

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

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*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

SUBRAMANIAN, RAMA; Krishnan, Vinitha; and A, Thirumagal, "IMPACT OF INTERNET IN ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY OF STUDENTS AMONG ENGINEERING GRADUATES" (2018). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1986.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1986>

# **IMPACT OF INTERNET IN ACADEMIC EFFICIENCY OF STUDENTS AMONG ENGINEERING GRADUATES**

<sup>1</sup>C. Ramasubramanian Part-Time Ph.D. Scholar Manonmaniam Sundaranar University  
Tirunelveli, Tamilnadu, India e-mail: vmtcram@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Dr. K. Vinitha Librarian St.Marys College Tuticorin, Tamilnadu, India  
e-mail: vinithaskmc@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup>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<sup>9</sup>. 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 relationship 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      |
| <b>Total</b> |        | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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      |
| <b>Total</b> |          | <b>164</b> | <b>100</b> |

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       |
| <b>Total</b> |         | <b>164</b>  | <b>100%</b> |

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          |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>MALE</b>   | 60<br>(77.92%)  | 07<br>(9.09%)            | 10<br>(12.99%)   | 77<br>(46.95%) |
| <b>FEMALE</b> | 70<br>(80.46%)  | 6<br>(6.9%)              | 11<br>(12.64%)   | 87<br>(53.05%) |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | 130<br>(79.27%) | 13<br>(7.93%)            | 21<br>(12.81%)   | 164<br>(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 |
|------------|--------|----------|
|------------|--------|----------|

| <b>CALCULATED VALUE</b> | <b>OF FREEDOM</b> | <b>SIGNIFICANCE</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| <b>0.2851</b>           | 2                 | 0.05<br>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**

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

| <b>CHI-SQUARE CALCULATED VALUE</b> | <b>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</b> | <b>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</b> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>9.9429</b>                      | 6                        | 0.05<br>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**

| <b>GENDER</b> | <b>Laptop</b>  | <b>Desktop</b> | <b>Mobile</b>   | <b>TOTAL</b>   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>MALE</b>   | 10<br>(77.92%) | 20<br>(9.09%)  | 47<br>(12.99%)  | 77<br>(46.95%) |
| <b>FEMALE</b> | 13<br>(80.46%) | 18<br>(6.9%)   | 56<br>(12.64%)  | 87<br>(53.05%) |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | 23<br>(14.02%) | 38<br>(23.17%) | 103<br>(62.80%) | 164<br>(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**

| <b>CHI-SQUARE CALCULATED VALUE</b> | <b>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</b> | <b>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</b> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>0.6757</b>                      | 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       |
| <b>Total</b> |                     | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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      |
| <b>Total</b> |                 | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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       |
| <b>Total</b> |               | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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      |
| <b>Total</b> |               | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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 relationship among most frequently Internet user and Purpose of using internet

H1: There is a significant relationship 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      |
| <b>Total</b> |               | <b>130</b> | <b>34</b>  | <b>164</b> | <b>100</b> |

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 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       |
| <b>Total</b> |          | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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      |
| <b>Total</b> |                       | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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<br>(40.24%) | 45<br>(27.44%) | 25<br>(%)      | 20<br>(%)      | 8<br>(%)          |       |
| 2    | Find relevant infn     | 64<br>(39.02%) | 48<br>(29.27%) | 27<br>(16.46%) | 15<br>(9.15%)  | 10<br>(6.10%)     |       |
| 3    | Authentic infn         | 41<br>(25%)    | 35<br>(21.34%) | 32<br>(19.51%) | 39<br>(23.78%) | 17<br>(10.37%)    |       |
| 4    | Time saved             | 84<br>(51.22%) | 50<br>(30.49%) | 15<br>(9.15%)  | 11<br>(6.71%)  | 4<br>(2.44%)      |       |

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

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

|   |                |                   |                | LEVEL                |          | STATUS          |
|---|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------|-----------------|
| ANOVA SUMMARY RESULT OF IMPACT FACTOR NO.4 (TABLE 12) |                |                   |                |                      |          |                 |
| 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.N<br>O | IMPACT<br>FACTOR | STRONGL<br>Y AGREE | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE | STRONGLY<br>DISAGREE | Total |
|----------|------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----------|----------------------|-------|
|----------|------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----------|----------------------|-------|

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

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**

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

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

## 15. OVERALL SATISFICATION WITH INTERNET SERVICES

**Table 15 – Overall Satisfaction 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          |
| <b>Total</b> |                     | <b>164</b>  | <b>100</b> |

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 Satisfaction 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          |
| <b>Total</b> |                     | <b>77</b> | <b>87</b> | <b>164</b> | <b>100</b> |

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**

| <b>S.NO</b>  | <b>Factor</b>               | <b>RESPONDENTS</b> | <b>%</b>   |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 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      |
| <b>Total</b> |                             | <b>164</b>         | <b>100</b> |

Out of 164 respondents, Most challenges faced while accessing 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,

October-2016

5. Syed Shah Alam et.al., (2014). Negative and positive impact of internet addiction on young adults:Emperical 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>