399-406.
- [10]. Gujral, H.K., Gupta, A. and Aneja, M., (2012).

"Emotional intelligence - An important determinant of well-being and employee behaviour: A study on young professionals". *International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, Vol. 2, No. 8, pp. 322-339. Retrieved from <http://www.ijmra.us>

[11]. Kakkar, Nidhi, (2015). "A study of academic achievement of senior secondary school students in relation to their general well-being". *Paripex-Indian Journal of Research*, Vol. 4, No. 12, pp. 123-125.

[12]. Kalia, K. Ashok and Deswal, Anita, (2011). *Manual for General Well-being Scale*. India, Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

[13]. Karatzias, A., Chouliara, Z., Power., K., and Swanson, V., (2006). "Predicting general well-being from self-esteem and affectivity: An exploratory study with Scottish adolescents". *Quality of Life Research*, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp. 1143-1151. doi: 10.1007/s11136-006-0064-2

[14]. Levi, L., (1987). "Fitting work to human capacities and needs". In Katme, et al. (Eds.), *Improvements in Contents and Organization of Work: Psychological Factors at Work*.

[15]. Maharishi, R., and Kumar, J. Ganesh, (2013). "Influence of the Emotional intelligence on General well-being of Government Welfare Residential School Children". *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 42-45. Retrieved from [www.iosrjournals.org](http://www.iosrjournals.org)

[16]. Mitra, S., (2015). "A study on the correlates of general well-being". *MyResearch Journals*, Vol. 6, No. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.myresearchjournals.com>

[17]. Parmar, P., (2016). "General well-being of students and professionals in the field of performing arts in relation to gender and experience". *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 55-70. doi:10.147/20160401.

[18]. Sharma, M., (2015). "General well-being among

senior secondary school students". *ZENITH International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp. 229-232. Retrieved from [www.zenithresearch.org.in](http://www.zenithresearch.org.in)

[19]. Shoben, E.J., (1957). "Toward a concept of the normal personality". *American Psychologist*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 183-189.

[20]. Singh, B., and Udainiya, R., (2009a). "Self-efficacy and well-being of adolescents". *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 227-232. Retrieved from <http://medind.nic.in/jak/t09/i2/jakt09i2p227.pdf>

[21]. Singh, Bhupinder and Udainiya, Rakhi, (2009b). "Self-efficacy and well-being of adolescents". *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 227-232. Retrieved from <http://medind.nic.in/jak/t09/i2/jakt09i2p227.pdf>

[22]. Tiwari, M.K., and Ojha, S., (2014). "Study of general well-being and emotional maturity of adolescents". *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 565-569. Retrieved from <http://www.i-scholar.in>

[23]. Vishal P. Parmar and Mahesh D. Makwana, (2016). "A Comparative Study of General well-being among the Government and Non-Government Students". *Indian Journal of Social Sciences and Literature Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 8-12. Retrieved from <http://iacrpub.com>

[24]. Wilner, J., (2011). "How to Improve Psychological Well-Being". *Psych. Central*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.psychcentral.com/positive-psychology/2011/03/how-to-improve-psychological-well-being/>

[25]. Zhang Yong, Cheng Teng, Zhang Bei, Tang Pei, Cao Yang, and Zhou Danhua, (2015). "Study on the differences and influence factors of the general well-being of the college students with left-behind experience". *Education Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 5, pp. 283-289. doi: 10.11648/j.edu.20150405.24

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

*Dr. A.S. Arul Lawrence is an Assistant Professor in the School of Education at Tamil Nadu Open University (TNOU), Chennai, India. He has completed his M.Sc., in Zoology, M.Ed., M.Phil., and Ph.D. Degrees in Education at Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India and has qualified the UGC-NET in Education. He has more than 8 years of teaching experience in conventional mode and 2+ years in Open and Distance Mode. He acted as Principal in Colleges of Education, Assistant Research Co-ordinator in TNOU and is now the Liaison Officer of TNOU. He has received 2 awards and organized 4 International Conferences and 2 National Seminars. He has presented more than 40 papers in both National and International Seminars & Conferences. He has authored 2 Books and edited 6 Books at International level and published more than 35 research articles in peer-reviewed Journals. He is meticulously guiding both M.Phil., and Ph.D. scholars. His areas of specialization are Cognitive Psychology, Educational Technology, and Teaching of Biological Science.*

