

USE OF INTERNET RESOURCES BY FACULTY OF ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY: A CASE STUDY

P.Srinivasaragavan¹, V.Mohan² and Dr.S.Ravi³

¹Librarian, Vel Tech Engineering College, Chennai.

²Technical Officer, Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Cochin-18.
cmfrimohan@gmail.com

³Prof. & Head, Library & Information Science Wing, DDE, Annamalai University.

ABSTRACT

This study is designed to analyse the patterns of internet resources use by the faculty and impact of internet resources and the problems faced. Internet is not a substitute for the library, to find out the use of internet resources by faculty members for their teaching. For this purpose a well structured questionnaire was distributed among the faculty members working from the five faculties viz: Arts, Science, Education, Engineering, Agriculture and Medicine of Annamalai University. Each faculty 50 potential participants were selected as the sample. The finding of frequency of using library reveals that the professor respondents considerably use the library daily but have average knowledge about internet, the respondents have main problem in lack of time to acquire computer skills to use internet resources. Rating of Internet Resources indicates that an average level of performance.

Keywords: Academic Library, Annamalai University Library, E-Resources, e- journals.

INTRODUCTION

The Internet is a global network of computers and software that is interconnected by cables. It is appropriate to define the World Wide Web WWW or Web as an interactive and collaborative information environment that is mainly composed of hypermedia and hypertext documents linked to one another, and distributed over the Internet. What is more, among ICT the Internet can be pictured as a dynamic force to change in higher education, it transforms perpetually. The internet is evidently becoming an integral part of people's everyday life and becoming the main vehicle of scholarly communication. Only 20 percent of urban Indians and three percent of rural Indians use the internet. About 40 per cent of the 150 million internet users in the country are women and close to 24 million of them log in everyday to check

emails, interact on social networking sites and shop online, according to a study conducted by search giant Google. (Times of India date: Jun 20, 2013) The progressive increased in the use of Internet in higher education has drastically changed the teaching and learning process. Several studies primarily represent basic and higher level uses integrate of internet resources by virtual class meetings. As of 2013, India has the third largest number of Internet users. It is next to the United States and China in terms of sheer number of users. While there is no concrete data available, India is expected to have in excess of 125 million users by 2013 end. It is not surprising; information science somehow tends to presume that man the originator of cultural progress is not inclined to really develop. This is betrayed by the bare fact that no major information theory or model accommodates human development.

ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY: AN OVERVIEW

The University has had the unique good fortune of having a succession of with forty-nine Departments of Study and over 3240 members on its teaching staff. During the last eighty two years the University has grown rapidly and has consolidated its position as a unitary and residential University. Apart from the regular Universities in India, the Annamalai University has differs from others. The only University is having one to cater to the needs of the students in the Faculties of Engineering & Technology, Agriculture, Medicine and Dentistry.

The Department of Business Administration for the students of Arts, Science, Education, Fine Arts and Marine Science are the regular departments. The University having new laboratory, Video conferencing, EDUSAT, Campus wide network, high-tech class room is some of the added new facilities. In this study, an attempt is made to analyse the internet use and information such behaviour among the faculty members of Annamalai University.

OBJECTIVES

- To analyse the respondent's duration and quantum of time utilization in search of information through internet
- To analyse the e-resources search behaviour of faculty members of Annamalai University
- To analyse the respondents' rating on utility of internet resources

HYPOTHESES

- The respondents do differ significantly in their e-resources search behaviour.
- There is a significant faculty wise variation with respect to respondents' rating on utility of internet resources.

METHODOLOGY

This study attempts to examine the internet use behaviour among the faculty members of Annamalai University. It is primarily a fact-finding venture. The identified facts are cross tabulated with the faculty background, and occupational background of the respondents. Thus it gives an analytical orientation to this study and the design of this study is partly exploratory in nature and partly analytical in nature.

SAMPLING

The researcher has selected Six faculties in Annamalai University, viz., Arts, Science, Engineering, Medicine and Agriculture. From each faculty 50 respondents are selected as samples. While selecting samples a stratification method is applied with a view to give relative weightage to the faculty members of different designations. Thus, the sampling of the study comes under stratified random sampling.

DATA COLLECTION

The researcher has employed a well structured questionnaire for collecting the data from the respondents of the five faculties of Annamalai University. The researcher has sent questionnaires to all the selected staff members who work at different faculties of Annamalai University. The questionnaires have been designed to elicit background information of the staff members, duration and quantum of library use, nature and type of information required, information sharing behaviour and achievements, database use and so on.

DATA ANALYSIS

The collected data are classified and tabulated according to the objectives and hypotheses stated. First, the data are recorded on data sheets and then fed to the computer personally.

Table 1: Faculty wise respondents' extend of using various internet resources

Faculty	E-Journals			E-Books			Online databases			E-Articles			E-publishing		
	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally
Arts	11 22.00	10 20.00	29 58.00	23 46.00	15 30.00	12 24.00	18 36.00	16 32.00	16 32.00	15 30.00	18 36.00	17 34.00	11 22.00	18 36.00	21 42.00
Science	22 44.00	18 36.00	10 20.00	28 56.00	11 22.00	11 22.00	10 20.00	15 30.00	25 50.00	23 46.00	17 34.00	10 20.00	16 32.00	21 42.00	13 26.00
Engineering	25 50.00	14 28.00	11 22.00	13 26.00	10 20.00	27 54.00	20 40.00	20 40.00	10 20.00	17 34.00	20 40.00	13 26.00	11 22.00	28 56.00	11 22.00
Agriculture	10 20.00	12 24.00	28 56.00	14 28.00	10 20.00	26 52.00	16 32.00	12 24.00	22 44.00	18 36.00	22 44.00	10 20.00	12 24.00	15 30.00	23 46.00
Design	15 30.00	22 44.00	13 26.00	15 30.00	12 24.00	23 46.00	21 42.00	15 30.00	14 28.00	27 54.00	13 26.00	10 20.00	10 20.00	15 30.00	25 50.00
Medicine	20 40.00	12 24.00	18 36.00	20 40.00	8 16.00	22 44.00	13 26.00	17 34.00	20 40.00	19 38.00	12 24.00	19 38.00	14 28.00	14 28.00	22 44.00
Total	103 34.33	88 29.33	109 36.33	113 37.67	66 22.00	121 40.33	80 32.67	79 31.67	91 35.67	119 39.67	102 34.00	79 26.33	74 24.67	111 37.00	115 38.33

Faculty	Reference works			Online book shop			Modal exam papers			Maps			Total
	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	
Arts	18 36.00	19 38.00	13 26.00	18 36.00	21 42.00	11 22.00	8 16.00	21 42.00	21 42.00	11 22.00	18 36.00	21 42.00	50
Science	17 34.00	8 16.00	25 50.00	22 44.00	13 26.00	15 30.00	22 44.00	13 26.00	15 30.00	17 34.00	18 36.00	15 30.00	50
Engineering	18 36.00	17 34.00	15 30.00	27 54.00	9 18.00	14 28.00	20 40.00	14 28.00	16 32.00	20 40.00	14 28.00	16 32.00	50
Agriculture	13 26.00	23 46.00	14 28.00	13 26.00	28 56.00	9 18.00	13 26.00	28 56.00	9 18.00	10 20.00	28 56.00	12 24.00	50
Design	15 30.00	23 46.00	12 24.00	15 30.00	23 46.00	12 24.00	15 30.00	23 46.00	12 24.00	12 24.00	26 52.00	12 24.00	50
Medicine	22 44.00	11 22.00	17 34.00	22 44.00	11 22.00	17 34.00	22 44.00	11 22.00	17 34.00	20 40.00	14 28.00	16 32.00	50
Total	103 34.33	101 33.67	96 32.00	117 39.00	105 35.00	78 26.00	100 33.33	110 36.67	90 30.00	90 30.00	118 39.33	92 30.67	300

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	320.0926	5	64.01852	3.675314	0.007876	2.449468
Columns	264.1481	8	33.01852	1.895599	0.087748	2.180172
Error	696.7407	40	17.41852			
Total	1280.981	53				ANOVA

Table 2: Designation wise respondents' extent of using internet resources

Designation	E-Journals			E-Books			Online databases			E-Articles			E-publishing		
	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally
Professor	19 34.55	15 27.27	21 38.18	20 36.36	18 32.73	17 30.91	13 23.64	19 34.55	23 41.82	12 21.82	28 50.91	15 27.27	9 16.36	30 54.55	16 29.09
Reader	22 33.33	15 22.73	29 43.94	22 33.33	12 18.18	32 48.48	22 33.33	16 24.24	28 42.42	32 48.48	16 24.24	18 27.27	22 33.33	16 24.24	28 42.42
Senior Lecturer	30 40.00	24 32.00	21 28.00	39 52.00	14 18.67	22 29.33	36 48.00	18 24.00	21 28.00	33 44.00	22 29.33	20 26.67	18 24.00	33 44.00	24 32.00
Lecturer	32 30.77	34 32.69	38 36.54	32 30.77	22 21.15	50 48.08	27 25.96	42 40.38	35 33.65	42 40.38	36 34.62	26 25.00	25 24.04	32 30.77	47 45.19
Total	103 34.33	88 29.33	109 36.33	113 37.67	66 22.00	121 40.33	80 32.67	79 31.67	91 35.67	119 39.67	102 34.00	79 26.33	74 24.67	111 37.00	115 38.33

Designation	Reference works			Online book shop			Modal exam papers			Maps			Total
	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Most Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	
Professor	23 41.82	12 21.82	20 36.36	13 23.64	32 58.18	10 18.18	29 52.73	11 20.00	15 27.27	15 27.27	18 32.73	22 40.00	55
Reader	16 24.24	22 33.33	28 42.42	32 48.48	16 24.24	18 27.27	16 24.24	35 53.03	15 22.73	25 37.88	15 22.73	26 39.39	66
Senior Lecturer	25 33.33	32 42.67	18 24.00	32 42.67	27 36.00	16 21.33	25 33.33	36 48.00	14 18.67	18 24.00	40 53.33	17 22.67	75
Lecturer	39 37.50	35 33.65	30 28.85	40 38.46	30 28.85	34 32.69	30 28.85	28 26.92	46 44.23	32 30.77	45 43.27	27 25.96	104
Total	103 34.33	101 33.67	96 32.00	117 39.00	105 35.00	78 26.00	100 33.33	110 36.67	90 30.00	90 30.00	118 39.33	92 30.67	300

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	1311.639	3	437.213	11.4916	7.26E-05	3.008786
Columns	396.2222	8	49.52778	1.301777	0.289306	2.35508
Error	913.1111	24	38.0463			
Total	2620.972	35				ANOVA

A study of data in Table 1 indicates the faculty wise respondents' frequency of access to e-resources. It is noted that out of the total 300 respondents 34.33 percent of them most frequently access e-journals. It is observed that 37.67 percent of them most frequently access e-books and the 40.33 percent of them occasionally access e-books. It is observed that 32.67 percent of them most frequently access to online data bases, 31.67 percent of them frequently access to online data bases. It is significant that 39.67 percent of them most frequently access to e-articles and 26.33 percent of them occasionally access to e-articles. It is noted that 24.67 percent of them most frequently access to e-publishing and 38.33 percent of them occasionally access to e-publishing. It is observed that 34.33 percent of them most frequently access to reference works such as dictionaries and Encyclopedias and 32.00 percent of them occasionally access reference works. It is noted that 39.00 percent of them most frequently access to online book shop, 35.00 percent of them frequently access to online book shop. It is significant that 33.33 percent of them most frequently access to model exam papers, 36.67 percent of them frequently access

to model exam papers. It is noted that 30.00 percent of them most frequently access to maps, 39.33 percent of them frequently access to maps. The faculty wise analysis reveals the following facts: majority of the respondent of science faculty most frequently access to e-books (56.00%), e-articles (46.00%), online book shop (44.00%) and model exam papers (44.00%). Majority of the respondents from faculty of agriculture were occasionally access to e-journals (56.00%), e-books (52.00%) and e-publications (46.00%). Majority of the respondents from faculty of engineering were frequently access to online data bases (40.00%), and e-publications (56.00%). A considerable number of respondents of faculty of medicine most frequently access to reference works dictionaries/Encyclopedias (44.00%), online books shop (44.00%), model exam papers (44.00%) and maps (40.00%). The ANOVA to a model is applied for further discussion. At one point the computed ANOVA value 3.67 which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation with respect to most frequent access to various internet resources is statistically

identified as significant. In another point the computed ANOVA value 1.89 which is lesser than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation among chosen faculties of Annamalai University is statistically identified as insignificant with respect to respondents' most frequent access to various internet resources. It is seen clearly from the above discussion that respondents mainly most frequently access to e-articles online book shop and e-books. They are occasional access to online data bases and e-publications.

A study of the data in Table 2 designation wise respondents' extend of using various internet resources. Majority of the Reader respondents most frequently use e-articles (48.48%), on-line book shop (48.48%) and maps (37.88%). A considerable number of senior lecturer respondents most frequently use e-journals (40%), e-books (52%) and on-line data bases (48%). Majority of the lecturer respondents occasionally use e-journals (36.54%), e-books (48.08%), e-publications (45.19%) and model exam papers (44.23%).

The ANOVA to a model is applied for further discussion. At one point the computed ANOVA value 11.49 which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation with respect to most frequent access to various internet resources is statistically identified as significant. In another point the computed ANOVA value 1.30 which is lesser than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation among chosen designation of respondents of Annamalai University is statistically identified as insignificant with respect to respondents' most frequent access to various internet resources. It is clear from the above discussion that professor respondents most frequently use reference works, and model exam papers.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The professor respondents considerably use the library daily.

Knowledge about internet resources indicates that majority of the respondents have above average knowledge about internet. The professor respondents have average knowledge about internet.

It is presumed that the main problem in search of internet resources indicates that the respondents have problems of using internet in terms of lack of time to acquire computer skills to use internet resources, lack of high quality information available from internet resources and access to suitable software.

Rating of internet resources indicates that a considerable number of respondents state that average level of performance of authority and availability of internet resources.

REFERENCES

1. Challener, J. (1999). "Information seeking behavior of professors of art history and studio art". Master Dissertation, School of LIS, Kent State University. Retrieved <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED435405>
2. Lazinger, S.S., Bar-Ilan, J. and Peritz, B.C. (1997). "Internet use by faculty members in various disciplines: a comparative study", *Journal of the American Society for Inf. Science*, Vol. 48 No. 6, pp. 508-18.
3. Bin Talib, A. (2003). "Faculty members' use of the internet in teaching: a literature review", unpublished paper, 30 pp.
4. Nyamboga, C.M., Ongonda, M.A. and Raymond, W. (2004). "Experiences in the use of the internet at Egerton University Library, Njoro-Kenya", *DESIDOC Bulletin of IT*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 11-24.
5. Stella Korobili, Irene Tilikidou, Antonia Delistavrou, (2006). "Factors that influence the use of library resources by faculty members", *Library Review*, Vol. 55 Iss: 2, pp.91 – 105
6. <http://www.ojaswitech.com/india-pune/internet-penetration-india.php>