Table(1): Socio-demographic data among students of practical and theoretical faculties.

Socio-demographic data	Practical		Theoretical		P value	
socio-demographic data	N=196 Percentage%		N=392 Percentage%		r value	
Age/years						
$Mean \pm SD$	20.19±1.58		20.17±1.47		0.91	
Gender						
Females	98	50.00%	196	50.00%	1.00	
Males	98	50.00%	196	50.00%		
Residence						
Rural	70	35.71%	189	48.21%	0.004**	
Urban	126	64.29%	203	51.79%		
Residence with						
Alone	42	21.43%	126	32.14%	0.007**	
With parents	154	78.57%	266	67.86%		
Father job						
Farmer	19	9.69%	52	13.27%	0.004**	
Official employed	112	57.14%	162	41.33%		
Self employed	37	18.88%	105	26.79%		
Retired	28	14.29%	73	18.62%		
Father education						
Illiterate	12	6.12%	50	12.76%		
Primary	19	6.69%	29	7.40%	0.046*	
Preparatory	20	10.20%	30	7.65%		
Secondary	46	23.47%	111	28.32%		
University	99	50.51%	172	43.88%		
Mother education						
Illiterate	29	14.80%	69	17.60%	0.021*	
Primary	16	8.16%	44	11.22%		
Preparatory	17	8.67%	49	12.50%		
Secondary	60	30.61%	96	24.49%		
University	74	37.76%	134	34.18%		
Monthly income						
Less than 2000	58	29.59%	113	28.83%		
2000-5000	97	49.49%	176	44.90%	0.34	
More than 5000	41	20.92%	103	26.28%		

Table (2): Distribution of internet addiction among students of practical and theoretical faculties.

internet addiction	Pra	ctical	Theoretical		Total X ²		P	
test	N=196	Percenta ge%	N=39 2	Percentage %	N	Percentag e%	val ue	value
Internet addiction								
Non problematic (Normal)	143	72.96%	238	60.71%	381	64.80%	8.5 9	0.003
Potentialy problematic	53	27.04%	154	39.29%	207	35.20%		

Table (3): Comparison between non-problematic and potentialy problematic internet user according to Socio-demographic data.

Socio-	non-problematicuse		potentialy problematic use		X ² value	P value
demographic data	N=381	Percentage%	N=207	Percentage%	-	
Age/years Mean ± SD	20.36± 1.50		19.85± 1.45		t=4.02	0.0001
Gender Females Males	223 158	58.53% 41.47%	71 136	34.30% 65.70%	31.49	<0.000 1**
Residence Rural Urban	163 218	42.78% 57.22%	96 111	46.38% 53.62%	0.70	0.43
Residence with Alone With parents	96 285	25.20% 74.80%	72 135	34.78% 65.22%	6.04	0.01*
Father job Farmer Official employed Self employed Retired	59 149 106 67	15.49% 39.11% 27.82% 17.59%	12 125 36 34	5.80% 60.39% 17.39% 16.43%	29.61	0.0001
Father education Illiterate Primary Preparatory Secondary University	54 37 36 100 154	14.17% 9.71% 9.45% 26.25% 40.42%	8 11 14 57 117	3.86% 5.31% 6.76% 27.54% 56.52%	25.46	<0.000 1**
Mother education Illiterate Primary Preparatory Secondary University	83 42 49 91 116	21.78% 11.02% 12.86% 23.88% 30.45%	15 18 17 65 92	7.25% 8.70% 8.21% 31.40% 44.44%	30.59	<0.000 1**
Monthly income Less than 2000 2000-5000 More than 5000	135 188 58	35.43% 49.34% 15.22%	36 85 86	17.39% 41.06% 41.55%	54.94	<0.000 1**

Table (4): Comparison between non-problematic and potentialy problematic internet user regarding to Academic data and patterns of internet use

	non-pr			otentialy	X ² value	P value
Academic data		T		problematic use		
	N=38	Percentage	N=20	Percentage		
	1	%	7	%		
Faculty						
Practical	143	37.53%	53	25.60%	8.59	0.003**
Therotical	238	62.47%	154	74.40%		
Grade of faculty						
1 st grade	167	43.83%	126	60.87%	15.57	<0.0001**
4 th grade	214	56.17%	81	39.13%		
Academic						
performance	161	42.26%	71	34.30%		
Average	58	15.22%	73	35.27%	31.46	<0.0001**
Good	162	42.52%	63	30.43%		
Excellent						
Presence of						
computer at home						
Not present	147	38.58%	42	20.29%	20.58	<0.0001**
Present	234	61.42%	165	79.71%		
Availability of						
internet at home						
Not present	156	40.94%	32	15.46%	40.06	<0.0001**
Present	225	59.06%	175	84.54%		
Main aim of						
internet use						
Chatting	74	19.42%	87	42.03%		
Games	61	16.01%	59	28.50%	67.77	<0.0001**
Gather information	144	37.80%	31	14.98%		
News	202	26.77%	30	14.49%		

Table(5):Comparison between non-problematic and potentialy problematic internet user regarding to the personality traits

Eysenck personality questionnaire (EPQ)	Non-problematic use	Potentialy problematic use	Z value	P value
	N=381	N=207		
Psychoticism Mean ± SD	5.97±3.57	13.18±6.40	-12.75	<0.0001**
Extraversion Mean ± SD	12.39±3.98	8.27±4.66	0.90	<0.0001**
Neuroticism Mean ± SD	11.08±5.63	16.53±3.67	-11.12	<0.0001**
Lie Mean ± SD	15.33±3.98	9.13±4.65	13.69	<0.0001**

Table (6): Final logistic regression model of factor affecting presence of potential ${\bf r}$

problematic internet use.

Variable	Odds ratio (95% confidence interval)	P value
Sever vs. no Depression	6.43 (2.40-17.25)	<0.0001**
Availability of internet at home Moderate vs. no Anxiety	5.25 (2.55-10.81) 4.85 (2.00-11.75)	<0.0001** <0.0001**
Moderate vs. no Depression	4.49 (1.93-10.44)	<0.0001
Presence of computer at home	2.21 (1.43-3.42)	<0.0001**
Psychoticism	1.21 (1.11-1.32)	<0.0001**
Gather information vs. Chatting	0.23 (0.11-0.47)	<0.0001**
Monthly income More than 5000 vs. Less than 2000	3.82 (2.22-6.58)	<0.001**
4 th grade vs. 1 st grade	0.44 (0.30-0.66)	<0.001**
Lie	0.87 (0.79-0.94)	0.001**
Age/years	0.73 (0.59-0.88)	0.002**
Sever vs. no Anxiety	8.01 (2.06-31.10)	0.003**
Academic performance Excellent vs. good	0.50 (0.30-0.83)	0.007**
Theoretical vs. Practical	2.17 (1.18-4.01)	0.01*
Academic performance Average vs. good	0.53 (0.32-0.87)	0.01*
Aim of internet use News vs. Chatting	0.39 (0.18- 0.82)	0.01*
Males Vs. females	2.18 (1.14-4.18)	0.02*
Monthly income 2000-5000 vs. Less than 2000	1.65 (1.03-2.65	0.04*