

## Effects of Internet on Psychogenic and Emotional Wellbeing of Prospective Teachers

Syeda Naureen Mumtaz<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Afsheen Salahuddin<sup>2</sup> & Dr. Amara Khan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor of education, University of Education Lahore,  
E-Mail: [sagitarious437@yahoo.com](mailto:sagitarious437@yahoo.com)

<sup>2</sup>Adjunct Faculty in English at Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani School of Humanities and Social Sciences (MGSHSS), Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS).  
E-Mail: [Afsheen.salahuddinn@lums.edu.pk](mailto:Afsheen.salahuddinn@lums.edu.pk)

<sup>3</sup>Assistant professor, English department LCWU Lahore.  
E-Mail: [Amara.khan@lcwu.edu.pk](mailto:Amara.khan@lcwu.edu.pk)

### Abstract

*The current study intended to explore the effects of internet on psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of prospective teachers. The researchers prepared the objectives and research questions to explore the effects of internet on psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of prospective teachers. This research was quantitative and descriptive in nature. The population of the study comprised of nineteen hundred and fifty-seven students at the University of Education, Lahore. The sample consisted of 1000 prospective teachers from 9 different departments. The sampling technique was random sampling. The questionnaire was adopted by the researchers for the purpose of collecting data. Questionnaire comprised of 25 questions. After collection of data each question was given a code. After coding data were entered into statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 15.0. Frequencies and percentages of items were calculated to find out prospective teacher's responses towards each statement. Chi-square test was used to explore comparison between items and demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree, program, shift and semester).*

**Keywords:** Internet effects, Internet websites, students' health, Internet addiction, Therapeutic strategies

### **Introduction**

Today, the Internet is a powerful source used to connect people all over the world. It is a source used for a quickest possible handing over of information. Ever since, Internet's establishment, its spread and popularity is on the rise (Internet World Stats, 2015). The benefits associated with Internet use, include: widest and quickest access to information, interpersonal communication through email and being connected to the entire world. However, despite its own merits, the risks associated with Internet unlimited-use are undeniable. The widespread of the Internet among youth is alarming (Chou, 2019).

Today, life without the Internet is inconceivable, which has its due toll on youth's psychogenic health and emotional development. In Europe alone 80% of the population is Internet dependent, (Internet World Stats, 2015). The Internet usage has become a necessity of every household across the globe.

There is an ongoing debate about the appropriateness of applying the concept of addiction to Internet use. So, Internet is being integrated as part of our every day's life because the usage of internet has been growing explosively worldwide. Homes, schools, colleges, libraries and internet cafes are the places which are more accessible to internet nowadays. Completing schoolwork, playing online games, reading and writing emails and engaging in real time chatting are the common online activities

Based on studies, internet usage has become popular worldwide, but is not without its negative impact on society at large. The cyber community is ever increasing; it has influenced our day to day life (Young, 2006). According to Widyanto (2004) the Internet dependent people exhibit low tolerance and signs of withdrawal. Such behavior is associated with the users of gadgets (McMurran, 2004). Internet's negative impact on youth is reportedly associated with depression and psychogenic disorder. The study describes those prospective teachers with internet dependence had poor outcome for mental wellbeing (Widyanto, 2004).

### **Statement of the Problem**

Due to the Internet usage, people across the world find it much inexpensive and easier to connect with one another. Even though internet facilitates individuals' learning process. In Pakistan, the youth and prospective teachers are among the most frequent internet users, and available evidence

suggests that their Internet dependence may affect their psychogenic and emotional wellbeing. Certain web-based content could be distressing for the students. The current study assessed internet effects on psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of the prospective teachers.

### **Objectives of the study**

1. To measure the effects of unlimited use of internet on psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of prospective teachers.
2. To find out the difference in psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of prospective teachers with respect to different demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift).

### **Research Questions**

1. To what extent the excessive use of internet affects the psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of prospective teachers?
2. To what extent internet affects differently the psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of prospective teachers with respect to different demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift).

### **Significance of Study**

Internet is an efficient linking device that allows information transfer. This study may be helpful for educationists, academic researchers, medical experts, and psychologists. This study may be helpful to increase the understanding of the reader about the phenomenon of internet. For the educationists and academic researchers, the study may help them as how the internet is utilized by prospective teachers. This study focuses on the access and use of internet among prospective teachers. For medical experts and psychologists, this study may be helpful for the treatment of addicts, caused by internet addiction. For parents, it may help to check the result of internet on psychogenic and emotional wellbeing of children.

### **Review of the Literature**

The internet is a global system, interconnecting computers. It is a network that consists of tens of thousands of public and private business, academics, and official networks, (Oskouei, 2010). The Internet is beneficial to both students and teachers if they use it as a way and means of knowledge

creation and dissemination. By using this facility, one can share information with other people around the world. It ensures access to latest news of the world. Also, it is a good way to find different types of jobs. It provides the facility to get online education. Teachers share similar concerns about the effects of Internet use on the mental abilities of students growing up with an unlimited access to Internet use. Prospective teachers can easily be distracted. The content available on different websites is not appropriate for youth of different age groups.

Researches argue that a new psychogenic disorder is found among youth and explains their problematic behaviors (associated with Internet), such as: mood swings, loneliness, timidity, poor time management, and anxiety. Adults and teenagers who spend a considerable time online also are known to experience frequently physical problems such as: frequent headaches, loss of focus, and lack of muscle-mobilizing activities (Martin & Schumacher, 2003).

Some studies show that having Internet access increases life satisfaction levels (Chou & Hsiao, 2000; Martin & Schumacher, 2003). In contrast, some researches indicate that Internet dependent people are less happy as compared to those who get indulged in physical activities.

Internet addiction is a wide term that covers a range of impulse-control problems and behaviors involving the internet (Oskouei, 2010).

Therapy employed for internet addicts who have lost their family bonding and social interactions would undergo a behavioral restructuring ;behavioral exercises, and exposure therapy in which the offline time of the individuals is enhanced by engaging them in more productive socio-physical activities (Sharma & Palanichami, 2018) .

### **Methodology**

The present research is quantitative descriptive survey research. Quantitative Research is explaining a phenomenon by collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods, in particular statistic, (Aliaga & Gunderon,2002). The current research was quantitative in nature because data from prospective teachers were obtained in form of numbers and analyzed it with statistical procedures to find whether predictive generalization of theory was true. In this study data was analyzed quantitatively using frequencies.

**Population**

The population of the study considered 1957 prospective teachers of University of Education. In order to conduct research on perception of prospective teachers regarding the effect of internet on their mental and emotional health, 9 departments were included in the study.

**Sample**

Sampling technique was stratified random sampling. According to Gay (1996), if the population size was greater than 1000, then the sample must be drawn about 30% which in current case was 587. But to be on the safe side 1000 sample size was drawn.

**Data Collection**

The researcher collected online data to access the perception of prospective teachers regarding the effect of internet on their psychogenic and emotional wellbeing. A link of the questionnaire was shared to students of all departments through email and requested to fill the questionnaire properly with patience and care.

**Data Analysis and Findings of the Study**

On completion of data collection, each questionnaire was given a code. After coding, data were entered into the SPSS version 15.0. Data were analyzed used the analytical techniques of descriptive statistic. Data were analyzed in the form of frequencies and percentage to find out the perception of prospective teachers regarding the effect of internet on their mental and emotional health. Chi-Square test was used to find difference in opinion of prospective teachers on the basis of demographic variables; gender, age, department, degree program, shift, and semester.

**Research Question 1**

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher’s responses on statement 1,2, and 3 about liking online games and internet*

*Table 1.1*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
Do you like online games?	208	20.8	96	9.6	163	16.3	533	53.3
Do you use internet?	22	2.2	16	1.6	240	24.0	722	72.2
Do you use internet at home?	30	3.0	12	1.2	288	28.8	670	67.0

Table 1.1 shows frequencies and percentages of perception of prospective teachers about liking of online games and usage of internet. It is clear from the table that half of the prospective teachers (53.3%) like online games and one-third of the prospective teachers (20.8%) do not like online games. Majority of the prospective teachers (72.2%) like to use internet and very few of them (2.2%) do not use internet. Then (67%) of the prospective teachers, use internet at home and few (3%) of them do not use internet at home.

Table 1.2

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher’s responses on statement 4,5, and 6 about use of internet*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
Is internet the main way of Communication with your offline friends?	229	22.9	62	6.2	267	26.7	442	44.2
Do you use internet to Share videos?	246	24.6	116	11.6	228	22.8	410	41.0
Do you make unknown friends on internet?	484	48.4	126	12.6	171	17.1	219	21.9

Table 1.2 is a representation about the use of internet. It is clear that, nearly half of the prospective teachers (44.2%) internet is the main way of communication with their offline friends and (22.9%) said that internet is not main way of communication. Still nearly half (41.0%) of the prospective teachers use internet to share videos and (24.6%) respondents responded that they do not use internet to share videos. (48.4%) respondents responded that they do not make unknown friends on internet.

Table 1.3

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher’s responses on statement 7,8, 9, and 10 about applications of internet*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
Is internet helpful in getting information of health and nutrition?	64	6.4	102	10.2	223	22.3	611	61.1
Is internet helpful in your studies?	37	3.7	28	2.8	291	29.1	644	64.4
Is internet helpful in your research work?	34	3.4	23	2.3	293	29.3	650	65.0
Is internet helpful for understanding and getting knowledge?	43	4.3	31	3.1	282	28.2	644	64.4

Table 1.3 shows the application of internet. It is clear from the table that more than half of the prospective teachers (61.1%) responded that internet is helpful in getting information about health and nutrition. And (6.4%) respondents responded that internet is not helpful in getting information about health and nutrition. More than half of the prospective teachers (64.4%) responded internet is helpful in studies and (3.7%) prospective teachers responded that internet is not helpful in their studies. (65%) prospective teachers answered that internet is helpful in their research work. And (64.4%) prospective teachers answered that internet is helpful for understanding and getting knowledge while, (4.3%) respondents responded that internet is not helpful for understanding and getting knowledge.

Table 1.4

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher’s responses on statement 11, 12, and 13 about time usage on internet*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
On average, do you spend time on internet more than 2 hours daily?	79	7.9	53	5.3	294	29.4	574	57.4
Is your time spent online longer than you originally planned?	190	19.0	98	9.8	285	28.5	427	42.7
Do you spend most of your time on online chatting?	329	32.9	103	10.3	266	26.6	302	30.2

Table 1.4 shows that more than half of the prospective teachers (57.4%), who participated said that their use of internet exceeded 2 hours. (7.9%) prospective teachers answered that their internet usage most of the time was not more than 2 hours per day. Regarding the time spent online longer than originally planned, (42.7%) prospective teachers replied in affirmative. (19%) prospective teachers said that they do not spent time online longer than they intended. (30.2%) prospective teachers time spent in online chatting. However (32.9%) prospective teachers do not time spent in online chatting.

Table 1.5

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher’s responses on statement 14, and 15 about effect of internet*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age

Does the use of internet decrease your participation in social activities like going parties/ religious gathering?	442	44.2	123	12.3	198	19.8	237	23.7
Do you feel depress when you stay online for long hours with friends?	405	40.5	99	9.9	255	25.5	241	24.1

Table 1.5 describes the effect of internet. Nearly half (44.2%) of the prospective teachers said that internet does not decrease their participation in social activities. However, (23.7%) prospective teachers responded that internet decrease their participation in social activities. (40.5%) of the prospective teachers do not feel depress when they online for long hours with friends. However (24.1%) responded that they feel depress when they stay online for long hours with friends.

Table 1.6

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher’s responses on statement 16,17, and 18 about effect of internet on mental and emotional health*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
Does the use of internet decrease your any physical activity like exercise?	367	36.7	119	11.9	238	23.8	276	27.6
Do you become moody, restless, irritable or depressed when you stop or decrease your internet use?	257	25.7	115	11.5	257	25.7	371	37.1
Do you use internet instead of T.V watching?	248	24.8	156	15.6	266	26.6	330	33.0

Table 1.6 shows frequencies and percentages about effect of internet on emotional and mental health of prospective teachers. (36.7%) prospective teachers responded that use of internet does not affect their physical activities like exercise. And (27.6%) responded that the use of internet affects their physical activities like exercise. (37.1%) responded that they become moody, restless irritable or depressed when they stop or decrease their internet use, similarly (25.7%) participants responded that they do not become moody, restless irritable or depressed when they stop or decrease their internet use. (33%) responded that they prefer using internet over

watching T.V and (24.8%) responded that they do not use internet over watching T.V

Table 1.7

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher's responses on statement 19,20, and 21 about excessive use of internet*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
Do you use internet instead of talking on phones?	372	37.2	119	11.9	233	23.3	276	27.6
Do you use internet instead of sleeping?	379	37.9	174	17.4	229	22.9	218	21.8
Do you use internet instead of exercising?	379	37.9	139	13.9	235	23.5	247	24.7

Table 1.7 is a representation about the excessive use of internet. (37.2%) prospective teachers responded that they do not use internet instead of talking on phones and (27.6%) responded that they use internet instead of talking on phones. Similarly, (37.9%) respondents responded that they do not use internet instead of sleeping and (21.8%) responded that they use internet instead of sleeping. (37.9%) respondents responded that they do not use internet instead of exercising and (24.7%) responded that they use internet instead of exercising.

Table 1.8

*Frequency and percentage of prospective teacher's responses on statement 22, 23, 24, and 25 about excessive use of internet*

Statements	No		Sometimes		Mostly		Yes	
	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age	Freq.	%age
Do you use internet instead of books, magazines, and newspaper?	334	33.4	158	15.8	231	23.1	277	27.7
Do you use internet instead of going to movie?	423	42.3	128	12.8	223	22.3	226	22.6
Do you use internet instead of going out/socializing?	459	45.9	151	15.1	219	21.9	171	17.1
Do you use internet instead of household work?	467	46.7	161	16.1	211	21.1	161	16.1

Table 1.8 shows the excessive use of internet. It is clear from the table that (33.4%) prospective teachers responded that they do not use internet instead of books, magazines, and newspaper and (27.7%) responded that they use internet instead of books, magazines, and newspaper. Nearly half of the prospective teachers (42.3%) do not use internet instead of going to movie and (22.6%) respondents responded that they use internet instead of

going to movie. Nearly half of the prospective teachers (45.9%) do not use internet instead of going out/socializing and (17.1%) prospective teachers use internet instead of going out/socializing. (46.7%) respondents responded that they do not use internet instead of household work and (16.1%) responded that they use internet instead of household work.

**Research Question 2**

Table 2.1

*Chi square test for comparison between item ‘Do you like online games?’ and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	32.624	3	.000
2.	Age	40.669	21	.006
3.	Department	48.918	24	.002
4.	Degree Program	53.120	30	.006
5.	Semester	44.440	9	.000
6.	Shift	20.734	3	.000

Table 2.1 is a representation of the comparison between the liking of online games by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the liking of online games with respect to their age, gender, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.2

*Chi square test for comparison between item ‘Do you use internet?’ and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	13.792	3	.003
2.	Age	44.884	21	.002
3.	Department	47.816	24	.003
4.	Degree Program	54.589	30	.004
5.	Semester	15.718	9	.073
6.	Shift	15.109	3	.002

Table 2.2 is a representation of the comparison between the usage of internet by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, and shift) and do not differ on the basis of semester. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the liking of online games with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, and shift.

Table 2.3

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet at home?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	11.344	3	.010
2.	Age	27.284	21	.162
3.	Department	20.473	24	.670
4.	Degree Program	29.663	30	.483
5.	Semester	25.239	9	.003
6.	Shift	17.220	3	.001

Table 2.3 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet at home by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for demographic variables (gender, age, semester and shift) and do not significant on the basis of department and degree program. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in use of internet at home with respect to gender, age, semester, and shift.

Table 2.4

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is internet the main way of communication with your offline friends?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	9.491	3	.023
2.	Age	59.461	21	.000
3.	Department	74.606	24	.000
4.	Degree Program	79.837	30	.000
5.	Semester	14.875	9	.094
6.	Shift	14.321	3	.002

Table 2.4 is a representation of the comparison between the internet is the main way of communication by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, and shift) and do not significant on the basis of semester. So it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ internet is the main way of communication with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, and shift.

Table 2.5

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet to share videos?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
---------	-----------------------	----------	----	----------

1.	Gender	27.069	3	.000
2.	Age	75.675	21	.000
3.	Department	109.232	24	.000
4.	Degree Program	119.656	30	.000
5.	Semester	34.036	9	.000
6.	Shift	11.235	3	.011

Table 2.5 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet to share videos by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p < 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the use of internet to share videos with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.6

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you make unknown friends on internet?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	20.728	3	.000
2.	Age	81.023	21	.000
3.	Department	39.200	24	.026
4.	Degree Program	59.891	30	.001
5.	Semester	21.987	9	.009
6.	Shift	19.757	3	.000

Table 2.6 is a representation of the comparison between the making unknown friends by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in making unknown friends on internet with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.7

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is internet helpful in getting information of health and nutrition?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	14.221	3	.003
2.	Age	49.283	21	.000
3.	Department	38.210	24	.033
4.	Degree Program	52.278	30	.007
5.	Semester	24.016	9	.004

6.	Shift	25.339	3	.000
----	-------	--------	---	------

Table 2.7 is a representation of the comparison between internet is helpful in getting information of health and nutrition by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in getting information about health and nutrition with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.8

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is internet help in your studies?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	19.342	3	.000
2.	Age	37.670	21	.014
3.	Department	31.069	24	.152
4.	Degree Program	52.219	30	.007
5.	Semester	20.694	9	.014
6.	Shift	18.051	3	.000

Table 2.8 is a representation of the comparison between internet is helpful in studies by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ regarding internet is helpful in studies with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.9

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is internet help in your research work?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	a
1.	Gender	22.424	3	.000
2.	Age	40.123	21	.007
3.	Department	36.864	24	.045
4.	Degree Program	58.166	30	.002
5.	Semester	19.851	9	.019
6.	Shift	16.293	3	.001

Table 2.9 is a representation of the comparison between that internet is helpful in research work by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant

at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ regarding internet is helpful in research work with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.10

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is internet helpful for understanding and getting knowledge?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	15.589	3	.001
2.	Age	43.751	21	.003
3.	Department	28.159	24	.253
4.	Degree Program	42.492	30	.065
5.	Semester	12.727	9	.175
6.	Shift	16.118	3	.001

Table 2.10 is a representation of the comparison between the internet is helpful in getting information and knowledge by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, semester, and shift) and do not significant on the basis of degree program. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ that internet is helpful in getting information and knowledge with respect to gender, age, department, semester, and shift.

Table 2.11

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'On average, do you spend time on internet more than 2 hours daily?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	a
1.	Gender	20.564	3	.000
2.	Age	38.645	21	.011
3.	Department	32.351	24	.119
4.	Degree Program	56.748	30	.002
5.	Semester	15.354	9	.082
6.	Shift	22.419	3	.000

Table 2.11 is a representation of the comparison between the time spent on internet is more than 2 hours daily by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, and shift) and do not significant on the basis of semester. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ that

time spent on internet is more than 2 hours daily with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, and shift.

Table 2.12

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is your time spent online longer than you originally planned?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	19.217	3	.000
2.	Age	18.956	21	.588
3.	Department	40.076	24	.021
4.	Degree Program	48.144	30	.019
5.	Semester	13.414	9	.145
6.	Shift	13.295	3	.004

Table 2.12 is a representation of the comparison between the time spent online longer than they planned by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in time spent online longer than they originally planned with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.13

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you spend most of your time on online chatting?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	24.584	3	.000
2.	Age	33.214	21	.044
3.	Department	37.177	24	.042
4.	Degree Program	52.741	30	.006
5.	Semester	17.770	9	.038
6.	Shift	17.379	3	.001

Table 2.13 is a representation of the comparison between the time spent on chatting by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in time spent on chatting with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.14

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Is the use of internet decrease your participation in social activities like going parties/ religious gathering?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	28.355	3	.000
2.	Age	45.930	21	.001
3.	Department	46.943	24	.003
4.	Degree Program	75.404	30	.000
5.	Semester	23.379	9	.005
6.	Shift	18.498	3	.000

Table 2.14 is a representation of the comparison between internet decreases any physical activities like religious gathering by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ regarding internet decreases any physical activities like religious gathering with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.15

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you feel depress when you stay online for long hours with friends?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	24.746	3	.000
2.	Age	36.204	21	.021
3.	Department	43.255	24	.009
4.	Degree Program	57.754	30	.002
5.	Semester	24.790	9	.003
6.	Shift	20.152	3	.000

Table 2.15 is a representation of the comparison between feeling depress when you stay online for long hours with friends by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in feeling depress when they stay online for long hours with friends with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.16

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do the use of internet decreases your any physical activity like exercise?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	13.196	3	.004
2.	Age	59.433	21	.000
3.	Department	46.097	24	.004
4.	Degree Program	71.256	30	.000
5.	Semester	43.720	9	.000
6.	Shift	15.429	3	.001

Table 2.16 is a representation of the comparison between that the internet decreases any physical activity by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ regarding internet decreases any physical activity with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.17

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you become moody, restless, irritable or depressed when you stop or decrease your internet use?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	18.017	3	.000
2.	Age	53.318	21	.000
3.	Department	73.649	24	.000
4.	Degree Program	96.768	30	.000
5.	Semester	29.348	9	.001
6.	Shift	18.774	3	.000

Table 2.17 is a representation of the comparison between when you stop using internet by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ when you stop using internet with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.18

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet instead of T.V watching?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
---------	-----------------------	----------	----	----------

1.	Gender	7.314	3	.063
2.	Age	40.717	21	.006
3.	Department	46.745	24	.004
4.	Degree Program	52.590	30	.007
5.	Semester	31.798	9	.000
6.	Shift	17.249	3	.001

Table 2.18 is a representation of the comparison between the internet is used instead of watching T.V by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (age, department, degree program, semester and shift) and do not significant on the basis of gender. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ that internet is used instead of watching T.V with respect to age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.19

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet instead of talking on phones?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	7.931	3	.047
2.	Age	63.389	21	.000
3.	Department	52.756	24	.001
4.	Degree Program	74.290	30	.000
5.	Semester	33.360	9	.000
6.	Shift	20.319	3	.000

Table 2.19 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet instead of talking on phones by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the use of internet instead of talking on phones with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.20

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet instead of sleeping?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	13.177	3	.004
2.	Age	29.609	21	.100
3.	Department	34.792	24	.072
4.	Degree Program	46.798	30	.026
5.	Semester	6.189	9	.721

6.	Shift	27.960	3	.000
----	-------	--------	---	------

Table 2.20 is a representation of the comparison between the internet is used instead of sleeping by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, and shift) and do not significant on the basis of semester. So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ that internet is used instead of sleeping with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.21

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet instead of exercising?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	22.456	3	.000
2.	Age	54.124	21	.000
3.	Department	43.830	24	.008
4.	Degree Program	63.341	30	.000
5.	Semester	18.177	9	.033
6.	Shift	16.193	3	.001

Table 2.21 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet instead of exercising by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the use of internet instead of exercising with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.22

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet instead of books, magazines and newspaper?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	8.997	3	.029
2.	Age	48.995	21	.001
3.	Department	51.246	24	.001
4.	Degree Program	69.081	30	.000
5.	Semester	33.175	9	.000
6.	Shift	21.586	3	.000

Table 2.22 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet instead of books, magazines and newspaper by prospective teachers and

demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the use of internet instead of books, magazines and newspaper with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.23

*Chi square test for comparison between item ‘Do you use internet instead of going to movie?’ and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	22.628	3	.000
2.	Age	64.847	21	.000
3.	Department	62.590	24	.000
4.	Degree Program	86.872	30	.000
5.	Semester	48.033	9	.000
6.	Shift	25.502	3	.000

Table 2.23 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet instead of going to movie by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the use of internet instead of going to movie with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.24

*Chi square test for comparison between item ‘Do you use internet instead of going out/ socializing?’ and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	20.576	3	.000
2.	Age	56.056	21	.000
3.	Department	46.806	24	.004
4.	Degree Program	54.429	30	.004
5.	Semester	18.526	9	.030
6.	Shift	12.775	3	.005

Table 2.24 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet instead of going out by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers

differ in the use of internet instead of going out with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

Table 2.25

*Chi square test for comparison between item 'Do you use internet instead of household work?' and demographic variables of prospective teachers (n=1000)*

Sr. No.	Demographic variables	$\chi^2$	df	$\alpha$
1.	Gender	19.039	3	.000
2.	Age	76.159	21	.000
3.	Department	46.183	24	.004
4.	Degree Program	70.931	30	.000
5.	Semester	20.428	9	.015
6.	Shift	20.394	3	.000

Table 2.25 is a representation of the comparison between the use of internet instead of household work by prospective teachers and demographic information of prospective teachers. It is clear that,  $\chi^2$  value is significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  for all demographic variables (gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift). So, it can be concluded that the prospective teachers differ in the use of internet instead of household work with respect to gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to explore the effects of internet on mental and emotional health of prospective teachers. The result of this research indicates wide range of internet effects on mental and emotional health of prospective teachers such as; liking online games, communication purposes, and excessive use of internet. Internet websites has been used for so many purposes by the youth of our country. They are using it for fun, chatting, playing games, increasing political awareness, sharing personal experiences, and connecting to their teacher and sharing assessments with friends and collage mates. Along with these uses, internet leaves some negative effect on mental development by using frequent use of internet. Some of them has affected the mental development in positive and good way and academic performance of the student. This is causing serious harm to their mental development.

Half of the prospective teachers use internet and they like online games and they like to use internet from their homes. Nearly half of them considered that internet is the main way of communication, they share

videos and they do not make unknown friends on internet. Most of the prospective teachers said that internet is helpful in getting information about health and nutrition, internet is helpful in their studies, research work, in getting knowledge. Majority of the prospective teachers use internet more than 2 hours per day. Some of them spent online time chatting. Most of the prospective teachers were depressed when they stayed online for long hours with friends. Some of them said that internet affects their physical activities and they become moody, restless when they stop using internet. Most of the prospective teachers use internet instead of watching television, instead of sleeping, instead of going out, instead of household work.

On the basis of gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift the prospective teachers differ in liking online games, usage of internet, making friends on internet, time spent on chatting, feeling depress when stay online for long hours with friends. On the other hand, prospective teachers showed a clear difference in the excessive use of internet (use of internet instead of talking on phones, instead of exercising, instead of going to movie, instead of going out, instead of household work) on the basis of gender, age, department, degree program, semester, and shift. However, gender, age, and shift influence all the aspects of mental and emotional health of prospective teachers. On the other hand, semester, department, and degree program had less influence on other aspects.

### **Recommendations**

Prospective teachers should minimize the use of internet for entertainment purpose. Social and health organizations should join hands to address these identified problems. Parents at home, and teachers at institutions are advised to remain vigilant to encourage safe internet use. Students' should monitor their own Internet based activities, and curtail the timings to increase its productivity. Misuses of the Internet should be avoided at all times to make the best use of the available facility.

Protection polices offered by telecommunication companies must be utilized to protect a child from any harm. Equipment or computer software (e.g., anti-virus software, antispayware, or firewall) should be provided to parents to monitor internet use for screening and blocking of inappropriate internet sites.

Computer laboratories in schools should be in well supervised areas to ensure that students use the Internet appropriately to protect student's

safety. This research was restricted only to 9 departments, it should also be conducted in other educational institutions and more departments..

### References

- Aliaga, M.& Gunderon(2002). Quantitative Research Methods : A Synopsis Approach. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* 6(11):40-47  
DOI:10.12816/0040336
- Chou, C. & Hsiao, M. (2000). Internet addiction, usage, gratification, and pleasure experience: taiwan college students' case. *Computer & Education*,35(1), 65-80.
- Chou,B. (2019). Difference of olfactory deficit in patients with acute episode of schizophrenia and major depressive episode. *Elsevier Volume( 212)*. ISSN 0920-9964,  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.08.004>.
- Gay, L. R. (1996). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage Publications.
- Internet World Stats,(2010). Retrived from  
<https://www.internetworldstats.com>
- Morahan-Martin, J., & Schumacher, P. (2003). Loneliness and social uses of the Internet. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19(6), 659–671.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632\(03\)00040-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(03)00040-2)
- Oskouei, R.J.( 2010).The role of social networks on female students activities. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1858378.1858404>
- Sharma, M.K, Palanichamy, T.S (2018). Psychosocial interventions for technological addictions. doi:  
10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry\_
- Widyanto, L., McMurrin, M.(2004). The psychometric properties of the internet addiction test. doi: 10.1089/cpb.2004.7.443.
- Young, K. S. (1999). *Internet addiction: symptoms, evaluation and treatment: Innovations in Clinical Practice*. Florida: Professional Resource Press.
- Young, K.Y. S. (2006). Cognitive behavior therapy with internet addicts: treatment outcomes and implications. *Journal of Cyber psychology & Behavior*, 10(5), 671-679.