2018

IMPACT OF INTERNET IN ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY OF STUDENTS AMONG ENGINEERING GRADUATES

RAMA SUBRAMANIAN
Sri Paramakalyani College, Alwarkurichi, vmtcram@gmail.com

Vinitha Krishnan
St.Marys College Tuticorin, Tamilnadu, India, vinithaskmc@gmail.com

Thirumagal A
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, librarian@msuniv.ac.in

IMPACT OF INTERNET IN ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY OF STUDENTS AMONG ENGINEERING GRADUATES

[1]C. Ramasubramanian Part-Time Ph.D. Scholar Manonmaniam Sundaranar University Tirunelveli, Tamilnadu, India e-mail: vmtcram@gmail.com
[2]Dr. K. Vinitha Librarian St.Marys College Tuticorin, Tamilnadu, India e-mail: vinithaskmc@gmail.com
[3]Dr. A.Thirumagal, Librarian, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli e-mail:librarian@msuniv.ac.in

ABSTRACT

In the modern digital world, Internet service play a crucial role in enriching new trends among young graduates. Internet have empowered new technology to young learners to progress their academic work. It is very essential to measure the impact of internet service among engineering graduates which paved the way for higher studies and employment. Digital era may oblige to learn everything in their routine life with new techniques. In this study, questionnaire is structured and issued to 180 engineering graduates around 3 colleges in Tirunelveli district. Out of 180, 164 responded and get collected. After analyzing , we came to know that 44.43 % of the respondent have strongly agree the positive impact in their academic way. In turn, 41.29% of the respondent have strongly agree the negative impact in their academic way.

KEYWORD

Internet, Empowered, Digital, Innovative, Academic, Impact

INTRODUCTION

Internet is a network of networks. Internet may wrap entire world into single entity. It reduce the gap between young learner and new technology. It enrich vast amount of information from anywhere at any time. Internet is a commercial backbone in the modern digital world. It carries and distribute wide range of information. The Internet carries many network services, most prominently mobile apps such as social media apps, the World Wide Web, electronic mail, multiplayer online games, Internet telephony, and file sharing services[9]. It plays a huge role among young graduates to learn, work and develop their academic skill.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Internet had enormous growth and progressive every day action of academic work. So, it is very necessary to measure the impact of internet perception among young engineering graduates in their academic growth of day today routine life.

OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

In this paper, we would to like to determine the following objectives.

- To study the Internet utilization behaviour of the students
- To identify the constraints in utilizing the internet services
- To identify the positive impact of internet service
- To identify the negative impact of internet service

- To measure the effective utilization of internet.
- To identify the challenges in using Internet services

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study is limited to college around Tirunelveli district affiliated with Annauniversity, Chennai.

HYPOTHESIS

In this study, to measure the impact of internet service, the following hypotheses have been constructed and those are tested by specific statistical tools.

- There is no significant difference between genders in frequent use of internet per week
- There is no significant difference among courses in frequent use of internet per week
- There is no significant difference between genders in frequently used device to access internet
- There is no significant realtationship among most frequently Internet user and Purpose of using internet
- There is no significant differences among groups and positive impact
- There is no significant differences among groups and negative impact
- There is no significant differences among genders in Internet satisfaction

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, Questionnaire is prepared and distributed to 3 colleges affiliated to Annauniversity around district of Tirunelveli. 180 questions distributed. Out of 180, 164 responded and get collected. All respondents are belonged to under graduates.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

1. GENDERWISE DISTRIBUTION

Table 1 – Gender wise distribution of respondents

S.NO	GENDER	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Male	77	46.95
2	Female	87	53.05
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, Female is in top most level(53.05%) followed by male(46.95%)

2. YEARWISE DISTRIBUTION

Table 2 – Year wise distribution of respondents

S.NO	Year	RESPONDENTS	%
1	I Year	30	18.29
2	II Year	29	17.68

3	III Year	53	32.32
4	IV Year	52	31.71
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, III year is in top most level(32.32%) followed by IV Year (31.71%), I Year (18.29%), II Year (17.68%).

3. COURSEWISE DISTRIBUTION

Table 3 – Course wise distribution of respondents

S.NO	COURSES	RESPONDENTS	%
1	ECE	40	23.39
2	EEE	42	25.61
3	CSE	42	25.61
4	CIVIL	40	23.39
Total		**164**	**100%**

Out of 164 respondents, CSE & EEE share top most level(25.61%) followed by CIVIL & ECE (23.39%)

4.FREQUENCY OF INTERNET USAGE

Hypothesis Statement
H0:There is no significant difference between genders in frequent use of internet per week
H1:There is a significant difference between genders in frequent use of internet per week

Table 4 – Frequency of Internet Usage of respondents per week

GENDER	Daily	More than 3 times a week	2-3 times a week	TOTAL
MALE	60 (77.92%)	07 (9.09%)	10 (12.99%)	77 (46.95%)
FEMALE	70 (80.46%)	6 (6.9%)	11 (12.64%)	87 (53.05%)
TOTAL	130 (79.27%)	13 (7.93%)	21 (12.81%)	164 (100%)

Out of 164 respondents, Daily usage of Internet in top most level(79.27%) followed by 2-3 times a week(12.81%), More than 3 times a week (7.93%).

Table 4A – CHI-SQUARE SUMMARY RESULT

CHI-SQUARE	DEGREE	LEVEL OF

CALCULATED VALUE	OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANCE
0.2851	2	0.05 SIGNIFICANT

The chi-square statistic value is 0.2851. The p-value for level 0.05 is 0.867154. The calculated Chi-square statistic value is less than critical value. Hence the result is not significant. Therefore Null Hypothesis is accepted. (i.e) There is no significant difference among genders in frequent access of internet.

5.FREQUENCY OF INTERNET USAGE AS PER COURSE WISE

Hypothesis Statement
H0:There is no significant difference among courses in frequent use of internet per week
H1:There is a significant difference among courses in frequent use of internet per week

Table 5 – Frequency of Internet Usage of respondents as per coursewise

COURSE	Daily	More than 3 times a week	2-3 times a week	TOTAL
ECE	30 (75%)	5 (12.5%)	5 (12.5%)	40 (23.39%)
EEE	31 (73.81%)	6 (14.29%)	5 (11.9%)	42 (25.61%)
CSE	38 (90.48%)	1 (2.38%)	3 (7.14%)	42 (25.61%)
CIVIL	31 (77.55%)	1 (2.5%)	8 (20%)	40 (23.39%)
TOTAL	130 (79.27%)	13 (7.93%)	21 (12.81%)	164 (100%)

Out of 164 respondents, CSE(90.48%) is top level in Daily usage of Internet followed by CIVIL (77.55%), ECE(75%), and EEE (73.81%) .

Out of 164 respondents, CIVIL(20%) is top level in 2-3 times a week usage of Internet followed by ECE (12.5%), EEE(11.9%), and CSE (7.14%) .

Out of 164 respondents, EEE(14.29%) is top level in more than 3 times a week usage of Internet followed by ECE (12.5%), CIVIL(2.5%), and CSE (2.38%) .

Table 5A – CHI-SQUARE SUMMARY RESULT

CHI-SQUARE CALCULATED VALUE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
9.9429	6	0.05 SIGNIFICANT

The chi-square statistic value is 9.9429. The p-value for level 0.05 is 0.127077. The calculated Chi-square statistic value is greater than critical value. The result is significant. Therefore Null Hypothesis is rejected. (i.e) There is a significant difference among courses in frequent access of internet per week.

6. FREQUENTLY USED DEVICE TO ACCESS INTERNET

Hypothesis Statement

H0: There is no significant difference between genders in frequently used device to access internet

H1: There is a significant difference between genders in frequently used device to access internet

Table 6 – Frequency of device to access internet by respondents

GENDER	Laptop	Desktop	Mobile	TOTAL
MALE	10 (77.92%)	20 (9.09%)	47 (12.99%)	77 (46.95%)
FEMALE	13 (80.46%)	18 (6.9%)	56 (12.64%)	87 (53.05%)
TOTAL	23 (14.02%)	38 (23.17%)	103 (62.80%)	164 (100%)

Out of 164 respondents, frequently accessed device is mobile in top most level (62.80%) followed by Desktop (23.17%), Laptop (14.02%)

Table 6A – CHI-SQUARE SUMMARY RESULT

CHI-SQUARE CALCULATED VALUE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
0.6757	2	0.05 SIGNIFICANT

The chi-square statistic value is 0.6757. The p-value for level 0.05 is 0.713291. The calculated Chi-square statistic value is less than critical value. The result is not significant. Therefore Null Hypothesis is accepted. (i.e) There is no significant difference between genders in frequently used device to access internet.

7. LEVEL OF EXPERIENCE OF USING INTERNET

Table 7 – Level of Experience of using internet by respondents

S.NO	Level of Experience	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Less than 1 year	10	6.10
2	1-2	34	20.73
3	2-3 years	61	37.20
4	3-5 years	48	29.27
5	More than 5 years	11	6.71
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, Level of experience is 2-3 years in top most level (37.20%) followed by 3-5 years (29.27%), 1-2 years (20.73%), Less than 1 year (6.10%), More than 5 years (6.71 %).

8. INTERNET ACCESS POINT

Table 8 – Most Accessed Point of accessing Internet by respondents

S.NO	Most Accessd	RESPONDENTS	%
1	College Campus	25	15.24
2	Home	122	74.39
3	Browsing Centre	17	10.37
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, Most accessed point of accessing internet is Home (74.39%), followed by College Campus (15.24%), Browsing Centre (10.37%).

9. PREFERRED SEARCH ENGINES

Table 9 – Most Accessed Search Engines by respondents

S.NO	Search Engine	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Google	107	65.24
2	Altavista	13	7.93
3	Bing	12	7.32
4	Yahoo	24	14.63
5	Others	08	4.88
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, Most accessed search engines is Google (65.24%), followed by Yahoo (14.63%), Altavista (7.93%), Bing (7.32%), and Others (4.88%).

10. PURPOSE OF USING INTERNET

Table 10 – Purpose of using Internet by respondents

S.NO	Purpose	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Exam	17	10.37
2	Job Oriented	35	21.34
3	Research	6	3.66
4	Assignments	15	9.15
5	Seminars	13	7.93
6	Projects	34	20.73
7	Entertainment	44	26.83
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, most purpose of using internet is Entertainment (26.83%) in the top most level followed by Job oriented (21.34%), Projects (20.73%) ,Exam (10.37%), Assignment (9.15%), Seminars (7.93%) and Research (3.66%).

Hypothetical statement
H0: There is no significant realtationship among most frequently Internet user and Purpose of using internet
H1: There is a significant realtationship among most frequently Internet user and Purpose of using internet

Table 10A – Purpose of using Internet by daily user

S.NO	Purpose	Daily user	Other user	Total	%
1	Exam	11	06	17	10.37
2	Job Oriented	29	06	35	21.34
3	Research	5	01	06	3.66
4	Assignments	10	05	15	9.15
5	Seminars	07	06	13	7.93
6	Projects	28	06	34	20.73
7	Entertainment	40	04	44	26.83
Total		**130**	**34**	**164**	**100**

The chi-square statistic value is 23.78922 The p-value for level 0.05 is 0.000571 ($P<0.05$). The calculated Chi-square statistic value is greater than critical value. The result is significant. Therefore Null Hypothesis is rejected (i.e) There is a significant association between between frequent user and Purpose of using internet.

11. FREQUENTLY USED FORMAT TO ACCESS INFORMATION FROM INTERNET

Table 11 – Frequently Used format from Internet by respondents

S.NO	FORMAT	RESPONDENTS	%
1	PPT	21	12.80
2	PDF	58	35.37
3	IMAGE	18	10.98
4	VIDEOS	25	15.24
5	DOCUMENT	32	19.51
6	OTHERS	10	6.10
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, most frequently accessed format from internet is PDF(35.37%) in top most level , followed by Document (19.51%), Videos (15.24%), PPT (12.80%) , Image (10.98%), and Others (6.10%).

12. METHOD OF BROWSING INTERNET SKILL

Table 12 – Method of Browsing Internet Skill

S.NO	Method	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Search Engine	133	81.10
2	Direct Domain Website	31	18.90
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, method of browsing internet skill is Search Engine(81.10%) in top most level , followed by Direct Domain Website (18.90%).

13. IMPACT OF INTERNET ON ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY – MERIT

Table 13 – Impact of Internet on Academic Efficiency – Merit

S.NO	IMPACT FACTOR	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	Total
1	New technology learned	66 (40.24%)	45 (27.44%)	25 (%)	20 (%)	8 (%)	
2	Find relevant infn	64 (39.02%)	48 (29.27%)	27 (16.46%)	15 (9.15%)	10 (6.10%)	
3	Authentic infn	41 (25%)	35 (21.34%)	32 (19.51%)	39 (23.78%)	17 (10.37%)	
4	Time saved	84 (51.22%)	50 (30.49%)	15 (9.15%)	11 (6.71%)	4 (2.44%)	

5	Retrieved in most convenient form	63 (38.41%)	59 (35.98%)	25 (15.24%)	10 (6.1%)	7 (4.27%)	164 (100%)
6	Support of carreer development	94 (57.32%)	39 (23.78%)	22 (13.41%)	7 (4.27%)	2 (1.22%)	
7	Influence Academic efficiency	98 (59.76%)	44 (26.83%)	11 (6.71%)	7 (4.27%)	4 (2.44%)	
Total		510 (44.43%)	320 (27.87%)	157 (13.68%)	109 (9.49%)	52 (4.53%)	

Positive impact of internet is measured by seven tools listed in the above table. Out of 164 respondents, overall Strongly Agree (44.43%) , followed by Agree (27.87%), Neutral (13.68%), Disagree (9.49%) and Strongly Disagree(4.53%)

Table 13A – ONE WAY ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT

ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.1 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.06481	0.805473	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	1234.4	8	154.3			
Total	1244.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.2 (TABLE 12)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.05353	0.822834	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	1494.4	8	186.8			
Total	1504.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.3 (TABLE 12)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.17079	0.690262	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	468.4	8	58.55			
Total	478.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT**		

				LEVEL		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.4 (TABLE 12)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.03381	0.858694	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	2366.4	8	295.8			
Total	2376.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.5 (TABLE 12)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.05227	0.824889	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	1530.4	8	191.3			
Total	1540.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.6 (TABLE 12)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.02857	0.869977	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	2800.4	8	350.05			
Total	2810.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.7 (TABLE 12)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.02475	0.878891	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	3232.4	8	404.05			
Total	3242.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		

14. IMPACT OF INTERNET ON ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY – DEMERIT

Table 14 – Impact of Internet on Academic Efficiency - Demerit

S.NO	IMPACT FACTOR	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	Total

1	Reduce memory power	91 (55.49%)	52 (31.71%)	9 (5.49%)	5 (3.05%)	7 (4.27%)	164 (100%)
2	Reduce creativity	67 (40.85%)	47 (28.66%)	23 (14.02%)	15 (9.15%)	12 (7.32%)	
3	Waste my time	41 (25%)	48 (29.27%)	39 (23.78%)	24 (14.63%)	12 (7.32%)	
4	Not reliable	88 (53.66%)	53 (32.32%)	14 (8.54%)	5 (3.05%)	4 (2.44%)	
5	Make me always in entertainment	85 (51.83%)	50 (30.49%)	20 (12.2%)	5 (3.05%)	4 (2.44%)	
6	Taken to many unwanted websites	54 (32.93%)	41 (25%)	33 (20.12%)	17 (10.37%)	19 (11.59%)	
7	Not able to search relevant information	48 (29.27%)	47 (28.66%)	37 (22.56%)	25 (15.24%)	7 (4.27%)	
	Total	**474 (41.29%)**	**338 (29.44%)**	**175 (15.24%)**	**96 (8.36 %)**	**65 (5.66%)**	

Negative impact of internet is measured by seven tools listed in the above table. Out of 164 respondents, Strongly Agree (41.29%) , followed by Agree (29.44%), Neutral (15.24%), Disagree (8.36%) and Strongly Disagree(5.66%)

Table 14A – ONE WAY ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT

ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.1 (TABLE 14)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.02547	0.8771	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	3140.4	8	392.55			
Total	3150.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.2 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.06388	0.806842	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	1252.4	8	156.55			
Total	1262.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.3 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean of Square	F-Value		
				Calculated	Table	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.10747	0.751459	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	744.4	8	93.05			
Total	754.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.4 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.02869	0.869701	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	2788.4	8	348.55			
Total	2798.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.5 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.02952	0.86786	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	2710.4	8	338.8			
Total	2720.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.6 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.07902	0.785763	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	1012.4	8	126.55			
Total	1022.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		
ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.7 (TABLE 13)						**STATUS**
Source of Variance	**Sum of Squares**	**Degree of Freedom**	**Mean of Square**	**F-Value**		
				Calculated	**Table**	
Between Groups	10	1	10	0.11488	0.743384	NOT SIGNIFICANT
Within Groups	696.4	8	87.05			
Total	706.4	9		**5% SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**		

15. OVERALL SATISFICATION WITH INTERNET SERVICES

Table 15 – Overall Satisfication in internet services

S.NO	FACTOR	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Highly Satisfied	90	54.88
2	Satisfied	49	29.87
3	Lease Satisfied	20	12.20
4	Dissatisfied	5	3.05
5	Highly Dissatisfied	0	0
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, Overall satisfaction with internet service is Highly Satisfied (54.88%) in top most level , followed by Satisfied (29.87%), Lease Satisfied (12.20%), Dissatisfied (3.05%).

Gender differences on Internet satisfaction

H0:There is no significant differences among genders in Internet satisfaction
H1:There is a significant differences among genders in Internet satisfaction

Table 15 A– Genderwise Satisfication in internet services

S.NO	FACTOR	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	%
1	Highly Satisfied	37	53	90	54.88
2	Satisfied	25	24	49	29.87
3	Lease Satisfied	15	5	20	12.20
4	Dissatisfied	0	5	5	3.05
5	Highly Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0
Total		**77**	**87**	**164**	**100**

The t-test value is is -0.16456. The p-value for level 0.05 is 0.436688 . The calculated t-value is less than critical value. The result is not significant. Therefore Null Hypothesis is accepted (i.e) There is no significant differences among genders in Internet satisfaction.

16. CHALLENGES FACED WHILE ACCESSING INTERNET

Table 16 – Challenges faced while accessing internet services by respondents

S.NO	Factor	RESPONDENTS	%
1	Network connectivity issues	22	13.41
2	Power failure	27	16.46
3	Slow Access	63	38.41
4	Lack of skill	25	15.24
5	Failure of H/w & S/w	7	4.27
6	Others	20	12.20
Total		**164**	**100**

Out of 164 respondents, Most challenges faced while accesing internet service is slow access (38.41%) in top most level , followed by Power failure (16.46%), Lack of Skill (15.24%), Network connectivity (13.41%), others (12.20%) and failure of Hardware and software (4.27%).

CONCLUSION

The conclusion that can be drawn from this Study Impact of Internet in academic efficiency of students among engineering graduates is a positive impact lead by some extent of negative impact. It is evident from the result of study, strongly agree positive impact is lead in their academic progression (44.43%) followed by strongly agree negative impact in their academic life (41.29%).And also among various positive impact of internet service, it is evident that 94% of the respondent have strongly agree that internet service is utilized for career development. In turn, among various negative impact of internet service, it is evident that 91% of the respondent have strongly agree that reduce memory power in using internet service. Also 38.41% of the respondent faced with challenges of slow connectivity, it is necessary to identified and need to be upgraded to avoid connectivity issues in using internet connectivity.

REFERENCES

1. R H Puspita and D Rohedi (2018). The Impact of Internet Use for Students. IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering 306 (2018) 012106.

2. Mohammed T.Al-Hariri and Abdulghani A.Al-Hattami (2017). Impact of students' use of technology on their learning achievements in physiology courses at the University of Dammam. Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences,Volume 12, Issue 1, February 2017, Pages 82-85

3. Sylvia Nabila Azwa Ambad, Khairiah Mazdiah Kalimin, Ku Mohd Amir Aizat Ku Yusof (2017). The Effect of Internet Addiction on students' emotional and academic performance, e-Academia Journal Volume 6 Issue 1 2017, 86 – 98

4. Ugwulebo Jeremiah Emeka and Okoro Sunday Nyeche (2016). Impact of Internet Usage on the Academic Performance of Undergraduates Students: A case study of the University of Abuja, Nigeria, International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, Volume 7, Issue 10,

5. Syed Shah Alam et.al., (2014). Negative and positive impact of internet addiction on young adults:Empericial study in Malaysia, IC, 2014 – 10(3): 619-638 – Online ISSN: 1697-9818 – Print ISSN: 2014-3214 from : http://dx.doi.org/10.3926/ic.452 OMNIA SCIENCE

6. VasilisGialamas, KleopatraNikolopoulou and GeorgeKoutromanos (2013). Student teachers' perceptions about the impact of internet usage on their learning and jobs, Computers & Education,Volume 62, March 2013, Pages 1-7

7. Aytekin ISMAN and Fahme DABAJ (2004). Attitudes of Students Towards Internet, Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE October 2004 ISSN 1302-6488, 5 (4)

8. Hong, K.-S., Ridzuan, A. A., & Kuek, M.-K. (2003). Students' attitudes toward the use of the Internet for learning: A study at a university in Malaysia. Educational Technology & Society, 6(2), 45-49, Available at http://ifets.ieee.org/periodical/6-2/5.html

9. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet