Information and communication technology is the latest in a series of technological advances that have changed the world in varied ways. The last two decades have noticed a techno-revolution caused by the rapid development of Information and Communication Technology (ICT). It is hard to imagine the future that is not supported, in one way or other, by Information and Communication Technology (ICT). An information world, called the *cyber world*, comes into being between the social and physical worlds. Looking at the current widespread diffusion and the use of ICT in modern societies, especially by the younger ones (called as *digital generation*) affects their way of life. ICTs in general and the *Internet* in particular is one of the most important and complex innovations of mankind. As we approaching a new millennium, the Internet has revolutionised our: society, economy, education as well as technological system. If there were a vote for the thing which very much influenced people's lives in the 21st century, it is none other than Internet. Most people are seen to accept Internet as a revolutionary medium which has changed the lifestyle of present generation. Gates (2000) asserted that Internet has significantly influenced the lifestyle of each one and mostly the student community. Internet is acknowledged globally as a technology dominated resource in education, social interaction and entertainment (Salako & Tiamiyu, 2007).

Michael Hart's (1995) quoted as:

*Internet, "for the first time we actually have the opportunity for a whole world's population to share not only air or water, but also to share the world of ideas, of art or of music and other sounds...anything that can be digitalized."*
The advancement of Information and communication technology shows increasingly a visible effect on education (Vandana & Rishu, 2011). The widespread availability of resources on the Internet and their potential used in educational settings has driven much debate in its use. It has made a considerable and dramatic impact on the contemporary educational practice (Chou, et al., 2002). Seeking information on Internet has become the first choice option for many teaming millions, and students seem to be no exception (Cole et al., 2003). In the present era, students integrate technology into all aspects of their life for varied purposes viz. academics, research, social networking and entertainment.

Internet usage among students is negatively reported with academic activities (Aslanidou & Menexes, 2008; Tadsad, 2003; Shen & Shakir, 2009). However, other findings are contrary. Internet among students is related to their studies (Omotayo, 2006), mainly for educational purposes (Ritter & Lemke, 2000) rather than for entertainment (Sam & Nordin, 2005). Some students strongly prefer the use of Internet as their primary information source (Gibson & Mazur, 2001). They favour the Web over traditional print materials and feel that information can be located much faster via Internet (Vansickle, 2002). Students consider Internet as easier than written material in books (Edmunds & Conole, 2010; Wallace, 2004). It has increasingly influenced the information seeking behaviour of students in higher education over the past decade. Turner & Farmer, (2008) reported that surfing the Internet for course material had positive effect on the intellectual development, vocational preparation and personal development of college and university students. The mass availability of information on the web has seen significant changes in this electronic era. It accelerates university students’ learning and democratizes access to educational opportunities, and support interactivity, interaction, and collaboration (Oliver, 2006). Studies carried on: effect of Internet usage on educational performance (Siomos et al 2008; Ghassemzadeh et al. 2008; Del Castillo et al. 2008; Recabarren et al. 2008; Tahiroglu et al. 2008). Relationship between Internet use and educational performance (Sahin & Ercan 2010). Internet usage and access to academic and entertainment networking (Tella, 2007; Anunobi, 2006; Papastergious & Solomonidou, 2005) revealed that Internet in relation to above variables go together.
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Internet as a social technology gives rise to interpersonal relationships (Merkle 2000). Some studies found Internet as a contributory to psychological well-being (Weiser, 2002, and Wellman et al., 2001). Internet linking attitude has been observed with higher increase to social support (LaRose et al., 2001). Mitchell et al. (2009), revealed Internet as a valuable means to health promotion. Lewis et al. (2009) refer interactive health communication applications as effective for the improved and healthier lifestyle. On the other hand, some studies indicated that Internet use among students undermines well-being because: online connections are weaker than real-life connections; online connections are often used to replace real-life relationships and activities (Nie, 2001 & Weiser, 2001). Some even observe Internet usage as a causal factor for psychological harm among youth (Eastin & LaRose, 2000). Other studies suggested Internet with direct negative effects (Choi, 2007; Sirgy, Lee, & Bae, 2006), such as social isolation, depression, loneliness and difficulties with time management. Internet use has been found associated with negative personal and social developmental outcomes (Lloyd et al. 2007; Morgan & Cotton, 2003; Nalwa & Anand 2003; Hilly us, & Erbring, 2002).

Gender differences in Internet usage are other attractive concerns of the research studies. No gender variation in Internet usage has been confirmed (Jackson et al. 2001; Odell, Korgen et al. 2000). Both girls and boys are equally observed comfortable with positive feelings toward the Internet. Gender does not provide consistent evidence for the presence or otherwise in Internet usage (Durndell & Haag 2002; Jackson et al. 2001, Schumacher et al. 2001; Odell et al. 2000, Nachmias et al. 2000). On the other hand, (Mishra, Yadav & Bisht 2005; Ono & Zovodny 2003; Weiser 2000; Morahan-Martin & Schumacher 2000; Nachmias, Mioduser & Shemla 2000; Madell & Sherman et al. 2000; Shashaani 1997) reported a significant gender difference in Internet usage. Various studies have documented that boys use Internet more frequently with longer time consumption than girls (Gross, 2004; Haythronthwaite & Wellman, 2002; Subrahmanyam, Greenfield, Kraut, & Gross, 2001). Liu & Huang (2008) revealed that male/female differences in web searching materials and female readers have been found with a strong preference for paper as a reading medium than male readers. However, male readers have experienced a greater
sense of satisfaction to online reading. Researchers like (Chen & Peng, 2008; Lin & Yu, 2008; Dholakia, 2006; Hupfer & Detlor 2006; Joiner et al. 2005; Madden, & Hitlin, 2005; Garbarino & Strahilevitz’s 2004; Griffiths, Davies, & Chappell, 2004; Jennings & Wartella, 2004; Korgaonkar, 2003; Jackson et al., 2001; Lenhart, Subrahmanyam, et al. 2001; Weiser 2000; Sherman et al. 2000; Odell et al. 2000; Wolin & Odell et al., 2000; Boneva, Kraut, & Frohlich 2001; Odell et al., 2000; Sherman et al., 2000) reported that male and female differences in web searching appear to persist such as women are more into e-mail, chat, maintaining social values, search reference materials and educational purposes. Whereas, men tend to focus on: information about personal interests and entertainment, leisure, visiting sex sites, researching for purchases, checking the news, playing games, and listening to and copying music. Female students used the Internet for communicative and academic purposes more than male counterparts and male students used the Internet for a wider variety of leisure activities than female counterparts (Jones et al. 2009 & Liu & Huang 2008). Most studies indicated male domination in terms of Internet usage and attitude towards the Internet; some studies showed otherwise. So, with the increased role of modern technology in day to day lives of the youth and in the light of the inconsistent findings referred above further exploration is required in this direction.

**Significance of the Study**

Internet has been used for the last two decades in our society and we have a generation who have grown up with its routine usage. However, since its inception, Internet has not only brought convenience to mankind, but has given birth to a great deal of potential problems too. Despite the positive effects of Internet, there is growing literature on the negative effects of its use. Hicks (2002) indicated that Internet is a double-edged sword. Although some accept Internet as a panacea yet for others it appears in its negative growth. Researchers report that a group of students is interested in and competent with technology and a group of students’ is not interested in and not very competent with technology (Vogel; Heinz 2000; & Minks 2000). Some students prefer to traditional print materials, despite the increasing prevalence of electronic sources (High & Beheshti, 2000).

Every year thousands of young students register themselves in Universities and all of them do not have the necessary skills to work with ICT resources available
to them. The gap in Internet usage is labelled as ‘the digital divide’ and it has been the subject of many scholarly debates. Studies conveyed that not all students are as inclined to integrate Internet use into their routine life; as is usually the case in educational debate, blame for this disparity has been most frequently attributed to deficits of skills, motivation and know-how etc on the part of students. Researchers have reasoned that some university students’ (non) engagement with the Internet is influenced by perceptions of usefulness, ease-of-use and other psychological attitudes towards both technology and learning (Cheung and Huang, 2005; Hong et al., 2003; Joiner et al., 2006). Users and Non-users have different ideas of what the online world is like. Peter & Valkenburg (2004) advocate a ‘digital differentiation’ approach to replace that of the digital divide, because they believe the former attributes greater importance to the characteristics of the Internet itself, rather than the characteristics of the actual users. Brotcorne (2005) reported that students’ use or not to use the Internet is not always due to a disadvantage but ‘more due to matters of “digital choice” rather than “digital divide”’.

There is a research spanning several domains, disciplines, and approaches that has investigated’ use of technology, but no work has focused on studying the influence of Use and Non-use of Internet on university students. With the surge in the use of information and communication technology, users and non-users of ICT can be considered to be more than just a simple anomaly, especially where the Internet is concerned. Internet research, therefore, is still in its infancy phase mostly among the higher education students. With regard to Internet usage a host of studies have been carried out on different categories of people. But university student population has not so far been specifically looked into. While scanning the literature, it appears that this field of research has been neglected hitherto. Besides, the investigator noticed that, there is no recent literature that bears testimony to the influence of Internet usage on university students in relation to their Lifestyle, academic achievement and attitude towards research. A gap in literature is observed by the present investigator, which led the investigator to proceed ahead by considering the Lifestyle, Academic achievement and Attitude towards research among university students in Kashmir (J&K).
Statement of the Problem

Internet Usage among University Students in Relation to their Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives have been formulated for the present investigation:

1. To identify Internet-users and Internet Non-users.
2. To find and compare the Lifestyle of Internet-users and Internet Non-users.
3. To find and compare the Academic Achievement of Internet-users and Internet Non-users.
4. To find and compare the Attitude towards Research of Internet-users and Internet Non-users.
5. To find and compare the Lifestyle of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on the basis of gender.
6. To find and compare the Academic Achievement of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on the basis of gender.
7. To find and compare the Attitude towards Research of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on the basis of gender.
8. To find and compare the Lifestyle of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on stream basis (Faculty-wise)
9. To find and compare the Academic Achievement of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on stream basis (Faculty-wise).
10. To find and compare the Attitude towards Research of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on stream basis (Faculty-wise).
11. To find out the dominant set of factors of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on Lifestyle and Attitude towards Research (separately)

Hypotheses

Following hypotheses have been framed for the present investigation:

1. There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on Lifestyle.
2. There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on Academic Achievement.
3. There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on Attitude towards Research.

4. There will be a significant gender variation of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on their Lifestyle.

5. There will be a significant gender variation of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on their Academic Achievement.

6. There will be a significant gender variation of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on their Attitude towards Research.

7. There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on their Lifestyle on stream basis (Faculty wise).

8. There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on their Academic Achievement on stream basis (Faculty wise).

9. There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on their Attitude towards Research on stream basis (Faculty wise).

10. The dominant set of factors of Internet-users and Internet Non-users on Lifestyle and Attitude towards Research bear no similarity.

**Research Design**

**Sample:**

A sample of 600 Post Graduate students was drawn through stratified random sampling technique from the three faculties of University of Kashmir, (J&K) India. It needs to be mentioned that the subjects enrolled in 3rd and 4th semesters were considered as the sample for the present study. The procedure for the selection of the sample is reported as under:

Three Faculties viz. i) Faculty of Science, ii) Faculty of Social Science and iii) Faculty of Arts (five departments from each faculty) participated in the investigation. These departments are: Zoology, Chemistry, Botany, Physics and Home Science (Faculty of Science); Sociology, Economics, Political Science, History and Social Work (Faculty of Social Science); English, Urdu, Persian, Hindi and Linguistics (Faculty of Arts). 40 students each from both the genders (20 Internet-users and 20...
Internet Non-users) were drawn randomly from each department with a total of 100
Internet-users and equal number of Internet Non-users from each faculty. The Table at
Page No. 100 of Chapter III shows a detailed breakup in this regard.

Tools

Following standardised tools were used to collect the required data. Besides,
an Information Blank was used to identify Internet-users and Internet Non-users. The
details are given as:

1. A Self constructed Information blank for the identification of Internet-
   users and Internet Non-users.
3. Attitude Scale towards Research by Vishal Sood and Y. K. Sharma (ASTR–
   SVSY,2012)

I. Information Blank: This Information blank was developed by investigator with
the purpose to identify the Internet-users and Internet Non-users.

II. Life Style Scale (LSS–BK): This scale has been designed by S. K. Bawa and S.
Kaur. It consists of 60 items representing six Dimensions as i) Health Conscious
Life Style, ii) Academic Oriented Life Style, iii) Career Oriented Life Style, iv) Socially Oriented Life Style, v) Trend Seeking Life Style, and vi) Family Oriented
Life Style.

III. Attitude Scale towards Research (ASTR): This scale has been designed
Vishal Sood and Y. K. Sharma. It consists of forty two (42) items representing
Four Dimensions, as (i) General Aspects of Research and Research Process, (ii)
Usefulness of Research in Professional Career, (iii) Relevance of Research in
Personal- Social Life and (iv) Difficulties in Research and Research Anxiety.

Statistical Treatment

The data obtained was put to suitable statistical analysis by using various
statistical techniques like percentage statistics (for asserting the different levels of
Lifestyle, Attitude towards Research and Academic Achievement of Internet-users
and Internet Non-users). Mean, Standard deviation (SD) and test of significance (“t”-
test) were used in order to determine whether there is any significant difference
between the Internet-users and Internet Non-users on the variables under
investigation. Besides, that data collected was subjected to Factor analysis by utilizing
the Principal Components Factor Analysis (PCFA).
Findings

The study emanated certain interesting and useful results. A brief reporting of these results is summarised under the following captions.

(A) Descriptive Analysis
Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research
(Inter- net-users and Non-users)

(B) Sub-Group Analysis
i) Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research
   (Gender wise)
ii) Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research
    (Faculty wise)

(C) Comparative analysis
i) Comparison between Internet-users and Non-users on:
   Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research
ii) Comparison between Internet-users and Non-users (Gender wise) on:
   Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research
iii) Comparison between Internet-users and Non-users (Faculty Wise) on:
   Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research

(D) Factor Analysis
Dominant factors influencing:
   i) Internet-users on Lifestyle and Attitude towards Research.
   ii) Internet-non-users on Lifestyle and Attitude towards Research.

Section (A): Descriptive Analysis:

Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research
(Inter-net-users and Non-users)

The below recorded conclusions are draw with regard to this Section:

1. Percent-wise distribution of Internet-users and Internet Non-users, on various levels of Lifestyle revealed majority of Internet-users with moderate level of lifestyle in comparison to Internet Non-users.

2. The study concluded that Internet-users, in comparison to Internet Non users, exhibited higher academic achievement. The percent wise distribution revealed the major percentage of Internet-users in first division category.
3. The study revealed majority of Internet-users moderately favourable on attitude towards research as against to their comparable group.

**Section (B): Sub-Group Analysis**

i) **Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research (Gender wise)**

The sub group analysis led to the following conclusions:

1. Percent-wise comparison of male and female Internet-users on Lifestyle revealed majority of the female Internet-users on above average level as against to their male counterparts.
2. The comparison between male and female Internet Non-user group on Lifestyle revealed a majority of female Internet Non-user group in high level category of Lifestyle as compared male Non Internet-user group.
3. The study concluded that the percent-wise distribution of male and female Internet-users on academic achievement indicated a higher frequency of female Internet-users in first division category as against to their male counterparts.
4. The percent-wise comparison of Internet Non-user group from both the genders on academic achievement revealed females with satisfactory results as compared to male group. Majority of female Internet Non-users were placed in first division category.
5. The study was concluded with the observation that both the genders from Internet-users’ group were moderately favourable on attitude towards research.
6. The findings revealed that a considerable percentage of male Internet Non-users had a moderate level of attitude towards research in comparison to female Internet Non-users.

**Sub-Group Analysis on:**

ii) **Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research (Faculty wise)**

The faculty wise comparison revealed the following broader conclusions:

1. Internet Non-users from Science stream had above average level of Lifestyle as against the Internet-users of same stream.
2. The percent-wise comparison between Internet-users and Internet Non-users belonging to *Social science stream* on Lifestyle was found significantly higher (above average) in case of Internet-users on Lifestyle.

3. The study found that on *high level* category, the lifestyle of Internet Non-users from *Arts stream* was higher as against Internet-users.

4. The percent wise comparison between Internet-users and Internet Non-users from *Science stream* found a maximum percentage from Internet-user group with first division.

5. The comparison between the Internet-users and Internet Non-users from *Social science stream* on academic achievement revealed a large percentage of Internet-users with *first division* as compared the Internet Non-users.

6. It was concluded that Internet Non-users from *Arts stream* were considerably in higher percentage with *first division* as against the Internet-users.

7. Percent-wise comparison between Internet-users and Internet Non-users belonging to *Science stream* found a *moderate level* of attitude towards research among Internet-users in comparison to Internet-Non users.

8. While comparing the Internet-users and Internet Non-users belonging to *Social science stream* on attitude towards research, it has been observed that a significant percentage of Internet Non-users found their place on *unfavourable level* category as against the Internet-users.

9. Percent wise comparison of *Arts Stream* Internet-users and Internet Non-users on attitude towards research revealed large percentage of Internet-users as *moderate level* in comparison to Internet Non-users.

**Section (C) Comparative Analysis**

(i) **Comparison between Internet-users and Non-users on:**

*Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research:*

This section is reported with the following conclusions:

1. Internet-users and Internet Non-users were significantly different on all the dimensions including the composite score of lifestyle.

2. The study found Internet-users with good adaptation towards Health Oriented Lifestyle, Academic Oriented Lifestyle, Career Oriented Lifestyle and Trend Oriented Lifestyle.
3. Internet Non-users were found inclined towards Socially Oriented Lifestyle and Family Oriented Lifestyle. However, the overall results revealed Internet-users with better adaptability on lifestyle than their comparable group.

4. A significant difference between the Internet-users and Internet Non-users on Academic Achievement was confirmed. This confirmation supported Internet-users’ group with higher academic achievement.

5. Internet-users and Internet Non-users differed significantly on all the four dimensions of Attitude towards Research. The study observed Internet-users with a favourable Attitude towards the: General aspects of Research and Research Process, Usefulness of Research in Professional Career, Relevance of Research in Personal Social Life. However, in one dimension i.e. Difficulties in Research and Possession of Research Anxiety could not be established among Internet-users.

(ii) Comparison between Internet-users and Non-users (Gender wise) on:
Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research:

Gender wise comparison emanated the following broader conclusions:

1. Male and female Internet-users differed significantly on three out of six dimensions of Lifestyle. The findings concluded that female Internet-users had excellent adaptation towards i) Academic and ii) Trend Oriented Lifestyle. Whereas, male Internet-users were found with a favourable tendency in the adaptation of better Career Oriented Lifestyle.

2. Both the groups under investigation were found equally inclined towards Health Oriented Lifestyle, Socially Oriented Lifestyle and Family Oriented Lifestyle. Overall results favoured female Internet-users with a better tendency in the adaptation of lifestyle than their comparable group.

3. The Male and female Internet Non-users differed significantly on three out of six dimensions of Lifestyle. Male Internet Non-users were found with better adaptation towards Health Oriented Lifestyle. Whereas, female Internet Non-users were equally inclined towards Socially Oriented Lifestyle and Family Oriented Lifestyle.

4. Both the groups were similar on Academic Oriented Lifestyle, Career Oriented Lifestyle and Trend Oriented Lifestyle. Overall results revealed equal inclination of both the groups towards life style.
5. Male and female Internet-users on Academic Achievement were found significantly different from each other. The results favoured female Internet-users with higher academic achievement.

6. Male and female Internet Non-users on Academic Achievement were found significantly different from each other. The results favoured female Internet Non-users with higher academic achievement.

7. Male and female Internet-users differed significantly on three out of four dimensions of Attitude towards Research. Male Internet-users were found with favourable tendency on General aspects of Research and Research Process, Usefulness of Research in professional Career and Difficulties in Research and Research Anxiety.

8. Both the groups were observed with similar inclination towards the Relevance of Research in Personal and Social Life. Overall results revealed male Internet-users with a favourable leaning towards Research in comparison to their comparable group.

9. Male and female Internet Non-users were significantly different on two out of four dimensions of Attitude towards Research. Female Internet Non-users’ showed favourable tendency towards the General aspects of Research and Research Process.

10. The study found male Internet Non-users favourably inclined towards the Relevance of Research in Personal and Social Life.

11. Both the groups had a similar inclination towards the Usefulness of Research in Professional Career and Difficulties in Research and Research Anxiety.

12. The overall results revealed both the groups of Internet users and Internet Non-users with an equal tendency towards their lifestyle.

(iii) **Comparison between Internet-users and Non-users (Faculty Wise) on:**

**Lifestyle, Academic Achievement and Attitude towards Research:**

The conclusions deduced in this section are put as:

1. Internet-users and Internet Non-users from *Science stream* differed significantly on four out of six dimensions of lifestyle. Internet-users were found with a tendency to adapt better Academic Oriented Lifestyle. On the other hand, Internet Non-users were found with excellent adaptation towards Socially Oriented Lifestyle, Trend Oriented Lifestyle and Family Oriented Lifestyle.
2. The dimensions of Health Oriented Lifestyle and Career Oriented Lifestyle were not found in any way different between both the groups of subjects from science stream.

3. The overall results revealed that Internet Non-users from science stream had a tendency to adapt better lifestyle than their comparable group.

4. Internet-users and Non-users from Social Science stream were found significantly different from each other on all the six dimensions of Lifestyle. Internet-users have shown good adaptation towards Health Oriented Lifestyle, Academic Oriented Lifestyle, Career Oriented Lifestyle, and Trend Oriented Lifestyle. Whereas, Internet Non-users were found with higher inclination towards Socially Oriented Lifestyle and Family Oriented Lifestyle.

5. The overall results revealed the Internet-users from Social Science stream with higher leaning on lifestyle than their comparable group.

6. The study concluded that Internet-users and Non-users from Arts stream were significantly different from each other on four dimensions of Lifestyle. Internet Non-users from Arts stream were found better on Health Oriented Lifestyle, Socially Oriented Lifestyle, Trend Oriented Lifestyle and Family Oriented Lifestyle. However, both the groups reported similarity towards the Academic Oriented Lifestyle and Career Oriented Lifestyle.

7. The overall results revealed Internet Non-users from Arts stream with an excellent adaptation towards lifestyle than their comparable group.

8. It was concluded that Internet-users and Internet Non-users belonging to Science stream were different from each other on Academic Achievement. Better grades and higher Academic Achievement favoured Internet-user group.

9. A significant mean difference on Academic Achievement between the Internet-users and Internet Non-users from Social Science stream was confirmed. This difference favoured the Internet-user group with higher grades and Academic Achievement.

10. Internet-users and Internet Non-users from Arts stream were found different on Academic Achievement. Observation of this mean difference has gone in favour of Internet Non-user group, who were seen higher on Academic Achievement.

11. It was found that Internet-users and Non-users (Science stream) were significantly different on two dimensions of Attitude towards Research.
Internet-user group was found favourable on both the dimensions i.e. General aspects of Research and Research Process and Usefulness of Research in Professional Career. However, both the groups could not be differentiated on Relevance of Research in Personal and Social Life and Difficulties in Research and Research Anxiety.

12. The overall results revealed Internet-users (*Science stream*) with a favourable Attitude towards Research in comparison to their comparable group.

13. Internet-users and Internet Non-users from *Social science stream* were seen significantly different in three out of four dimensions on Attitude towards Research. Internet-users were found with favourable attitude towards the General aspects of Research and Research Process, Usefulness of Research in Professional Career and Difficulties in Research and Research Anxiety. On one dimension i.e. Relevance of Research in Personal and Social Life, the difference between the two groups could not be established.

14. The overall findings revealed Internet-users (*Social science stream*) with a favourable Attitude towards Research as against to their comparable group.

15. Internet-users and Internet Non-users from *Arts stream* differed significantly in one dimensions of Attitude towards Research. Internet-users were found with a favourable condition towards the General aspects of Research and Research Process. In rest of the three dimensions of Attitude towards research i.e. Usefulness of Research in Professional Career, Relevance of Research in Personal and Social life and Difficulties in Research and Research anxiety, the differences between the two groups could not be established.

16. The overall results revealed that Internet-users (*Arts stream*) were favourable on the Attitude towards Research than Internet non user group.

**Section D: Factor Analysis**

i) **Dominant factors influencing Internet-users on: Lifestyle and Attitude towards Research**

The following conclusions are drawn by applying factor analysis:

1. The factor analysis led to the emergence of three factors in case of Internet-users with 74 % of the total variation in data. Each of the variables that loaded on the First factor with a correlation (r) of $0.853 \leq r \leq 0.906$ and this First factor is
designated as “Contemporary Lifestyle with Career and Physical Efficacy”. This factor was found more influential among the Internet-users group with high factor loadings.

2. The Second factor that loaded with correlation (r) as $0.717 \leq r \leq 0.903$ is designated as “Academic Attainment and Research Affinity”. This factor is the second influential factor of Internet-users.

3. The variables that loaded on the Third factor with a correlation (r) coefficient of $0.676 \leq r \leq 0.717$ is labelled as “Research Connivance in Routine Life”. This is the third but least influential factor among Internet-users.

4. It is to be recorded factors - “Contemporary lifestyle with Career and physical efficacy” and “Academic attainment and research affinity” exhibited a greatest variability among Internet-users.

5. Last identified factor i.e. “Research connivance in routine life” emerged as the 3rd factor which exhibits low variability among Internet-users.

ii) Dominant factors influencing Internet Non-users on: Lifestyle and Attitude towards Research:

6. Three factors emerged among Internet Non-users with 76 % of variance. Each of the variables that loaded on the First factor has a correlation (r) coefficient as $0.701 \leq r \leq 0.922$. Therefore, this factor is labelled as “Socio-familial Involvement and Professional Interest” and is reported as the most influential factor among Internet Non-users group. This factor is the second influential factor of Internet Non-users.

1. The Second factor on which the variables that loaded on this factor has found a correlation (r) coefficient as $0.510 \leq r \leq 0.815$. This factor is designated as “Health Efficacy with Research Perception”.

2. The variables that loaded on the third factor with a correlation (r) coefficient as $0.412 \leq r \leq 0.831$. Therefore, the factor is labelled as “Research Acquaintance for Existence”. This is the third and least influential factor among Internet-users.

3. The factor analytical method found Internet Non-users group with the greatest variability in “Socio-familial involvement and professional interest” and “Health efficacy with Research perception”.
4. The last identified factor i.e. “Research acquaintance for existence” emerged as the 3\textsuperscript{rd} factor which exhibited a low variability among Internet Non-users.