METHOD

The primary aim of the present investigation was to study the effects of the different types of internet addiction viz. cyber-sexual addiction, cyber-relational addiction and information overload, and gender on internet addiction and its correlates among adolescents. The effect of the employment status of the mothers on internet addiction and its correlates was also studied. For this purpose, 3x2x2 analysis of variance was employed with 30 replications in each condition.

The secondary aim was to study the relationship of internet addiction with Eysenckian dimensions of Personality viz., Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion and Social Desirability (Lie Scale), State – Trait Anxiety, Locus of Control, Sensation Seeking (Thril and Adventure Seeking, Experience Seeking, Disinhibition, Boredom Susceptibility and Total Sensation Seeking), Shyness, Loneliness, Stress Symptoms, Daily Hassles and Uplifts, Coping (Task Focused Coping, Emotion Focused Coping and Avoidance Focused Coping), Mental Health and its dimensions (Being Comfortable With Self, Being Comfortable With Others, Perceived Ability to Meet Life’s Demands and Total Mental Health), Perceived Parental Bonding (Perceived Maternal Care, Perceived Maternal Overprotection, Perceived Paternal Care, Perceived Paternal Overprotection), Satisfaction With Life and Perceived Social Support.

Predictors of internet addiction in terms of above mentioned variables were also identified for all the groups.

For diagnosing the Internet Addiction, Young’s Diagnostic Criteria (1996) was used. The test comprised of eight questions to be answered in terms of ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ response. According to Young (1996), any person
giving a ‘Yes’ response to five or more of the questions, is diagnosed as a Dependent user of Internet.

For measuring internet addiction, Internet Addiction Test devised by Young (1998a) was used. It comprised of 20 items associated with internet use, including psychological dependence, compulsive use and withdrawal symptoms, as well as related problems of school, sleep, family and time management. According to Young’s criteria, persons scoring in the range of 20 – 39 points are average on-line users. Such persons might surf the Web a bit too long at times, but they have control over their usage. Persons scoring in the range of 40 – 69 points experience frequent problems because of the Internet. Persons scoring in the range of 70 – 100 points experience significant problems in their lives, caused by their internet use. Consequently, subjects scoring more than 20 points were identified as dependent users of internet and subjects scoring less than 20 points were identified as non–dependent internet users.

For classifying the Dependent Internet users into different categories of Cyber-sexual, Cyber-relational and Information Overload groups, they were personally interviewed regarding the various purposes they used the internet for; and in accordance with the excessive usage in particular areas such as social networking, information seeking and viewing pornography, they were classified into three categories viz., Cyber-Sexual, Cyber-Relational and Information Overload. They were also asked about the various sites frequently visited by them.

Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire - Revised (EPQ-R) devised by Eysenck et al (1985) was used to measure the four dimensions of personality viz. Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion and Social Desirability (Lie Scale). Rotter’s Locus of Control Scale (1966) was used to measure the externality – internality dimension of locus of control.
For measuring sensation seeking, Sensation Seeking Scale by Basu et al. (1993) was used. It measures four dimensions viz. Thrill and Adventure Seeking, Experience Seeking, Disinhibition and Boredom Susceptibility. State – Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) given Speilberger et al. (1970) was employed to measure the dimensions of state anxiety and trait anxiety.

Shyness was measured using the Shyness Questionnaire devised by Henderson and Zimbardo (2000).

To measure stress, Stress Symptoms Rating Scale developed by Heilbrun and Pepe (1985) was used. In addition to this, the Daily Hassles and Uplifts Scale by Delongis et al. (1982) was used to measure the hassles and uplifts in the life of adolescents.

The Coping Styles Inventory by Carver et al. (1989) was used to measure three types of coping viz. Task Focused Coping, Emotion Focused Coping and Avoidance Focused Coping. Mental health of the individuals was measured using WHO Measure of Mental Health adopted for use in India by Wig (1999) which has three dimensions viz. Being Comfortable with Self, Being Comfortable with Others and Perceived Ability to Meet Life Demands. All the three dimensions are added to give the Total Mental Health score.

Loneliness was measured using revised UCLA Loneliness Scale devised by Russel et al. (1980). Life satisfaction was measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale developed by Diener et al. (1985).

Perceived Parental Bonding among the adolescents was measured using the Parental Bonding Instrument by Parker et al. (1979). It has four dimensions viz. Perceived Paternal Care and Perceived Paternal
Overprotection, Perceived Maternal Care and Perceived Maternal Overprotection.

Perceived social support was measured with the help of the Perceived Social Support Questionnaire devised by Nehra et al. (1996).

SAMPLE

To select the Dependent Users of Internet, the data was collected in two phases.

Phase – I

In the first phase, the various schools and colleges in the tricites of Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula were contacted and after obtaining due permission from the authorities concerned, the students in the age range of 16 – 18 years were administered Young’s Diagnostic Questionnaire as a screening instrument to identify internet dependence in these adolescents. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the subjects for the study. Out of approximately 700 students, 360 students who were dependent users of internet (as per Young’s criteria of Internet Addiction) and 40 subjects who were non – dependent users of internet (as per Young’s criteria of Internet Addiction) were enlisted as subjects. Thus the final sample comprised of 400 adolescents.

Phase – II

After the screening phase, the subjects were explained about the nature and aim of the investigation and were requested to volunteer as respondents. They were then administered another test on Internet Addiction (to assess the extent of internet addiction) and were also personally interviewed and asked questions regarding the various reasons they use the internet for. They were asked about the sites most frequently
visited by them. On the basis of their responses, they were categorized into the Cyber-sexual, Cyber-relational and Information Overload groups, depending on the type of internet usage they showed most frequent. They were then administered other tests to find the various psychosocial correlates of internet addiction.

**Inclusion Criteria**

Only those individuals belonging to the nuclear families and those belonging to the middle income group were included in the final sample in order to control the effect of socioeconomic variables.

**TESTS AND TOOLS**

The following standardized tests and tools were used for the present investigation:

1. Young’s Diagnostic Questionnaire *(Young, 1996)*.
2. Internet Addiction Test *(Young, 1998 a)*
3. Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire *(Eysenck et al. 1985)*
4. WHO Measure Of Mental Health *(Wig, 1999)*
5. Stress Symptoms Scale *(Heilbrun and Pepe, 1985)*
6. Coping Styles Inventory *(Carver et al. 1989)*
7. Satisfaction With Life Scale *(Diener et al. 1985)*
8. State – Trait Anxiety Inventory *(Speilberger et al. 1970)*
9. Daily Hassles and Uplifts Scale *(Delongis et al. 1982)*
10. Parental Bonding Instrument *(Parker et al. 1979)*
11. Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al. 1980)

12. Sensation Seeking Scale (Basu et al. 1993)

13. Perceived Social Support Scale (Nehra et al., 1996)

14. Rotter’s Internal – External Locus Of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966)

15. Shyness Questionnaire (Henderson and Zimbardo, 2000)

In addition, a questionnaire was also administered to enquire into the prevalence of any other addictions, viz. smoking, alcohol, drug usage etc. among the subjects. Demographic information was also assessed.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE TESTS

1. Young’s Diagnostic Questionnaire (1996)

Diagnostic Questionnaire for Internet Addiction was adapted from DSM-IV criteria for pathological gambling by Young (1996). YDQ consists of eight questions with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ responses. Young asserted that five or more ‘yes’ responses to the eight questions indicate a dependent user. Johansson and Götestam (2004) reported that the split-half reliability of the YDQ was .73 and the Cronbach’s alpha was .71. It has been successfully used by various researchers such as Bai et al. (2001), Cao and Su (2006) and Li et al. (2008).

2. Internet Addiction Test (Young, 1998a)

This test of internet addiction devised by Young (1998a) comprises of 20 items associated with internet use, including psychological dependence, compulsive use and withdrawal symptoms, as well as related problems of school, sleep, family and time management. For
Each item, there is a graded response (0 = not at all/does not apply to 5 = always). The total score on internet addiction ranges from 20 to 100. The test has internal consistency (Crombach’s alpha of .92) and the test – retest reliability, performed biweekly, was also satisfactory (r = .85). It has been successfully used in west by Whang et al. (2003), Yoo et al. (2004), Tsitsika et al. (2008), Lam et al. (2009), Bernardi and Pallanti (2009), Velezmoro et al. (2010) and, Stieger and Burger (2010).

Further, in order to classify the dependent users into the cybersexual, cyber-relational and information overload groups, they were personally interviewed regarding the various purposes they used the internet for; and in accordance with the excessive usage in particular areas such as social networking, information seeking and viewing pornography, they were classified into three categories, viz., cyber-relational, information overload and cyber-sexual. They were also asked about the various sites frequently visited by them.

3. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire – Revised (Eysenck et al., 1985)

Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire – Revised has been developed by Eysenck et al. (1985) in order to measure personality. The EPQ-R was originally constructed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) to measure varied dimensions of personality viz. Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N) and Psychoticism (P). It also consists of Social Desirability (Lie Scale). The scale was revised by Eysenck et al. (1985) to improve psychometric weakness of the Psychoticism scale. EPQ-R comprises of 90 items measuring afore mentioned dimensions of personality with P-Scale (25 items), E-Scale (21 Items), N-Scale (23 items) and L-Scale (21 items).
Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) proposed that extraversion refers to outgoing, uninhibited, impulsive and social inclinations of person. The typical extravert is sociable, like parties, has many friends, need to have people to talk to and does not like reading or studying by himself.

The second major personality dimension deduced by Eysenck (1947) was Neuroticism/Stability. Neuroticism refers to a general, emotional over responsiveness, emotional liability and liability to neurotic breakdown under stress. According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1968), neuroticism as contrasted to emotional stability is very much similar to anxiety.

The third dimension of personality proposed by Eysenck is Psychoticism. Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) and Howarth (1986) reported that a person with a higher scorer on Psychoticism possesses the following traits: Impulsiveness, lack of cooperation, oral pessimism, rigidity, lower super ego control, low social sensitivity, low persistence, lack of anxiety, egocentric, impersonal, lack of feeling of inferiority, unempathic, creative, aggressive, cold, antisocial and tough minded.

The Social Desirability (Lie Scale) was first incorporated in the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) to measure a tendency on the part of the subjects to fake good responses. It is being considered as a tendency to respond in a socially desirable way; it is variously described as a desire to conform to social norms (Edwards, 1954); nice personality (Skinner et al., 1970); ideal self and ideal responses (Choudhary, 1972).

The alpha reliabilities for the revised scale have been found to be as follows:

4. The WHO Measure of Mental Health
(Wig, 1999)

The scale has 16 items and is designed to measure mental health. It has three dimensions: Being Comfortable With Self, Being Comfortable With Others and Perceived Ability to Meet Life’s Demands. The test obtains 3 scores on mental health dimensions and a summated score on Total Mental Health. The response format has two categories – Yes or No. A score of one is given if subject ticks ‘Yes’ and zero if he ticks ‘No’. The test has adequate reliability and validity. This scale has been used in India by Sehgal (2003), Shourie (2003), Sharma (2005), Mohan et al. (2005, 2007b, 2011), Salariya (2006), Malhotra (2006), Caur (2006), Kaur (2007), Bala (2007), Tripathi (2008) and Yadav (2010).
5. Stress Symptoms Ratings Scale
(Heilbrun and Pepe, 1985)

Heilbrun and Pepe (1985) constructed the Stress Symptoms Rating Scale which is a response-identified measured of stress in construct to the stimulus – defined measures being used in earlier stress research. The Stress Symptom Rating Scale is an inquiry into the amount of stress experienced, without regard to what provoked them. They selected 25 symptoms of stress from a list that Selye (1976) indentified as readily detectable by individual. The subject is required to rate the frequency of each stress symptom (for the previous year) on a six-point scale ranging from ‘Not at all’ to ‘More than once per day’ (i.e. ranging from 0 to 5). The stress score is the summation of scores obtained over all the ratings.

The alpha reliability for the scale has been found to be .93 by Heilbrun and Pepe (1986). Evidence for validity has come from differential elevations of stress found in groups, otherwise identified as more stressful. The test has been successfully used in India by Saini (1998), Opara (1999), and Mohan (2000, 2006), Shourie (2003), Sharma (2005), Caur (2006), Malhotra (2006), Salariya (2006), Bala (2007), Kaur (2007), Mohan et al. (2007a, 2008a, 2011), Tripathi (2008) and Yadav (2010).

6. Coping Styles Inventory
(Carver et al. 1989)

Coping styles were assessed using Carver et al.’s shorter version (1989). The inventory measures three broad coping dispositions – Task Focused, Emotion Focused and Avoidance Focused Coping. Items were conceptually grouped into three scales with 10 items in each scale. Each item was answered on a 4 point rating scale ranging from ‘I
usually don’t do this at all’ to ‘I usually do this a lot’ (i.e. 1 to 4). The scores on each of the scales may range from 10 to 40.

Internal consistency of each scale was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. For TaskFocused Coping, it was .78; EmotionFocused Coping, it was .76 and for Avoidance Focused Coping, it was .77. Task and Emotion Focused Coping were correlated (r=.46) but neither task nor Emotion Focused Coping were associated with Avoidance Focused Coping (r=.16). This scale was used in India by Sehgal (2003), Salariya (2006), Haobam (2007), Mohan et al. (2007b, 2008a, 2011) and Yadav (2010).

7. Satisfaction with Life Scale
(Diener et al., 1985)

It is a five-item scale that is designed around the idea that one must ask subjects for an overall judgment of their life in order to measure the concept of life satisfaction. Individuals indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a 7-point Likert scale with 7 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. Scores range from 5 to 35. Diener et al. (1985) reported a 2-months test-retest correlation coefficient of 0.82 for undergraduates. Diener et al. (1985) also reported it to be a valid test. This scale was used in India by Maini (2001), Kaur (2002), Sehgal (2003), Caur (2006), Mohan (2006), Bala (2007), Mohan et al. (2007a, 2008b, 2009), Tripathi (2008) and Yadav (2010).

8. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory
(Speilberger et al., 1970)

The State – Trait Anxiety Inventory was developed by Spielberger et al. (1970) to provide reliable and standardized self-report scales to assess both State and Trait Anxiety. The test consists
of 40 items, 20 to measure State Anxiety and 20 to measure Trait Anxiety. On the State Anxiety form, the subjects respond to each item in terms of severity (with 1 = Not at all and 4 = Very Much). The Trait Anxiety form, subjects respond in terms of frequency categories (with 1 = Almost Never and 4 = Almost Always). The items are both direct and reverse scored. The scores may range from 20 to 80 for either form. The test-retest reliability on male and female samples of high school and college students ranges from .65 to .86 for the trait anxiety and from .16 to .62 for the state anxiety. This low level of the stability for the state-anxiety scale is expected since responses to the items on this scale are thought to reflect the influence of whatever transient situational factors exist at the time of testing. Validity coefficients were obtained for STAI and other measures of anxiety such as Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, the IPAT Anxiety scale and the Multiple Affect Adjective check list. The correlations are .80, .75 and .52 respectively. The test has been successfully used in India by Mohan (1999, 2000, and 2001) and Shourie (2003), Sharma (2005), Mohan et al. (2007b, 2008b, 2009).

9. Daily Hassles and Uplifts Scale
(Delongis et al., 1982)

Hassles and Uplifts scale was constructed by Kanner et al. (1981) to assess the number, severity and intensity of the daily hassles and uplifts that the subject has experienced in the last month. The ‘Hassles Scale’ consisted of a list of hassles or every day irritants. These cover the areas of health, family, friends, the environment, practical considerations and chance occurrences. Subjects are requested to indicate any hassles that they have experienced during the last month and rate how severe these have been on a 3 point scale, 3 being ‘a great deal’ and 0 being ‘none or not applicable’. The
'Uplift Scale' consists of a list of uplifts; minor life event that make people feel good. Subjects are asked to indicate the uplifts they have experienced during the last month and rate their experience of each on a 3 point scale, 3 being 'a great deal' and 0 being 'none or not applicable'. The present study used a revised version of Hassles and Uplifts scale by Delongis et al. (1982) which is a shorter version of Kanner et al. (1981) test and consists of 53 items. The test has been successfully used in India by Opara (1999), Mohan (2000), Mohan et al. (2000, 2007b, 2009), Kaur (2002), Shourie (2003) and Salariya (2006), Haobam (2007), Harinder (2007) and Vipin (2010).

10. Parental Bonding Instrument  
(Parker et al., 1979)

The PBI is a 25 item self-report measure of respondents' recollection of parents' attitudes and behaviors during the first 16 years. Respondents are asked to answer the questions based on how they remember their parents, using a Likert type scale ranging from 0 (Very like) to 4 (Very unlike). The PBI was developed using factor analysis from self reports of experiences with parents in childhood. The scale consists of two factors: Maternal/Paternal Care (i.e. care vs. indifference and rejection) and Maternal/Paternal overprotection (i.e. overprotection vs. encouragement of autonomy). Higher scores on the two scales indicate higher perceived parental care and overprotection, respectively. The 12 items of Care factor allow a maximum score of 36 and the 13 item of the Overprotection factor permit a maximum score of 39. The two factors are negatively correlated (r= -.24) suggesting that the two dimension are not independent (Parker et al., 1979), i.e. 'overprotection' is associated with lack of 'care'.
Adequate internal consistency has been demonstrated in numerous studies using split-half technique. The scale also has high test-retest reliability over a 3-week period for both care and overprotection scale \((r = .63; p<.001)\) \((\text{Parker et al., 1979; Parker, 1989})\). The scales’ interrater reliability and concurrent, convergent, criterion and predictive validity are also established \((\text{Parker, 1989})\). The test has recently been used by \text{Kaur (2007), Haobam (2007), Harinder (2007) and Vipin (2010)}.

11. Revis ed UCLA Loneliness Scale
\((\text{Russell et al. 1980})\)

This self report measure of loneliness constructed by \text{Russell et al. (1980)} comprises of 20 items, in which 10 of the items are positively worded and the other 10 are negatively worded. The individual has to mark the responses on a four point scale, with 1=Never and 4=Often for the negatively worded items. The scoring pattern is reversed for positively worded items. The internal consistency of the revised measures was high \((\text{coefficient alpha of .94})\). The assessment of concurrent validity of this scale also yielded high correlation values. Loneliness scores were significantly correlated with scores on the Beck Depression Inventory \((r=.62)\), Costello-Comery Anxiety \((r=.32)\) and Depression \((r=.35)\). The test has been used in India by \text{Goyal (1989), Kumar (1990), Sidhu (2000), Upmanyu et al. (1992, 1993, 1994) and Pandeya (2010)}.

12. Sensation Seeking Scale
\((\text{Basu et al., 1993})\)

The original scale was developed by \text{Zukerman et al. (1975)} at the University of Delaware, Newark, USA. It was developed as a measure of individual differences in the preferred optimal level of
stimulation and arousal. The first form (Form II, 1964) contained a general scale only. Further factor analysis yielded four factors, three of them, which were reliable across the sexes. Scales, based on these four factors and the General Scale form II were included in form IV. The general scale in form IV was not a total score, but partially overlapped with the subscales.

Modified Sensation Seeking Scale (MSSS; Basu et al., 1993) is an Indian adaption of the Sensation Seeking Scale-Form V (Zuckerman et al., 1978). It comprises of 40 items force-choiced as yes (score 0) or No (score 1). The test gives a score for the Total Sensation Seeking and four subscales i.e. Thrill and Adventure Seeking (TAS), Experience seeking (ES), Boredom susceptibility (BS) and Disinhibition (DIS).

This form contains 10 items representing each of the four factors. It does not contain the general scale but instead uses a sensation seeking total score based on the sum of the four factor score. The four factors form the four subscales.

**Thrill and Adventure Seeking (TAS)**

It consists of items expressing the desire to engage in sports or activities involving some physical danger or risk taking (such as mountain climbing, speeding in car etc.)

**Experience Seeking (ES)**

It contains items describing the desire to seek new experiences through the mind and senses by living in a non confirming life style with unconventional friends and through travel.

**Boredom Susceptibility (BS)**
It indicates an aversion for repetitive experience of any kind of routine work or even dull or predictable people. Other items indicate a restless reaction when things are unchanging.

**Disinhibition (DIS)**

It was named for the items describing the need to disinhibit behavior in the social sphere by drinking, partying and seeing variety in sexual partners.

This 40-item Inventory has a large research base that generally validates the instrument. Both the internal reliability and test - retest reliability for the test are highly significant, alpha and inter item correlation being in the range of .83 to .94. The cross subscale correlations were generally low to moderate, ranging from .55 to .44. The correlation between form IV and V was high, in the range .61 to .93. It also shows significant age, sex and racial differences, as well as cross country differences.

The scale was first adapted to Indian population by Basu et al. (1993) at Chandigarh. The modified scale was found to have high rank order correlation coefficient of the test and retest scores. It has been used in India by Mohan and Sehgal (2004), Ramma (2006), Malhotra (2006) and Vipin (2010).

**13. Perceived Social Support Scale**

*(Nehra et al., 1996)*

The social support questionnaire assessed subjects' perceived social support with the help of 18 items. The subject was to read each statement and express his degree of agreement/disagreement from 4 response category – Totally agree (4), Mostly agree (3), Somewhat agree (2), Do not agree at all (1).
Seven out of the 18 items were negatively worded – (Item numbers 2, 4,8,9,11,12 and 18) and had to be reverse scored.

It is a reliable and valid questionnaire. The test-retest reliability after a week’s interval was found to be .59. Concurrent validity has been found to be significant and comparison with external criterion was found to be significant at 0.01 level (Nehra et al., 1996). It has been used in India by Sharma (2002), Vaidya (2003), Sehgal (2003) and Sharma (2005).

14. Rotter’s Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966)

The Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was developed by Rotter (1966). The concept of locus of control was first developed by Phares (1957), regarding beliefs about internal versus external control of reinforcement. Rotter (1966) postulated that consistent individual differences exist with respect to a person’s belief in the way his or her behavior affects the control of his life events. These beliefs were designated as ‘locus of control.’ The first monograph of LOC was published by Rotter (1966). Even though the items from this instrument load on several distinct factors (Marsh and Richards, 1986), the overall score from this measure provides an index of global control beliefs (Cohen and Edwards, 1989).

The instrument consists of 29 forced – choice pairs of statements (Rotter, 1966). The respondents are instructed to choose one statement from each pair that they most strongly believe to be true. Scores indicate points along a continuum rather than ‘Internal’ and ‘External’ types i.e. they do not represent one type or another but rather
display varying degrees of Internality and Externality. A high score on this scale indicates Externality.

The test – retest reliability of the scale was reported by Rotter (1966) to range from .49 to .83. The Rotter’s LOC scale has been successfully used in India by Kapur (1982), Sehgal and Bhatia (1987), Joshi (1988), Tayal (1987), Kaur (1993), Mohan et al. (2007a) and Jaggi (2008).

15. Shyness Questionnaire
(Henderson and Zimbardo, 2000)

This test comprises of 35 items that are scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1=Not at all characteristic to 5=Extremely characteristic. The subject is required to indicate how characteristic the statement is of him/her and how much it reflects what the subject thinks feels or does in a particular situation. The score ranges between 35 to 175. The greater the score, more shy the person is. The alpha reliability of the test ranges between .92 and .93 for the college student samples. The concurrent validity of the scale with the other well established measures of shyness such as Revised Cheek and Buss shyness scale was obtained as .59 (Melchoir and Cheek, 1990).

PROCEDURE

All the respondents for the testing sessions were contacted personally and requested to volunteer for the testing schedule. These respondents were then given the questionnaires in the booklet form and were requested to the instructions. They were assured that the information they give about themselves and their results would be kept strictly confidential and used for research purpose only.
The testing schedule was started by firstly asking the participants to fill in the first form which comprised of the general information and diagnostic criteria for measuring internet addiction along with a questionnaire and personal interview to measure the type of internet addiction. Those subjects who were found to be in the category of dependent users of internet, were later given another booklet of questionnaire for a detailed analysis to find the correlates of internet addiction. All the respondents were given instructions for each questionnaire as specified in the respective manuals, as follows:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Young’s Diagnostic Questionnaire

Instructions given for the Young’s Diagnostic Questionnaire were, “Given below are a set of 8 questions with ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ options. Please read each question carefully and mark your response in terms of either ‘Yes’ or ‘No’.”

2. Internet Addiction Test

Instructions given for the Internet Addiction Test were, “Given below are a series of questions with different options, you are required to read each question and choose your answer from the options given below each question. Please tick mark the option which best applies to you.”

3. Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire

The Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire has the following instructions “Please answer each question by putting a circle around
the ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ alternatives following the question. There are no right or wrong answers and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too long about the exact meaning of the question. Please check that you have answered all the questions.”

4. WHO Measure of Mental Health

The following instructions were given “Kindly tick the response which is true for you by putting a circle around the ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ alternatives following the question. Your answer will be kept strictly confidential.”

5. Stress Symptoms Scale

The following instructions were given for the Stress Symptoms Rating Scale “Rate the frequency of each item for the previous year along the following scale: (1) Not at all (2) Between once per week and once per month (3) About once per day and per week (4) About once per day (5) More than once per day. Indicate your answer by circling a number for each item. All your responses will be kept strictly confidential.”

6. Coping Styles Inventory

The instructions for Coping Styles Inventory were “Rate your response for each item along the following scale: (0) Do not do it at all (1) Rarely do it (2) Often do it (3) Usually do this a lot.”

7. Satisfaction With Life Scale

For performing this test, the subjects were instructed as follows “Given below are a number of statements. Read each statement
carefully and choose one of the seven alternatives: (1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (3) Slightly disagree (4) Neither agree nor disagree (5) Slightly agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly agree.

8. State - Trait Anxiety Inventory

The test comprised of 2 parts. Part 1 measured State Anxiety and Part 2 measured Trait Anxiety.

**Instructions for Part 1 (State Anxiety)**

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then circle the appropriate option given for each statement to indicate “how you feel right now”, i.e., at this moment. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any statement but give the answer which seems to describe your present feelings best using the following scale (1) Not at all, (2) Somewhat, (3) Moderately, (4) Very much.

**Instructions for Part 2 (Trait Anxiety)**

Instructions for Part 2 were the same as Part 1 except that the subject were told to describe “how they generally feel” using the following scale (1) Almost Never, (2) Sometimes, (3) Often, (4) Almost always

9. Daily Hassles and Uplifts Scale
Instructions for the Daily Hassles and Uplifts Scale were as follows “How much of a hassle was this item for you today? How much of uplift was this item for you yesterday? Please circle one number on the left hand side and one number on the right hand side for each of item using the following scale (0) None or Not Applicable, (1) Somewhat, (2) Quite a bit, (3) A great deal”

10. Parental Bonding Instrument

The following instructions were given “This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behavior of parents. As you remember your Mother/Father in your first 16 years would you place a tick in the most applicable column next to each question. There are two parts of this form. Use the first part to mark responses about your mother and the second part to mark responses about your father”

11. Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale

Following instructions were given “Given below is a set of 20 statements. Read each statement carefully and indicate how often you feel the way described in each of the following statements. Tick one option from ‘Never’, ‘Rarely’, ‘Sometimes’ or ‘Often’ for each statement.

12. Sensation Seeking Scale

The subjects were given the following instructions “It is important, you respond to all items with only “one choice” A or B. We are interested only in your likes or feelings, not in how others feel about
these things or how one is supposed to feel. There are no right or wrong answers as in other kinds of test. Be frank and give an honest appraisal of yourself.”

13. Perceived Social Support Scale

The test is in Hindi and instructions were also given in Hindi. An English translation of these transactions is given below “Read each statement carefully and answer how far you agree with statement. If you “agree” with the statement, mark your response by putting tick on “option no.4”, if you “Agree” with the statement, please put a tick mark on “option no.3”, if you “slightly agree” with the statement, put a tick mark on “option no.2” and if you “completely disagree” with the statement then put a tick mark on “option no.1”. Please mark your responses carefully and do not take too much for answering each statement. Your response would be kept confidential”

14. Rotter’s Internal – External Locus of Control Scale

Following instructions were given for the Rotter’s locus of control scale “Given below is a series of items. Each item has two choices “A” and “B”. Read both the statements for each item and mark against the option which best suits you. We are interested only in your likes or feelings, not in how others feel about these things or how one is supposed to feel. There are no right or wrong answers so be frank and give an honest appraisal of yourself”

15. Shyness Questionnaire

The subject was instructed as follows “Please indicate, for each of the statements given below, how characteristic the statement is for
you, that is, how much it reflects what you typically think, feel, and do.
Use the following scale to mark your response (1) Not at all characteristic, (2) Somewhat characteristic, (3) Often characteristic, (4) Very characteristic, (5) Extremely characteristic

SCORING AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The scoring on Young’s Diagnostic Questionnaire was done to diagnose the internet addicts. Then these individuals were administered the other tests and their scoring was done as per the instructions provided in the scoring manual of the tests. The scores were then subjected to various statistical treatments and analysis. Means, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio, ANOVA, Discriminant Functional Analysis, Correlation and Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis were done to analyse the data.