A Study on Utilization of Electronic Resources by the Faculty Members of Agriculture Colleges

[1]Sankaranarayanan, D. [2]Elayaraja, T.
[1] Department of Library and Information Science
Annamalai University - 608 002, Tamil Nadu, India
[2] T. S. Pettai - 608002
Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT: *This paper aims to assess and evaluate the awareness and ability to use e- recourse by faculty members in agriculture colleges in Tamil Nadu. The study mainly focused on the use of various types of electronic information resources, location of access, purpose and benefit of accessing e-resources. For this purposes the author prepared a well structured questionnaire as a tool for data collection and same analyzed and presented with useful percentage analysis and suitable table for presentation of data.*

Keywords: Electronic Resources, Faculty Members, Agriculture College

Received: 3 March 2019, Revised 9 May 2019, Accepted 17 May 2019

DOI: 10.6025/jdp/2019/9/3/67-72

1. Introduction

Electronic resources are invaluable research tools which complement print based resources in a traditional library. They provide access to information that might be restricted to the user because of geographical location or finance. Electronic resources are convenient to use since people are able to access to current information from the library, internet café, offices or homes at any time of the day. E-recourse thus possess the better accessibility than regular paper resources.

2. Methodology

According to this paper 310 samples are taken from the library users of 10 constituent agriculture colleges in Tamil Nadu. The structured questionnaires are prepared for this study. Questionnaire are distributed to the library users and received. The selected questionnaire are grouped, coded tabulated and analysed by using appropriate statistical techniques.

3. Objectives

The following are the objectives of the study

1) To find out the awareness of the users about available e-resources.

2) To know the different types of electronic information resources used by the faculty members of agriculture colleges.

3) To find out the frequency of accessing e-resources by the faculty members.

4) To study the different purposes of using e-resources.

5) To find out the place of accusing e-resources

6) To study the usefulness and benefit of using e-resources, by the faculty members.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Status	No. of respondents	Percentage
Associate professor	102	32.90
Assistant professor	208	67.10
Total	310	100.00

Table 1. Status wise Distribution of Respondents

Table 1 shows wise distribution of respondents. The result reveals that out of a Total of 310 respondents, the associate professor population is 102 number and comes to 32.90 percent whereas the population of Assistant professor is 208 and the percentage share comes to 67.10 percent.

Status	No. of Respondents				Total	%
	Yes	%	No	%		
Associate Professor	100	32.26	2	0.65	102	32.90
Assistant Professor	203	65.48	5	1.61	208	67.10
Total	**303**	**97.74**	**7**	**2.26**	**310**	**100**

Table 2. Status wise Distribution of Respondents Awareness of E-resources

Table 2 shows the status wise distribution of respondents awareness of e-resources. Out of 310 total respondents 303 (97.77%) respondents are aware of e-resources and 7 (2.26%) respondents are not aware of e-resources. The above table also shows that out of 102 Associate professors, 100 (32.26%) respondents are aware of e-resources and 2 (0.65%) respondents are not aware of e-resources. Out of 208 Assistant professors 203 (65.48%) respondents are aware of e-resources and 5 (1.61%) respondents are not aware of e-resources.

Table 3 shows the status wise distribution' awareness approach to e-resources. Out of 310 respondents, 28(9.03%) are aware of e-resources through library website, 39(12.58%) are were of e-resources through membership, 50(16.13%) respondents are aware of e-resources through information broucher, 124(40.00%) respondents are aware of e-resources through colleagues / friends and 69(22.26%) respondents are aware of e-resources through library staff and other sources.

Awareness Approach through	No. of Respondents				Total *N* = 310	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Library Website	10	9.80	18	8.45	28	9.03
Membership	18	17.65	21	10.10	39	12.58
Information Broucher	11	10.78	39	18.75	50	16.13
Colleagues / Friends	42	41.18	82	39.42	124	40.00
Library staff and other sources	21	20.59	48	23.08	69	22.26
Total	**102**		**208**		**310**	

Table 3. Status wise Distribution of Respondents Awareness Approach to E-resources

Purpose	No. of Respondents				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Study	55	53.92	78	37.50	133	42.90
Research	71	69.61	84	40.38	155	50.00
Publishing Articles/Books	53	51.96	67	32.21	120	38.71
Keeping up-to-date information	81	79.41	171	82.21	252	81.29
Finding relevant information	64	62.75	110	52.88	174	56.13
Professional development	78	76.47	102	49.04	180	58.06
Entertainment	31	30.39	49	23.56	80	25.81
chatting	27	26.47	38	18.27	65	20.97

Note: The Percentage exceeded 100% because of multiple choice of option.

Table 4. Status wise Distribution of Respondents purpose of using E-resources

Data presented in table 4 indicates status wise distribution of respondents purpose of using e-resources. It is clearly observed from the table that 133(42.90%) using e-resources for their study followed by 155(50.00%) respondents use e-resources for research 120(38.71%) respondents use for publishing articles / books, 252(81.29%) respondents use e-resources for keeping up-to-date information, 174(56.13%) respondents use e-resources for finding relevant information, 180(58.06%) respondents use e-resources for professional development, 80(25.81%) respondents use e-resources for entertainment and 65(20.97%) respondents use e-resources for chatting.

Table 5 shows the status wise distribution of respondents use of resources. It can be seen from the table that 213(68.71%)

respondents use e-journals followed by 86(27.74%) respondents use e-conference proceedings, 164(52.90%) respondents use e-databases, 111(35.81%) respondents use open source literature, 83(26.74%) respondents use e-reference sources, 60(19.35%) respondents use e-tutorials, and 149(40.06%) respondents use e-thesis and dissertations.

E-resources	No. of Respondents				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
E-Journals	82	80.39	131	62.98	213	68.71
E-Books	48	47.06	68	32.69	116	37.42
E-Conference Proceedings	37	36.27	49	23.56	86	27.74
E-Tutorials	18	17.65	42	20.19	60	19.35
E-Databases	57	55.88	107	51.44	164	52.90
Open source Literature	44	43.14	67	32.21	111	35.81
E-Reference sources	31	30.39	52	25.00	83	26.74
E-Thesis and dissertations	47	46.08	102	49.04	149	48.06

Note: The Percentage exceeded 100% because of multiple choice of option.

Table 5. Status wise Distribution of Respondents Frequently by used E-resources

Place of access	No. of Respondents				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Library	61	59.80	94	45.19	155	50.00
Department	72	70.59	102	49.04	174	56.13
Residence	82	80.39	143	67.75	225	72.58
Cyber cafe	12	11.76	22	10.58	34	10.97

Table 6. Status wise Distribution of Respondents Place of access to E-resources

Table 6 shows the status wise distribution of respondents place of access to e-resources. It is seen from the table that about 155(50.00%) respondents access the e-resources at library, 174(56.13%) respondents access the e-resources at department, 225(72.58%) respondents access the e-resources at residence and 34(10.97%) respondents access the e-resources at cyber café.

Table 7 indicates the status wise distribution of respondents regarding the usefulness of e-resources. Out of 310 total respondents, 99(31.94%) respondents, opine that very useful, 157(50.65%) respondents opine that useful, 60(19.35%) respondents opine that average and 14(4.52%) respondents opine that not useful.

Usefulness	No. of Respondents				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Very Useful	38	37.25	61	29.33	99	31.94
Useful	63	61.76	94	45.19	157	50.65
Average	18	17.25	42	20.19	60	19.35
Not Useful	03	2.94	11	52.88	14	4.52
Total	**102**		**208**		**310**	

Table 7. Status wise Distribution of respondents regarding the usefulness of E-resources

Benefit	No. of Respondents				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Time saving	68	66.67	112	53.85	180	58.06
Better sources of information	74	72.55	120	57.69	194	62.58
Access to up-to-date Information	92	90.20	165	79.33	257	82.90
Information available in various formats as per the need	46	45.10	68	32.69	114	36.77
Improvement in the quality of professional work	40	39.22	57	18.51	97	31.29
Easily portability of E-resources	51	50.00	61	24.33	112	36.13
24/7 access to E-resources	61	59.80	82	39.42	143	46.13S

Note: The Percentage exceeded 100% because of multiple choice of option

Table 8. Status wise Distribution of Respondents Benefit if use of E-resources

Table 8 It is identified from the table 8 that faculty members have largely benefited with 257 (82.90%) access to up-to-date information, followed by 114 (36.77%) information available in various formats as per the need, 180 (58.06%) time saving, 194 (62.58%) better sources of information, 97 (31.29%) improvement in the quality of professional work, 112 (36.13%) easily portability of e-resources and 143 (46.13%) 24/7 access to e-resources.

5. Findings of the Study

The study revalued that most of the faculty members are completely aware of the availability of electronic information resources.

Among the respondents, 252 (81.29%) despondence are using e-resources for keeping up-to-date information, 2139(68.71%) respondents are using E-journal, 225(72.58%) respondents are accessing e-resources at residence,157(50.65) respondents opined that electronic resources are useful and 257(82.90%) respondents are benefited with access to up-to-date information.

6. Conclusion

It has a great impact that electronic formats of every resources in different formats really give the optimum usage for the resources in agriculture institution. The maximum usages of electronic resources are used for the purposes of keeping up-to-date information. In the future, the world totally depends open the digital formats in every piece of research work not only in the field of agriculture but also in every discipline.

References

[1] Sini, M., Ally Surname. (2007). Use of e-resources among PG students of Karalla Agricultural University. KELPRO Bulletion, 11(2) 13-24.

[2] Duff, A. S. (2008). four "e" pochs: the story of information. *Library Review*, 52 (2) Available: http:// www.emeraldinsight.com (Accessed on 10 September 2006)

[3] Wood, P. A., Watlher, J. H. (2000). The future of academic libraries: changing formats and changing delivery. The bottom line: Managing library finances, 13(4). Available. http:// www.emeraldinsight.com (Accessed on 10 October 2007)

[4] Rowley. J. (2001). JISC user behavior monitoring and evaluation framework ariadne 30. URL: http:// www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue 30/jisc/intro.html. (Accessed on 10 October 200 February 07, 2009)

[5] Zhu, Q. (2004). Understanding open URL standard and electronic resources: effective use of available resources, programme: *Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 38 (4) 251-6.