University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Use of Library and Library Resources in University Libraries of Northern India: A Comparative Study between Research Scholars and Faculty Members

Har Singh
Assistant Librarian, Central Library, Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, Patiala, Punjab-147004, India, infoisil07@gmail.com

Preeti Mahajan
Panjab University, Chandigarh (India)

Use of Library and Library Resources in University Libraries of Northern India: A Comparative Study between Research Scholars and Faculty Members

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate research scholars (RS) and faculty members (FM) involvement in use of library, library resources, purpose behind using them and satisfaction from the resources in five university libraries of Northern India. The representative samples were selected based on sample size given by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The representative sample was formed by taking 15% of respondents from each category from each university. The 'Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling Technique' was used. The data collected was analyzed with the help of statistical software package called SPSS and hypotheses were tested using Chi-Square test. The study was limited to five universities libraries of Northern India. No significant relationship was found in frequency of visit to the library between the research scholars (RS) and faculty members (RM) across the libraries. RS spent more time in their respective libraries as compared to FM and library is the prominent place for reading in the opinion of RS, whereas FM visited their respective libraries for circulation purpose. A significant difference was found between RS and FM about availability of required resources, information sources used by them except non-book materials, whereas a significant relationship was found in opinion of RS and FM satisfaction from the library collection. The findings will help the library authorities to understand the pattern of use of their library, purpose of visit, information sources consulted, reasons for use of print and e-resources and satisfaction from their respective collections between RS and FM.

Keywords: Use of Library, Use of Library Resources, University Libraries in Northern India, Research Scholars, Faculty Members.

1. Introduction

The basic function of any library is collection, storage and dissemination of information, where information is an essential commodity for study, teaching and research (Lewis and Mallaiah, 2014).The prime objective of any university library is to support in learning, teaching and research and the library is considered as the heart of any institute (Kona*et al.*, 2017; Gurikar and Gurikar, 2015). The academic libraries have the responsibility

of providing optimum and reliable information resources to different kind of users with varied needs (Peacock and Vecchione, 2020). Library resources help the users to get knowledge for recreation, personal development and inter-personal relationships (Adeoye and Popoola, 2011).The value of the library is always measured by its collection, however the choice of information resources collected by the libraries depends on library budgets and space constraints (Bhatt and Rana, 2011).The library resources are divided into two broad categories, i.e., print and non-print resources. The printed materials include books, print periodicals, magazines, pamphlets, newspapers, theses/dissertations, standards, reference resources, etc., whereas non-printed materials include audio-visual resources and e-resources (Adeoye and Popoola, 2011). Although information sources are acquired in libraries after spending a huge amount of funds, yet it is often not clear about the frequency of their use and the satisfaction from them. Such information is important from the point of view of the librarians'/ library authorities so as to devise some mechanisms for their optimum use. Therefore, the present study attempts to find out the use of library, use of library resources and satisfaction from the library collection by the research scholars (RS) and faculty members (FM) of five university libraries in Northern India.

2. Review of Literature

Lahor and Kumbar (2002) found that faculty members were well aware about the use of library resources. Siddique (2002) found that 69% research scholars visit the library daily and 31% found library collection adequate. Woo (2005) found that 68.8% respondents prefer e-journals, whereas 31.2% respondents use print journals. Busayo (2006) found that 51.5% respondents used the library only for submission of assignment, 56.2% used the library during examinations and 32% respondents used the library to consult particular resources. Korobili *et al*. (2006) found that printed sources are more often used by faculty members than e-journals, although e-journals were also used frequently by them. Dhingra and Mahajan (2007) found that 40% users used 1-2 print journalism a week, whereas 36% users used 1-2 e-journals in a week. 24% and 40% users used print and electronic journals respectively 3-5 journals in a week at PU library. Madhusudhan (2010) found that the research scholars use e-resources for research purpose (47, 94%), followed by for finding relevant information (27, 54%), keeping up-to-date subject information (21, 42%), getting current information (21, 42%) and both teaching purpose and publishing research articles (11, 22%). He also found that 62% of the research scholars accessed e-resources daily as they were time saving (88%), easy to use (78%) and more informative (66%). Ali and Nisha (2011) found 45% users

preferred print journals, 31% preferred online journals and 24% used print as well as electronic journals. Khan and Zaidi (2011) found that maximum faculty members (81, 30.9%) used the library to prepare classroom instructions, followed by 74 (28.2%) who used the library for research purpose. Majority of the researchers (84, 91.3%) visited the library for research purpose. They also found that 123 faculty members (46.9%) used current periodicals, 178 (67.9%) used back volumes of journals and 70 (26.7%) used indexing/abstracting periodicals respectively. Ogunmodede *et al.*, (2011) found that 19.3% respondents visited the library daily, 23.9% respondents rarely visited, majority of the respondents used books (89.3%), encyclopedias (47.8%), dictionaries (52.3%) and newspapers (56.4%). Okiki (2012) found that 55% faculty members were not fully aware of the subscribed e-resources and they accessed the e-resources for writing research papers and teaching. Simisaye (2012) found that majority of faculty members (59.3%) visited library once a week, 11% visited daily, maximum faculty members used textbook, e-journals and newspapers and they used the library to aid in teaching, learning and research activities. Bhat (2014) found that majority of the faculty members (39.6%) visited the library twice or thrice in a week, 25% visited daily and 16.7% visited the library once a week. He also found that faculty members prefer books, reference books, law reports, statutes and print journals. Lewis and Mallaiah (2014) found that maximum respondents (96.2% research scholars and 86.4% faculty members) were aware of textbooks, reference books (93.9% and 86.4% respectively), newspapers and magazines (96.2% and 100% respectively) and online journals (96.2% and 72.7% respectively). They also found that overall respondents were moderately satisfied with the information resources available in their respective libraries. Gurikar and Gurikar (2015) found that maximum research scholars used the reference material, followed by theses/dissertation and maximum research scholars on an average were satisfied by the library resources. Eyiolorunshe and Eluwole (2017) found that maximum faculty members were aware of textbooks (91%), newspapers (87%), reference collection (82%), journals (80%) and online databases (73%). Maximum faculty members used the library to update their knowledge and development competence (both 92%), followed by 91% who used the library for research and preparing lecture notes (89%).The faculty members were quite satisfied with the textbooks collection (48%), newspapers and magazines (50%), reference collection (60%) and online databases (54%). Kona et al., (2017) found that majority of the respondents visited their respective libraries daily. Kumar (2017)found that 45.07% of PG students and 47.05% research scholars visited the library daily, 8.45% and 25.49% respectively visited weekly, 55% and 10.78% respectively visited fortnightly, 15.84% and

13.72% respectively visited occasionally. He also found that 97.18% PG students and 84.31% research scholars used the library to borrow the books, 84.86% and 92.20% respectively to consult and read the books and 82.39% and 95.10% respectively to read journals and magazines. 61.97% and 30.39% respectively were extremely satisfied, whereas 5.98% and 6.86% respectively were slightly satisfied from the library resources.

3. Brief profile of five university libraries

PU, the oldest university in the region, was established in 1947 followed by PbiU (1962), GNDU (1969), KU (1956) and MDU (1971). PU library holds approximately 6,40,000 publications including books, bound volume of journals, rare books, reports, theses/dissertations, government publications and 1490 manuscripts. It subscribes to 600 current periodicals, 20 electronic databases and has more than 10,000 e-journals. PbiU library has approximately 5,54,000 volumes of books, bound volumes of journals, rare collection, theses/dissertations, etc. It has more than 9100 e-journals, 1290 e-books, 294 current journals, 22 magazines, 21 newspapers, etc. GNDU library has more than 4,70,875 documents which include books, rare books, bound volumes of journals, theses/dissertations, etc. It has more than 7500+ e-journals, 383 current journals, 1036 manuscripts. KU library has approximately 401460 books and bound volumes of journals, 8000+ e-journals, 15000 manuscripts, 227 current journals, etc. MDU library comprises 3,67,433 books, 25018 e-books, 14529 e-journals, 54797 bound volumes of journals, 440 current journals, 16,972 print theses and around 300 video cassettes, etc.

4. Objectives of the Study

- To find out the use of library by research scholars and faculty members at five university libraries in Northern India.

- To find out the use of various information resources and purpose of using them by the research scholars and faculty members

- To find out the satisfaction of research scholars and faculty members from the library collection of the selected universities.

5. Hypothesis

H_0 There is no significant difference in satisfaction level of research scholars and faculty members from the library collection of the universities under the study.

6. Research methodology and data analysis

The study was limited to five universities libraries of North India which included Panjab University (PU), Punjabi University (PbiU), Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU), Kurukshetra University (KU) and Maharishi Dayanand University (MDU). The respondents included the research scholars (RS) and faculty members (FM) from all disciplines. The representative samples were selected based on sample size given by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The representative sample was formed by taking 15% of respondents from each category within each university. The 'Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling Technique' was used. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire was tested through expert opinion, focused group, and pilot study before its distribution. The data collected was analyzed with the help of statistical software package called SPSS and the hypotheses were tested using Chi-square test.

7. Data analysis, findings and discussion

7.1 Frequency of visit to library

The respondents were asked about their frequency of visit to their respective libraries. The analysis is given in table 1 below:

Frequency of Visit	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total (n= 465)
	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 45)	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 50)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 40)			
Every Day	30 (37.5)	01 (02)	32 (40)	02 (07)	18 (36)	02 (07)	20 (50)	07 (23)	15 (37.5)	05 (12.5)	**115 (39.76)**	**17 (9.71)**	**132 (28.4)**
Twice or thrice a week	14 (17.5)	12 (27)	28 (35)	07 (23)	05 (10)	11 (37)	14 (35)	06 (20)	17 (42.5)	17 (42.5)	**78 (26.90)**	**53 (30.29)**	**131 (28.2)**
Once a week	16 (20)	10 (22)	12 (15)	03 (10)	09 (18)	08 (27)	02 (05)	10 (33)	02 (05)	12 (30)	**41 (14.14)**	**43 (24.57)**	**84 (18.1)**
Once a fortnight	04 (05)	07 (16)	02 (2.5)	04 (13)	12 (24)	05 (17)	02 (05)	02 (07)	03 (7.5)	03 (7.5)	**23 (7.93)**	**21 (12)**	**44 (9.5)**
Once a month	06 (7.5)	04 (09)	06 (7.5)	05 (17)	03 (06)	03 (10)	01 (2.5)	04 (13)	01 (2.5)	02 (05)	**17 (5.86)**	**18 (10.29)**	**35 (7.5)**
Very rarely	10 (12.5)	11 (24)	00 (00)	09 (30)	03 (06)	01 (03)	01 (2.5)	01 (03)	02 (05)	01 (2.5)	**16 (5.52)**	**23 (13.14)**	**39 (8.4)**

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)
RS=Research Scholars and FM=Faculty Members

Table 1: Frequency of visit to the library

Table 1 shows that 115 RS (39.76%) and 17 FM (9.71%) visited their libraries daily, whereas 78 RS (26.90%) and 53 FM (30.29%) visited twice or thrice a week. 41 RS (14.14%) and 43 FM (24.57%) visited once a week. 17 RS (5.86%) and 18 FM (10.29%) visited their libraries once a month. Only 16 RS (5.52%) and 23 FM (13.14%) visited their library very rarely across the libraries. Hence, no significant relationship was found between the RS and FM frequency of library visit. The findings support the study of Ugah (2004) who found that 22.6% respondents access library on daily basis (28.4% in present study) and only7.7% respondents (7.5% in present study) used the library less than once a month. The findings of the present study also support Bhat (2014) who revealed that majority of the faculty members visited the library twice or thrice in a week. It is in contrast to the findings of Yusuf and Iwu (2010) who found that 20% faculty members (9.71% in present study) and 35.7% students (39.75% in present study)visited daily, 21.1% FM (30.29% in present study) and 53.3% students (26.90%) visited their respective libraries2-3 times a week (26.90 % in present study). It is in contrast to the findings of Ogunmodede et al., (2011) who found that 19.3% respondents visited daily (28.4% in present study), 23.9% respondents visited the library rarely (8.4% in present study). Simisaye (2012) revealed that 59.3% faculty members (24.57% in present study) visited library once per week, whereas only 11% (9.71% in present study) visited the libraries daily. Kumar (2017) found 47.05% RS (39.76% in present study) visited the libraries daily, whereas 13.72% (5.52% in present study) visited their library occasionally.

7.2 Average time spent in library

Table 2 below reflects the average time spent per week by the respondents in their libraries.

Use of Library per week	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total (n= 465)
	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 45)	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 50)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 40)			
Few minutes	06 (7.5)	02 (05)	02 (2.5)	03 (10)	02 (04)	01 (03)	04 (10)	07 (23)	00 (00)	05 (12.5)	**14 (4.83)**	**18 (6.21)**	**32 (6.9)**
0.5 - 1 Hour	20 (25)	05 (11)	10 (12.5)	05 (17)	01 (02)	05 (17)	11 (27.5)	10 (33)	00 (00)	11 (37.5)	**42 (14.48)**	**36 (12.41)**	**78 (16.8)**
1-2 Hours	14 (17.5)	14 (31)	16 (20)	09 (30)	06 (12)	13 (43)	06 (15)	06 (20)	10 (25)	15 (37.5)	**52 (17.93)**	**57 (19.66)**	**109 (23.4)**
2-4 Hours	12 (15)	17 (38)	18 (22.5)	10 (33)	19 (38)	07 (23)	02 (05)	04 (13)	03 (7.5)	04 (10)	**54 (18.62)**	**42 (14.48)**	**96 (20.6)**
4-6 Hours	24 (30)	06 (13)	24 (30)	02 (07)	13 (26)	03 (10)	05 (12.5)	02 (07)	22 (55)	03 (7.5)	**88 (30.34)**	**16 (5.52)**	**104 (22.4)**
6-8 Hours	04 (05)	01 (02)	10 (12.5)	01 (03)	08 (16)	01 (03)	09 (22.5)	01 (03)	04 (10)	02 (05)	**35 (12.07)**	**6 (2.07)**	**41 (8.8)**
8-10 Hours	00 (00)	00 (00)	00 (00)	00 (00)	01 (02)	00 (00)	03 (7.5)	00 (00)	01 (2.5)	00 (00)	**05 (1.72)**	**00 (00)**	**05 (1.1)**

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)

Table 2: Average time spent in the library

Table 2 shows that14 RS (4.83%) and 18 FM (6.21%) across the libraries spend only a few minutes per week in their libraries, 88(30.34%) RS and 16 (5.52%) FM spend 4-6 hours per week across the libraries. 35 RS (12.1%) and6 FM (2.07%) spend 6-8 hours per week in their respective libraries. 5 RS (1.75%) and none of the FM spend 8-10 hours per week in their respective libraries. It is clear that RS spend more time in their respective libraries as compared to FM within the libraries as well as across the university libraries.

7.3 Purpose of visit to the library

The respondents were asked about the purpose of their visit to the library. The responses received from the respondents are analyzed in table 3 below:

Purpose*	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total (n= 465)
	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 45)	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 50)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 40)			
Reading and research purpose	62 (77.5)	22 (49)	70 (87.5)	06 (20)	18 (36)	03 (10)	32 (80)	15 (50)	30 (75)	15 (37.5)	**212 (73.10)**	**61 (34.86)**	**273 (58.7)**
Consult the books	40 (50)	14 (31)	48 (60)	05 (17)	13 (26)	05 (17)	27 (67.5)	13 (43)	18 (45)	10 (25)	**146 (50.34)**	**47 (26.86)**	**193 (41.5)**
Consult the journals	42 (52.5)	11 (24)	50 (62.5)	14 (47)	20 (40)	08 (27)	22 (55)	06 (20)	19 (47.5)	16 (16)	**153 (52.76)**	**55 (31.43)**	**208 (44.7)**
Issue/ return books	38 (47.5)	15 (33)	44 (55)	18 (60)	25 (25)	11 (37)	15 (37.5)	11 (37)	16 (40)	23 (57.5)	**138 (47.59)**	**78 (44.57)**	**216 (46.5)**
To check the new arrivals	20 (25)	10 (22)	24 (30)	05 (17)	08 (16)	02 (07)	05 (12.5)	07 (23)	15 (37.5)	04 (10)	**72 (24.83)**	**28 (16)**	**100 (21.5)**
Access Internet	12 (15)	00 (00)	40 (50)	01 (03)	18 (36)	00 (00)	10 (25)	03 (10)	20 (50)	01 (2.5)	**100 (34.48)**	**05 (2.86)**	**105 (22.6)**
Access Electronic Resources	10 (12.5)	02 (04)	44 (55)	01 (03)	30 (60)	01 (03)	18 (45)	03 (10)	14 (35)	03 (7.5)	**116 (40)**	**10 (5.71)**	**126 (27.1)**
*Multiple Answers permitted													

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)
Table 3: Purpose of visit to the library

Table 3 shows that 212 RS (73.10%) and 61 FM (34.86%) across the libraries visit their respective libraries for reading and research purpose, 146RS (50.34%) and 47 FM (26.86%) visit the library to consult the books, 153RS (52.76%) and 55 FM (31.43%) visit the library to consult the journals and magazines. It clearly indicates that library is a prominent place for reading in the opinion of RS, whereas FM visit the libraries to issue/return the books. In contrast to above findings, Yusuf and Iwu (2010) revealed that FM 76.6% (5.71% in present study) used the library to access e-journals, Khan and Zaidi (2011) revealed that 28.2% FM (34.86% in present study) and 91.3% RS (73.10% in present study) visit the library for research purpose. In contrast to above findings, Kumar (2017) revealed that 84.31% RS (47.59% in present study) used the library to borrow books, 92.20% RS

(73.10% in present study) used them for reading books and 95.10% RS (52.76% in present study) for reading journals and magazines.

7.4 Availability of required resources in the library

The respondents were asked about the availability of required resources in their respective libraries. The response received from the respondents is depicted in table 4.

Resour ces	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total (n= 465)
	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 45)	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 50)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 40)			
Often	32 (40)	32 (71.1)	40 (50)	22 (73.3)	35 (70)	23 (76.7)	25 (62.5)	15 (50)	28 (70)	29 (72.5)	**160 (55.17)**	**121 (69.14)**	**281 (60)**
Occasi onally	37 (46.3)	10 (22.2)	25 (31.3)	06 (20)	13 (26)	06 (20)	14 (35)	11 (36.7)	10 (25)	10 (25)	**99 (34.14)**	**43 (24.57)**	**142 (31)**
Never	11 (13.7)	03 (6.7)	15 (18.7)	02 (6.7)	02 (04)	01 (3.3)	01 (2.5)	04 (13.3)	02 (05)	01 (2.5)	**31 (10.69)**	**11 (6.29)**	**42 (09)**

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)
Table 4: Availability of required resources in the library

Table 4 shows that 70% RS both from GNDU and MDU and 40%RS from PU often found the required resources in their respective library. 76.7% FM from GNDU and 50%FM from KU often found the required resources in their respective libraries. 18.7% RS from PbiU and 2.5% RS from KU never found the required resources in their respective libraries. 13.3% FM from KU and 2.5% FM from MDU never found the required resources in their respective libraries. 160 RS (55.17%) and 121 FM (69.14%) often found, whereas only31 RS (10.69%) and 11 FM (6.29%) never found the required resources in their respective libraries. In contrast, Yusuf and Iwu (2010) revealed that33.3% FM (69.14% in present study) and 51.4% students (55.17% in present study) always, 62.3% FM (24.57% in present study) and 45.3% students (34.14% in present study) sometimes and 4.4% FM (6.29% in present study) and 3.3% students (10.69% in present study) did not find the required resources in the library.

7.5 Information sources used by the respondents

The respondents were asked about the use of various information resources available in their respective libraries. The analysis of the response is given in table 5:

Information Sources used	Frequency	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total, N=465
		RS, n=80	FM, n=45	RS, n=80	FM, n=30	RS, n=50	FM, n=30	RS, n=40	FM, n=30	RS, n=40	FM, n=40			
Text Books	Often	35 (43.8)	05 (11.1)	25 (31.5)	08 (26.7)	15 (30)	12 (40)	26 (65)	07 (23.3)	27 (67.5)	18 (45)	**128 (44.1)**	**50 (28.8)**	**178 (38.3)**
	Occasionally	30 (37.5)	12 (26.7)	30 (37.5)	21 (70)	24 (48)	17 (56.7)	08 (20)	11 (36.7)	04 (10)	15 (37.5)	**96 (33.1)**	**76 (43.4)**	**172 (37)**
	Never	15 (18.8)	28 (62.2)	25 (31.5)	01 (3.3)	11 (22)	01 (3.3)	06 (15)	12 (40)	09 (22.5)	07 (17.5)	**66 (22.8)**	**49 (28)**	**115 (24.7)**
Reference Books	Often	18 (22.5)	13 (28.9)	13 (16.5)	10 (33.3)	18 (36)	07 (23.3)	15 (37.5)	13 (43.3)	16 (40)	13 (32.5)	**80 (27.6)**	**56 (32)**	**136 (29.3)**
	Occasionally	45 (56.2)	18 (40)	20 (25)	17 (56.7)	15 (30)	22 (73.3)	12 (30)	08 (26.67)	06 (15)	25 (62.5)	**98 (33.8)**	**90 (51.4)**	**188 (40.4)**
	Never	17 (21.3)	14 (31.1)	47 (58.8)	03 (10)	17 (34)	01 (3.33)	13 (32.5)	09 (30)	18 (45)	02 (05)	**112 (38.6)**	**29 (16.6)**	**141 (30.3)**
Journals and Magazines	Often	32 (40)	05 (11.1)	21 (26.3)	05 (16.7)	25 (50)	10 (33.3)	17 (42.5)	12 (40)	20 (50)	29 (72.5)	**115 (39.66)**	**61 (34.9)**	**176 (37.9)**
	Occasionally	25 (31.3)	21 (46.7)	35 (43.8)	17 (56.7)	18 (36)	17 (56.67)	13 (32.5)	05 (16.7)	07 (17.5)	10 (25)	**98 (33.8)**	**70 (40)**	**168 (36.1)**
	Never	23 (28.8)	19 (42.2)	24 (30)	08 (26.7)	07 (14)	03 (10)	10 (25)	13 (43.33)	13 (32.5)	01 (2.5)	**77 (26.6)**	**44 (25.1)**	**121 (26)**
E-Resources	Often	14 (17.5)	23 (51.1)	24 (30)	13 (43.3)	30 (60)	15 (50)	20 (50)	05 (16.7)	20 (50)	14 (35)	**108 (37.2)**	**70 (40)**	**178 (38.3)**
	Occasionally	56 (70)	18 (40)	44 (55)	15 (50)	10 (20)	09 (30)	09 (22.5)	11 (36.67)	12 (30)	21 (52.5)	**131 (45.17)**	**74 (42.3)**	**205 (44.1)**

	Never	10 (12.5)	04 (8.9)	12 (15)	02 (6.7)	10 (20)	06 (20)	11 (27.5)	14 (46.7)	08 (20)	05 (12.5)	**51 (17.6)**	**31 (17.7)**	**82 (17.6)**
Theses and Dissertations	Often	42 (52.5)	04 (8.9)	59 (73.8)	05 (16.7)	37 (74)	02 (6.7)	24 (60)	05 (16.7)	31 (77.5)	02 (05)	**193 (66.6)**	**18 (10.3)**	**211 (45.4)**
	Occasionally	25 (31.3)	28 (62.2)	19 (23.8)	06 (20)	12 (24)	23 (76.7)	11 (27.5)	16 (53.3)	07 (17.5)	23 (57.5)	**74 (25.52)**	**96 (54.9)**	**170 (36.6)**
	Never	13 (16.3)	13 (28.9)	02 (2.5)	19 (63.3)	01 (02)	05 (16.7)	05 (12.5)	09 (30)	02 (05)	15 (37.5)	**23 (7.9)**	**61 (34.9)**	**84 (18.1)**
Newspapers	Often	45 (56.3)	08 (17.8)	65 (81.25)	04 (13.3)	32 (64)	03 (10)	26 (65)	08 (26.7)	21 (52.5)	03 (7.5)	**189 (65.2)**	**26 (14.9)**	**215 (46.2)**
	Occasionally	33 (41.3)	30 (66.7)	13 (16.3)	17 (56.7)	17 (34)	15 (50)	10 (25)	13 (43.3)	17 (42.5)	21 (52.5)	**90 (31.03)**	**96 (54.9)**	**186 (40)**
	Never	02 (2.5)	07 (15.6)	02 (2.5)	09 (30)	01 (02)	12 (40)	04 (10)	09 (30)	02 (05)	16 (40)	**11 (3.8)**	**53 (30.3)**	**64 (13.8)**
Non Book Materials (CDS/DVDs)	Often	01 (1.3)	01 (2.2)	02 (2.5)	01 (3.3)	04 (08)	02 (6.7)	01 (2.5)	01 (3.3)	05 (12.5)	01 (2.5)	**13 (4.5)**	**6 (3.4)**	**19 (4.1)**
	Occasionally	08 (10)	06 (13.3)	05 (6.3)	05 (16.7)	15 (30)	11 (36.7)	05 (12.5)	02 (6.7)	08 (20)	08 (20)	**41 (14.1)**	**32 (18.3)**	**73 (15.7)**
	Never	71 (88.8)	38 (84.4)	73 (91.3)	24 (80)	31 (62)	17 (56.7)	34 (85)	27 (90)	27 (67.5)	31 (77.5)	**236 (81.9)**	**137 (78.3)**	**373 (80.2)**

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)

Table 5: Information sources used by the respondents

Table 5 shows that 128 RS (44.1%) and 50 FM (28.8%) often, whereas 66 RS (22.8%) and 49 FM (28%) never used the textbooks. 80 RS (27.6%) RS and 56 FM (32%) often, whereas 112 RS (38.6%) and 29 FM (16.6%) never used the reference books, 115 RS (39.66%) and 61 FM (34.9%) often, whereas 77 RS (26.6%) and 44 FM (25.1%) never used the journals/magazines, 108 RS (37.2%) and 70 FM (40%) often, whereas 51 RS (17.6%) and 31 FM (17.7%) never used the e-resources in their respective libraries. Similarly, 193 RS (66.6%) and only 18 FM (10.3%), 189 RS (65.2%) and only 26 FM (14.9%), only 13 RS (4.5%) and 6 FM (3.4%) often consult and read theses/dissertations, newspapers and non-book materials respectively in their libraries. It is clear that information sources used/consulted by RS and FM are quite different in respect to all the resources except for use of non-books material. The reasons for non use of non-book material may be due to the fact that the libraries have very few non-book materials in their collection. Moreover, the RS as well as the FM may not be aware of their existence in libraries. The above findings also support Lahor and Kumbar (2002) and Simisaye (2012) and Bhat (2014) who found that FM were well aware about the use of library resources. In contrast, Ogunmodede et al., (2011) revealed that majority of the respondents (89.3%) used textbooks (38.3% in present study) and 56.4% used newspapers (46.2% in present study). Gurikar and Gurikar (2015) found that maximum RS used the reference materials (theses/dissertations in present study), followed by theses/dissertation (newspapers in present study).

7.6 Reasons for use of print resources

The respondents were asked the reasons of use of print resources in their respective libraries. The analysis is given in table 6 below:

Reasons*	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total (n=465)
	RS (n=80)	FM (n=45)	RS (n=80)	FM (n=30)	RS (n=50)	FM (n=30)	RS (n=40)	FM (n=30)	RS (n=40)	FM (n=40)			
Easy to access	52 (65)	30 (66.7)	52 (65)	07 (23.3)	10 (33.3)	03 (10)	25 (62.5)	15 (50)	17 (42.5)	18 (45)	**156 (53.79)**	**73 (42.19)**	**229 (49.2)**
Comfortable than e-resources	30 (37.5)	15 (33.3)	50 (62.5)	10 (33.3)	13 (43.3)	08 (26.7)	12 (30)	05 (16.7)	22 (55)	23 (57.5)	**127 (43.79)**	**61 (35.26)**	**188 (40.4)**
Portable and easy to handle	42 (52.5)	22 (48.9)	48 (60)	13 (43.3)	18 (60)	05 (16.7)	18 (45)	08 (26.7)	14 (35)	26 (65)	**140 (48.27)**	**74 (42.77)**	**214 (46)**
Easy to read	48 (60)	25 (55.6)	66 (82.5)	15 (50)	25 (83.3)	09 (30)	29 (72.5)	16 (53.3)	21 (52.5)	30 (75)	**189 (65.17)**	**95 (54.91)**	**284 (61.1)**
Easy to photocopy	16 (20)	18 (40)	48 (60)	08 (26.7)	13 (43.3)	06 (20)	15 (37.5)	07 (23.3)	12 (30)	27 (67.5)	**104 (35.86)**	**66 (38.15)**	**170 (36.6)**
No IT knowledge required	02 (2.5)	05 (11.1)	10 (12.5)	04 (13.3)	02 (6.7)	02 (6.7)	04 (10)	03 (10)	07 (17.5)	05 (12.5)	**25 (8.62)**	**19 (10.98)**	**44 (9.5)**
*Multiple Answers													

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)

Table 6: Reasons of use of print resources

Table 6 shows that 156 RS (53.79%) and 73 FM (42.19%) found print resources 'easy to access', 127 RS (43.79%) and 61 FM (35.36%) found them 'comfortable than e-resources', 140 RS (48.27%) and 74 FM (42.77%) found them 'portable and easy to handle', 189 RS (65.17%) and 95 FM (54.91%) found them 'easy to read', 104 RS (35.86%) and 66 FM (38.15%) found them 'easy to photocopy' and 25 RS (8.62%) and 19 FM (10.98%) opined that 'no IT knowledge is required' to access print resources. It is clear that the opinion of RS and FM differs on reasons of use of print resources, whereas it is quite similar to some extent in case of 'easy to photocopy' and 'no IT knowledge is required' to consult and read them.

7.7 Reasons for use of e-resources

The respondents were asked about the reasons for use of e-resources procured by their libraries and the analysis of their responses is depicted in table 7 below:

Reasons*	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total, N=465
	RS, n=80	FM, n=45	RS, n=80	FM, n=30	RS, n=50	FM, n=30	RS, n=40	FM, n=30	RS, n=40	FM, n=40			
Available from Desktop	53 (66.3)	25 (55.6)	60 (75)	18 (60)	23 (46)	15 (50)	32 (80)	12 (40)	18 (45)	35 (87.5)	186 (64.14)	105 (60)	291 (62.58)
Easy to access	45 (56.3)	34 (75.6)	48 (60)	25 (83.3)	26 (52)	22 (73.3)	32 (80)	20 (66.7)	23 (57.5)	34 (85)	174 (60)	135 (77.14)	309 (66.45)
Hyperlink to references	32 (40)	27 (60)	39 (48.8)	15 (50)	20 (40)	18 (60)	22 (55)	22 (73.3)	10 (25)	25 (62.5)	123 (42.41)	107 (61.14)	230 (49.46)
On screen Reading	65 (81.3)	30 (66.7)	60 (75)	20 (66.7)	27 (54)	12 (40)	35 (87.5)	18 (60)	21 (52.5)	30 (75)	208 (71.72)	110 (62.86)	318 (68.39)
Access from different location	72 (90)	33 (73.3)	70 (87.5)	18 (60)	30 (60)	18 (60)	32 (80)	20 (66.7)	20 (50)	32 (80)	224 (77.24)	121 (69.14)	345 (74.19)
Timeless availability	55 (68.8)	31 (68.9)	45 (56.3)	23 (76.7)	26 (52)	15 (50)	22 (55)	23 (76.7)	22 (55)	20 (50)	170 (58.62)	112 (64)	282 (60.65)
Full text Available	48 (60)	38 (84.4)	40 (50)	14 (46.7)	20 (40)	10 (33.3)	15 (37.5)	16 (53.3)	17 (42.5)	17 (42.5)	140 (48.28)	95 (54.29)	235 (50.54)
Downloading facility	53 (66.3)	35 (77.8)	43 (53.8)	14 (46.7)	19 (38)	15 (50)	18 (45)	16 (53.3)	18 (45)	20 (50)	151 (52.07)	100 (57.14)	251 (53.98)
Archival facility	60 (75)	34 (75.6)	45 (56.3)	10 (33.3)	12 (24)	10 (33.3)	15 (37.5)	17 (56.7)	12 (30)	25 (62.5)	144 (49.66)	96 (54.86)	240 (51.61)
Qualitative contents	42 (52.5)	25 (55.6)	40 (50)	13 (43.3)	15 (30)	10 (33.3)	13 (32.5)	12 (40)	11 (27.5)	23 (57.5)	121 (41.72)	83 (47.49)	204 (43.87)
*Multiple Answers													

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)

Table 7: Reasons for use of e-resources

Table 7 indicates that 186 RS (64.14%) and 105 FM (60%) used e resources as they found them 'available from desktop', 174 RS (60%) and 135 FM (77.14%) found them 'easy to access', 123 RS (42.41%) and 107 FM (61.14%) observed that these have 'hyperlink to references', 208 RS (71.72%) and 110 FM (62.86%) found them 'on screen reading', 224 RS (77.24%) and 121 FM (69.14%) found that these can be accessed from different location, 170 RS (58.62%) and 112 FM (64%) cited the reason for using them as they are quickly available. Similarly, 140 RS (48.28%) and 95 FM (54.29%) always found the full text, 151 RS (52.07%) and 100 FM (57.14%) access them due to availability of 'downloading feature' and 121 RS (41.72%) and 83 FM (47.49%) used them due to 'quality content'. It is clear that RS and FM have different opinions regarding the reasons of using e-resources. In contrast, Madhusudhan (2010) revealed that 88% RS used e-resources daily as they were time saving (58.62% in present study) and 78% found them easy to use (60% in present study).

7.8 Satisfaction from the library collection

The respondents (n=465) were asked about their satisfaction from the collection available in their respective libraries. The response received from the respondents is depicted in table 8 below:

Satisfaction Level	PU		PbiU		GNDU		KU		MDU		Total RS (290)	Total FM (175)	Total (n= 465)
	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 45)	RS (n= 80)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 50)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 30)	RS (n= 40)	FM (n= 40)			
Strongly Satisfied	25 (31.2)	16 (35.6)	22 (27.5)	08 (26.7)	15 (30)	09 (30)	14 (35)	07 (23.3)	15 (37.5)	15 (37.5)	**91 (31.39)**	**55 (31.43)**	**146 (31.4)**
Satisfied	34 (42.5)	21 (46.7)	32 (40)	10 (33.3)	19 (38)	08 (26.7)	14 (35)	11 (36.7)	14 (35)	14 (35)	**113 (38.97)**	**64 (36.57)**	**177 (38.1)**
Neutral	14 (17.5)	03 (6.7)	18 (22.5)	05 (16.7)	11 (22)	08 (26.6)	06 (15)	09 (30)	07 (17.5)	06 (15)	**56 (19.31)**	**31 (17.71)**	**87 (18.7)**
Dissatisfied	06 (7.5)	03 (6.7)	05 (6.2)	04 (13.3)	03 (06)	05 (16.7)	04 (10)	02 (6.7)	03 (7.5)	04 (10)	**21 (7.24)**	**18 (10.29)**	**39 (8.4)**
Strongly Dissatisfied	01 (1.2)	02 (4.4)	03 (3.8)	03 (10)	02 (04)	00 (00)	02 (05)	01 (3.3)	01 (2.5)	01 (2.5)	**09 (3.1)**	**07 (04)**	**16 (3.4)**
Chi-square	4.014		3.515		4.219		2.924		0.22		**1.774**		
Df	4		4		4		4		4		**4**		
Sig.	.404[b]		.476		.377		.571		.994		**0.777**		

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)

Table 8: Satisfaction from the collection

Table 8 reveals that maximum RS (37.5%) from MDU and minimum FM (23.3%) from KU are strongly satisfied with the collection available in their respective libraries. Maximum RS (2, 5%) from KU, whereas FM (3, 10%) from PbiU are strongly dissatisfied. 91 RS (31.39%) and 55 FM (31.43%) were strongly satisfied, whereas 9 RS (3.1%) and 7 FM (4%) were strongly dissatisfied from the library collection across the libraries. The study also supports Khan and Zaidi (2011) and Lewis and Mallaiah (2014) that majority of the respondents were satisfied from the library collection. The findings of the study also support Kumar (2017) who found 30.39% RS (31.39% in present study) were extremely satisfied, whereas 6.86% RS (7.24% in present study) were dissatisfied from the library resources. In contrast, Yusuf and Iwu (2010) revealed that 77.7% FM (31.43% in present study) and 79.5% students (31.39% in present study) strongly satisfied, whereas 5.7% FM (4% in present study) and 4.8% students (3.1% in present study) were never satisfied from the library resources.

The calculated chi square value and p-value (X^2= 4.014, df=4, p-value=0.404[b]) shows non-significant difference (as p-value is greater than level of significance (0.05)) in satisfaction level of RS and FM from the library collection in case of PU. The calculated chi square value and p-value (X^2= 3.515, df=4, p-value=0.476[b]) shows non-significant difference (as p-value is greater than level of significance (0.05)) in satisfaction level of RS and FM from the print collection in case of PbiU. The calculated chi square value and p-value (X^2= 4.219, df=4, p-value=0.377[bc]) shows non-significant difference (as p-value is greater than level of significance (0.05)) in satisfaction level of RS and FM from the library collection in case of GNDU. The calculated chi square value and p-value (X^2= 2.294, df=4, p-value=0.571[b]) shows highly non-significant difference (as p-value is greater than level of significance (0.05)) in satisfaction level of RS and FM from the library collection in case of KU. The calculated chi square value and p-value (X^2= 0.22, df=4, p-value=0.994[bc]) shows highly non-significant difference (as p-value is greater than level of significance (0.05)) in satisfaction level of RS and FM from library collection in case of MDU. Hence, hypothesis is **accepted** in respect to satisfaction from library collection between RS and FM in case of PU, PbiU, GNDU and KU, whereas it is **accepted to a great extent** in case of MDU.

Overall, the users' satisfaction from the library collection across the libraries was also calculated with the help of chi-square test. The calculated chi square value and p-value (X^2=1.774, df=4, p-value=0.777) shows non-significant difference (as p-value is greater than level of significance (0.05)) in satisfaction level from the library collection between RS and FM across the libraries. Hence it is also **accepted** in case of satisfaction of RS and FM from the library collection across the libraries. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) "There is no

significant difference in satisfaction level of research scholars and faculty members from the library collection of the universities under the study" is accepted to a great extent.

8. Conclusion and suggestions

The study revealed that no significant relationship was found in terms of use of library, use of library resources, purpose of visit to the library, reasons to access print as well as electronic resources and satisfaction from the library collection between the research scholars (RS) and faculty members (FM) within their library as well as across the libraries. Firstly, the comparison of RS and FM within their library indicates no significant relationship in frequency of visit to their respective libraries at PU, PbiU and GNDU, whereas in MDU both RS and FM (42.5%) visited their library twice or thrice a week, as well as once a fortnight (both 7.5%), average time in university library per week, purpose of visit to the library except KU in case of circulation of books (both 37%), availability of required resources except to some extent in MDU, where RS and FM (both 25%) occasionally get the required resources. The comparison between RS and FM also indicates that no significant relationship exist in use of information sources, except in case of non-books materials, reasons of use of print resources, except to some extent in GNDU where similarity was found in opinion of RS and FM (both 7.7%) that 'No IT knowledge is required' and reasons of use of e-resources except to some extent in PU in case of 'timeless availability' (both 68.8%), 'archival facility' (both 75%), to some extent in GNDU in case of 'access from different locations' (both 60%) as well as MDU in case of 'full text available' (both 42.5%). Regarding the satisfaction from the library collection (both print and electronic), the results indicate that RS and FM of PU, PbiU and GNDU were satisfied, whereas RS and FM of KU were fully satisfied from their library collections. Secondly, if we compare the overall research scholars (RS) and faculty members (FM) across the libraries then no significant relationship was found in frequency of visit to the library between the RS and FM across the libraries. RS spend more time in their respective libraries as compared to FM and library is the prominent place for reading in the opinion of RS, whereas FM visited their respective libraries for circulation purpose. A significant difference was also found in opinion of RS and FM about availability of required resources, information sources used by them, reasons of use of print resources e-resources, whereas RS and FM are both equally satisfied from the library collection across the libraries.

Based on the above findings, academic librarians should promote and market the acquired information resources among the library users, organize more orientation programmes, frequently carry out the exercise of curriculum mapping, get the feedback from users on regular basis and thereafter, develop specific criteria for the resources which are not being used. The librarians should regularly monitor the usage of print and e-resources and should think about innovative strategies for satisfying the diverse and multifarious needs of the users. Academic libraries should put more efforts on promotion, stimulating demands and improve usage of resources among RS and FM. The academic libraries should also enhance their discovery mechanism for locating and searching resources such as integration of all kind of resources in library catalogue, adoption of discovery services (single platform search) for searching of e-resources, arrangement of resources by subject disciplines, etc.

References

Ali, P.M. Naushad and Nisha, Faizul (2011), "Use of e-journals among research scholars at Central Science Library, University of Delhi", *Collection Building,* Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 53-60.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/01604951111105023.

Behling, O. and Cudd, K. (1967), "A library looks at itself", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol.26 No. 8, pp. 416-422. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_28_06_416.

Bhat, AtulAshokbhai (2014), "Information needs, perceptions and quests of law faculty in the digital era", *The Electronic Library*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 659-669. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/EL-11-2012-0152.

Bhat, Nazir Ahmad (2017), "Engagement of uesrs with e-resources across agricultural libraries of Northern India", *Library Management*, Vol. 39 No. 3/4, pp. 233-245.
DOI:https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-04-2017-0039.

Bhatt, Sunil and Rana, Madan Singh (2011), "E-information usage among engineering academics in India with special reference to Rajasthan State", *Library Hi Tech*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 496-511.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/07378831111174440.

Busayo, Isaac Oluwadare (2006), "Accessibility and use of library resources by part-time students: a case study of the Federal Polytechnic, Ado-Ekiti, Nigera", *Library Review*, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 148-156.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530610649639.

Dhingra, Navjyoti and Mahjan, Preeti (2007), "Use of electronic journals: a case study of Panjab University Library", *5th International CALIBER – 2007,* Panjab University, 08-10 February, Chandigarh.

Eyiolorunshe, Toluwani A. and Eluwole, Oluwadamilola A. (2017), "Awareness, accessibility and use of library resources by faculty members of Landmark University, Nigeria", *Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 118-128.
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/iijikm.v8i2.10.

Gurikar, Rushmanasab and Gurikar, Razaksab (2015), "Use of library resources and services by Karnatak University research scholars: a case study", *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 361-367. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.35.5.8275.

Khan, A. M. and Zaidi, S. M. (2011), "Determinants of library's effectiveness and efficiency: a study of collection development, organization and services of Maulana Azad library, AMU (India)", *Library Collections, Acquisition, & Technical Services,* Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 95-105.
DOI: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649055.2011.10766312.

Kona, Ramakrishna, Chagari, Sasikala and Rudraksha, Gowridevi (2017), "Use of library resources and services in selected deemed university libraries in Andhra Pradesh: a study", *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 1506. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1506(accessed 10 August 2020).

Korobili, Stella, Tilikidou, Irene and Delistavrou, Antonia (2006), "Factors that influence the use of library resources by faculty members", *Library Review*, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 91-105.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530610649594.

Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970), "Determining sample size for research activities", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 30, pp. 607-610. Available at:
http://home.kku.ac.th/sompong/guest_speaker/KrejcieandMorgan_article.pdf.(accessed 13 July 2020).

Kumar, G. Kiran(2017), "Use of information resources and services available in the library by the postgraduate students and research scholars of University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad: a study", *International Journal of Digital Library Services,* Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 1-12.
Available at: http://www.ijodls.in/uploads/3/6/0/3/3603729/1ijodls3717.pdf.(accessed10August 2020).

Lahor, M.S. and Kumbar,Mallinath (2002), "Use of library facilities and information resources in SahyadriColleges, Shimoga (Karnataka): a case study", *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 73-87. Available at: http://nopr.niscair.res.in/handle/123456789/4137.(accessed 15 August 2020).

Lewis, Felcy and Mallaiah, T.Y. (2014), "Use of information resources in engineering college libraries of Dakshina Kannada and Udupi Districts: a comparative study", *Annals of Library and Information Studies,* Vol. 61, pp. 142-152. Available at: http://nopr.niscair.res.in/handle/123456789/29035(accessed 15 August 2020).

Madhusudhan, Margam (2010), "Use of electronic resources by research scholars of Kurukshetra University", *The Electronic Library,* Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 492-506.Doi:10.1108/02640471011033684.

Ogunmodede, T. A., Adio, Gboyega and Odunola, O. A. (2011), "Library use education as a correlate of use of library resources in a Nigerian University", *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal).* Paper 604. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/604. (accessed 15 August 2020).

Okiki, O. C. (2012),"Electronic information resources awareness, attitude and use by academic staff members of the University of Lagos, Nigeria", *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal).* Paper 834. Available at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/834/. (Accessed 15 August 2020).

Peacock, Rebeca and Vecchione, Amy (2020), "Accessibility best practices, procedures, and policies in Northwest United States Academic Libraries", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 46 No. 1. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.102095.

Rose-Wiles, L. M., and Irwin, J. P. (2016),"An old horse revived? in-house use of print books at Seton Hall University", *Journal of Academic Librarianship,* Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 207-214. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.02.012.

Siddiqui and Asif Fareed (2002), "Use of library collection in the Jawaharlal Nehru University library, New Delhi", *IASLIC Bulletin*, Vol. 47 No.3, pp. 149-161.

Simisaye, A.O. (2012), "Faculty use of university library resources: a study of Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria", *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal).Paper 820. Available at:https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/820/(accessed 25 August 2020).

Ugah,Akobundu Dike (2008), "Availability and accessibility of information sources and the use of library services at Michael Okpara University of Agriculture", *Library Philosophy and Practice*(e-journal). Paper 190. Available at:https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/190/(accessed 25 August 2020).

Woo, Helen (2005), "The 2004 user survey at the University of Hong Kong Libraries", *College & Research Libraries,* Vol. 66 No. 2, pp. 115–135. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.66.2.115.

Yusuf, Felicia and Iwu, Juliana (2010), "Use of academic library: a case study of Covenant University, Nigeria", *Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal,* 30. Available at: http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl30YI.pdf. (accessed 25 August 2020).