Electronic Resources Access Pattern in Engineering College Libraries: An Analytical Study at Vellore District, Tamil Nadu

R. Palani¹ and V. Ramesh Babu²

¹Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India ²Research Supervisor, T.B.M.L. College, Porayar, Tamil Nadu, India E-Mail: palanir69@gmail.com

(Received 18 March 2019; Revised 3 April 2019; Accepted 18 April 2019; Available online 24 April 2019)

Abstract - This study conducted to find out the electronic information/resources access and seeking behavior of engineering college students in Vellore district. Objective- of the paper is to identify the availability of e-resources, awareness, usage level, level of satisfaction and barriers during access of the students. Methodology-a systematic questionnaire designed and distributed among the Engineering College library users. After data collection analysis of the study done. Findings - It is observed from the data analysis most of the UG Students are using Google as their search engine and they prefer DELNET also on the other hand PG students and faculty prefer all subscribed resources for their teaching and learning. There is a less awareness about the commercial resources among the students. Suggestions were given to improve the infrastructure and need orientation programme for all category of users.

Keywords: Electronic Resources, Educational Institutions, Communication Technology

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher Educational institutions are playing key role in disseminating electronic information to the users of the libraries. Information seeking behavior differs among user groups. Academic libraries must understand the information needs of the students and faculty. In order to full fill their needs the administrator of the institutions and librarians should bring the latest technological development viz. Digital information/electronic-resources for quick dissemination of information resources to the users. Due to information and communication Technology every day latest e-resources marketing in the field of higher education. The electronic resources should be upgraded or subscribed for the sake of Teaching and learning purpose. The Government of India and Ministry of HRD taking initiatives for growth and development of electronic resources. The Government provides subsidy for certain category of institutions regarding subscription of electronic resources. There are difference types of electronic resources viz. Delnet, Inflibnet, Proquest, Scopus, Springer, Science Direct.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Srilakshmi, B and Sridhar, K (2018) investigate the access and use of e-resources by the faculty members and students in university of madras, the study is a quantities approach using questionnaire to gather the data and information from total respondents of 120. The study recommends that the establishment of basic arrangement that support the effective use of online resources acquire by the library are put into maximal use by the library patrons thereby ensuring the accomplishments of the libraries unbiased which is satisfying the users information needs. Raja, I et al., (2018) investigated the infrastructure and Internet facilities for Faculty members to access online resources with special reference to Engineering Colleges in Thanjavur District, Tamil Nadu. Total no of questionnaires 110 are distributed among faculty members of engineering colleges in Thanjavur to collect relevant data. 96% (110) Faculty members have responded where 106 responses are collected to the Library Internet/Browsing centre during working hours. Majority (58%) of the Engineering college library internet centre during working hours are from 8am to 4pm. For 100% availability of internet browsing facility in the institutions for members of the faculty and the researchers, 100% institutions for internet centre are maintaining log book and provide user statistics in the internet centre/library. Internet bandwidth (45%) of institution has 2 MBPS bandwidth to meet the needs of the faculty. Online resources are playing a vital role to meet future demands of faculty members and research scholars for information and knowledge.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the important objectives of the study,

- 1. To study the availability of electronic information resources in the concerned colleges
- 2. To study the impact of electronic resources among the academic users
- 3. To identify the awareness about the Open Source resources
- 4. To know the different category of users and their preference of resources
- 5. To find out the problems faced by the users while using electronic resources.
- 6. To measure the users- level of satisfaction on electronic resources
- 7. To investigate the man power support to access electronic resources
- 8. To indentify the infrastructure facility of the colleges under study
- 9. To know the latest technological development in libraries

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN

The present research work is a case study of the academic community of engineering colleges in Vellore district of Tamil Nadu, India. A systematic questionnaire designed to collect data from the engineering college library users. There is 1500 Questionnaire distributed to concerned college library users. There are 1290 questionnaire are received back that is response rate is 86%. After received

the questionnaire they are edited and fed into computer MS-Excel for further analysis.

A. Sampling Plan: There are more than 20 Engineering colleges in Vellore District affiliated to Anna University, Tamil Nadu among the 20 Engineering colleges 15 are randomly selected for data collection and Geographical area of study also taken in to account.

V. DATA ANALYSIS & DISCUSSIONS

| S. No. | Name of the Institution | No. of Questionnaire distributed | No. of Questionnaire Received back | Percentage |
|--------|--|--|--|------------|
| 1 | Adhiparasakthi College of Engineering, Kalavai | 100 | 92 | 92% |
| 2 | Annai Mira College of Engineering and Technology, Arappakkam | 100 | 86 | 86% |
| 3 | Bharathidasan Engineering College, Natramballi | 100 | 75 | 75% |
| 4 | C. Abdul Hakeem College of Engineering & Technology, Melvisharam | 100 | 87 | 87% |
| 5 | Ganadipathy Tulsi's Jain Engineering College, Kaniyambadi | 100 | 69 | 69% |
| 6 | Global Institute of Engineering and Technology, Melvisharam | 100 | 70 | 70% |
| 7 | Kingston Engineering College, Katpadi | 100 | 78 | 78% |
| 8 | Podhigai College of Engineering and Technology, Tirupattur | 100 | 86 | 86% |
| 9 | Priyadarshini Engineering College, Vaniyambadi | 100 | 80 | 80% |
| 10 | Ranipettai Engineering College, Walajapet | 100 | 91 | 91% |
| 11 | Saraswathi Velu College of Engineering, Sholinghur | 100 | 88 | 88% |
| 12 | Shri Sapthagiri Institute of Technology, Nemili | 100 | 73 | 73% |
| 13 | Sree Krishna College of Engineering, Anaikattu | 100 | 76 | 76% |
| 14 | Sri Nandhanam College of Engineering & Technology, Tirupattur | 100 | 75 | 75% |
| 15 | Thanthai Periyar Government institute of Technology, Thorapadi | 100 | 74 | 74% |
| | TOTAL | 1500 | 1200 | 80% |

TABLE I NAME OF THE ENGINEERING COLLEGES IN VELLORE DISTRICT UNDER STUDY

The above table I depicts the data collection study of the Engineering colleges in Vellore district. According to the table highlights the Adhiparasakthi College of Engineering, Priyadarshini Engineering College and Ranipettai Engg. College respondents' rate is more than 90% and rest of the colleges 80% and above filled the questionnaire. Over all response rate is 86%.

| | Designation | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------|-------|--|
| Name of the discipline | Students | Asst. Professor | Associate Professor | Professor | Total | |
| D E Mashaniaal Engineering | 127 | 21 | 8 | 11 | 167 | |
| B.E Mechanical Engineering | 18.7% | 11.4% | 3.7% | 9.2% | 13.9% | |
| D. Tao. Information Tasknalogy | 42 | 9 | 17 | 8 | 76 | |
| B. Tec. Information Technology | 6.2% | 4.9% | 7.8% | 6.7% | 6.3% | |
| D E Civil Engingering | 19 | 25 | 29 | 10 | 83 | |
| B.E Civil Engineering | 2.8% | 13.6% | 13.4% | 8.3% | 6.9% | |
| D.E. Computer Science and Engineering | 37 | 8 | 15 | 10 | 70 | |
| B.E Computer Science and Engineering | 5.4% | 4.3% | 6.9% | 8.3% | 5.8% | |
| | 50 | 2 | 19 | 8 | 79 | |
| B.E Electrical and Electronic Engineering | 7.4% | 1.1% | 8.8% | 6.7% | 6.6% | |
| P. Tash Pistashnalagy | 33 | 21 | 18 | 10 | 82 | |
| B. Tech. Biotechnology | 4.9% | 11.4% | 8.3% | 8.3% | 6.8% | |

TABLE II NAME OF THE SUBJECT DISCIPLINE VS DESIGNATION

| D E Electronic and Inst. Engineering | 59 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 78 | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|--|
| B.E Electronic and Inst. Engineering | 8.7% | 4.9% | 2.8% | 3.3% | 6.5% | |
| D E Electronic and come an einervice | 20 | 18 | 14 | 3 | 55 | |
| B.E Electronic and com. engineering | 2.9% | 9.8% | 6.5% | 2.5% | 4.6% | |
| BE Assessmentical Engineering | 73 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 78 | |
| B.E Aeronautical Engineering | 10.8% | .5% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 6.5% | |
| M. Tash Dis tashnalagu | 57 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 60 | |
| M. Tech Bio technology | 8.4% | 0.0% | .9% | .8% | 5.0% | |
| M.E. Computer science and Engineering | 24 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 42 | |
| | 3.5% | 2.7% | 2.3% | 6.7% | 3.5% | |
| M.E. Mechatronics | 21 | 24 | 11 | 8 | 64 | |
| | 3.1% | 13.0% | 5.1% | 6.7% | 5.3% | |
| M.E Power Electronics and Drives | 16 | 2 | 22 | 11 | 51 | |
| M.E Power Electronics and Drives | 2.4% | 1.1% | 10.1% | 9.2% | 4.3% | |
| M.E VLSI | 42 | 14 | 39 | 13 | 108 | |
| M.E VLSI | 6.2% | 7.6% | 18.0% | 10.8% | 9.0% | |
| MCA | 14 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 32 | |
| MCA | 2.1% | 6.0% | 1.4% | 3.3% | 2.7% | |
| MBA | 45 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 75 | |
| MBA | 6.6% | 7.6% | 4.1% | 5.8% | 6.3% | |
| T-4-1 | 679 | 184 | 217 | 120 | 1200 | |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | Value | | df | | . (2-sided) | |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 313.456 ^a | | .00 | .000 | | |

The table II exposes the two types of respondents that are under graduate and Post graduate. Among this maximum of B.E Mechanical engineering students 127(18.7%) are participated in the study. In case of PG 57 (8.4%) M Tech Bio technology students covered under the study. In case of Asst. Professors and Associate Professors 184 and 217 are responded respectively. On the other hand 120 of Professors are participated under the study.

| A | Designation | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|-------|--------------------|-----------|--------|--|
| Awareness of E-resources | Students | Students Asst. Professor Associate Profess | | rofessor | Professor | Total | |
| Not at all arran | 80 | 17 | 46 | | 32 | 175 | |
| Not at all aware | 11.8% | 9.2% | 21.29 | % | 26.7% | 14.6% | |
| | 86 | 48 | 38 | | 26 | 198 | |
| Slightly aware | 12.7% | 26.1% | 17.59 | % | 21.7% | 16.5% | |
| a . | 51 | 34 | 24 | | 10 | 119 | |
| Somewhat aware | 7.5% | 18.5% | 11.1% | | 8.3% | 9.9% | |
| Madametala anna | 195 | 47 | 78 | | 28 | 348 | |
| Moderately aware | 28.7% | 25.5% | 35.9% | | 23.3% | 29.0% | |
| | 267 | 38 | 31 | | 24 | 360 | |
| Extremely aware | 39.3% | 20.7% | 14.39 | % | 20.0% | 30.0% | |
| T. () | 679 | 184 | 217 | 1 | 120 | 1200 | |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% 100 | | 1% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| Pearson Chi-Square | Value | df | | Asymp. Sig. (2-sid | | led) | |
| | 114.916 ^a | 12 | | 0.000 | | | |

TABLE III AWARENESS OF E-RESOURCES VS DESIGNATION

According to awareness of Electronic resources among the respondents from table III, It is observed that designation wise maximum 267 (39.3%) students extremely aware the

e-resources facility on the other hand only 14.6% that is 175 of the respondents not aware the availability of e-resources.

| Quantum of time taken to access | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--|
| or downloading e-resources | Students | Asst. Professor | Associate Professor | Professor | Total | |
| Less them 10 min | 150 | 31 | 34 | 14 | 229 | |
| Less than 10 min | 22.1% | 16.8% | 15.7% | 11.7% | 19.1% | |
| 10 to 20 min | 126 | 35 | 54 | 34 | 249 | |
| | 18.6% | 19.0% | 24.9% | 28.3% | 20.8% | |
| 20to 30 min | 96 | 27 | 36 | 24 | 183 | |
| 2010 50 11111 | 14.1% | 14.7% | 16.6% | 20.0% | 15.3% | |
| 30 to 40 min | 95 | 20 | 40 | 15 | 170 | |
| 30 to 40 min | 14.0% | 10.9% | 18.4% | 12.5% | 14.2% | |
| More than 1 hrs. | 212 | 71 | 53 | 33 | 369 | |
| More than 1 lifs. | 31.2% | 38.6% | 24.4% | 27.5% | 30.8% | |
| T-4-1 | 679 | 184 | 217 | 120 | 1200 | |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| Poorson Chi Squara | Value | df | Asy | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | | |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 29.471 ^a | 12 | 0.003 Rejected | | | |

TABLE IV TIME TAKEN TO ACCESS OR DOWNLOADING OF E-RESOURCES VS DESIGNATION

As per the table IV indicates that time has taken to access downloading of electronic resources is 229 (19.1%) are insisted that less than 10 minutes. Next to this 369(30.8%)

of respondents are pointed out that more than 1 hour taken for downloading the documents.

| Access to a computer | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------|--|--|
| with internet connection | Students | Asst. Professor | Associate Professor | Professor | Total | | |
| At library | 124 | 15 | 18 | 3 | 160 | | |
| At horary | 18.3% | 8.2% | 8.3% | 2.5% | 13.3% | | |
| A (1 | 112 | 22 | 30 | 18 | 182 | | |
| At home | 16.5% | 12.0% | 13.8% | 15.0% | 15.2% | | |
| At department | 151 | 54 | 75 | 31 | 311 | | |
| At department | 22.2% | 29.3% | 34.6% | 25.8% | 25.9% | | |
| At our comput | 292 | 93 | 94 | 68 | 547 | | |
| At our campus | 43.0% | 50.5% | 43.3% | 56.7% | 45.6% | | |
| Total | 679 | 184 | 217 | 120 | 1200 | | |
| 10(a) | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| Deemoon Chi Square | Value | df | Asyı | np. Sig. (2-side | ed) | | |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 47.170 ^a | 9 | 0.000 Rejected | | | | |

TABLE V ACCESS TO A COMPUTER WITH INTERNET CONNECTION VS DESIGNATION

TABLE VI TIME SPENT IN THE ELECTRONIC INFORMATION GATHERING ACTIVITIES IN THE LIBRARY VS

| Time spent in the electronic information gathering activities in the library | Time spent up to 1 to ^{2hrs} | | Time spent up to 2to3hrs | Time spent up to 3to4 hrs. | Time spent up to 4to 5hrs | More than 5 hrs. | М | R |
|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------|---|
| Searching journal/magazine | Frequency | 57 | 130 | 328 | 294 | 391 | 3.6933 | 5 |
| Searching Journal/magazine | Percent | 4.8 | 10.8 | 27.3 | 24.5 | 32.6 | 5.0955 | 5 |
| Searching for Books | Frequency | 98 | 45 | 236 | 402 | 419 | 3.8325 | 1 |
| | Percent | 8.2 | 3.8 | 19.7 | 33.5 | 34.9 | 3.6323 | 1 |
| Proweing a Journals on Internet | Frequency | 97 | 69 | 276 | 409 | 349 | 3.7033 | 4 |
| Browsing e-Journals on Internet | Percent | 8.1 | 5.8 | 23.0 | 34.1 | 29.1 | | 4 |
| Saarahing online datahasas | Frequency | 80 | 50 | 266 | 507 | 297 | 3.7425 | 3 |
| Searching online databases | Percent | 6.7 | 4.2 | 22.2 | 42.3 | 24.8 | 5.7425 | 3 |
| E | Frequency | 48 | 63 | 285 | 514 | 290 | 2 7702 | 2 |
| E-mail alerts, correspondence | Percent | 4.0 | 5.3 | 23.8 | 42.8 | 24.2 | 3.7792 | 2 |
| Accessing a books | Frequency | 86 | 99 | 325 | 465 | 225 | 3.5367 | 6 |
| Accessing e-books | Percent | 7.2 | 8.3 | 27.1 | 38.8 | 18.8 | 5.5507 | 6 |

According to table VI expose that the time is spent in the electronic information gathering activities among the users. There are 391 (32.6%) respondents are spending more than 5 hours for searching journal/magazines. Among the 1200

respondents 419 and 225 are more than 5 hours time taken for browsing e-journals and e-books. In case of searching online database 80% (6.7%) and browsing e-journals 97 (8.1%) are time taken 1 to 2 hours.

| Subscribed Online Databases | | Not available | Not Readily available | Available | Readily available | М | R |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------|----|
| IEEE / IEL | Frequency | 94 | 214 | 144 | 748 | 3.2883 | 5 |
| IEEE / IEL | Percent | 7.8 | 17.8 | 12.0 | 62.3 | 5.2005 | 3 |
| ACM Digital Library | Frequency | 76 | 258 | 133 | 733 | 3.2692 | 7 |
| Activi Digitar Library | Percent | 6.3 | 21.5 | 11.1 | 61.1 | 5.2092 | / |
| ASME | Frequency | 102 | 170 | 162 | 766 | 3.3267 | 1 |
| ASME | Percent | 8.5 | 14.2 | 13.5 | 63.8 | 5.5207 | 1 |
| ASCE | Frequency | 113 | 177 | 143 | 767 | 3.3033 | 3 |
| ASCE | Percent | 9.4 | 14.8 | 11.9 | 63.9 | 5.5055 | 3 |
| Nature (Orling Issue) | Frequency | 76 | 255 | 113 | 756 | 3.2908 | 4 |
| Nature(Online Journal) | Percent | 6.3 | 21.3 | 9.4 | 63.0 | | 4 |
| Service and (Ordine Jammal) | Frequency | 233 | 343 | 234 | 390 | 2.6508 | 13 |
| Springer (Online Journal) | Percent | 19.4 | 28.6 | 19.5 | 32.5 | 2.0508 | |
| Science Direct | Frequency | 86 | 213 | 148 | 753 | 3.3067 | 2 |
| | Percent | 7.2 | 17.8 | 12.3 | 62.8 | | 2 |
| EBSCO | Frequency | 207 | 223 | 380 | 390 | 2.7942 | 12 |
| EDSCO | Percent | 17.3 | 18.6 | 31.7 | 32.5 | 2.7942 | 12 |
| SCOPUS | Frequency | 199 | 221 | 390 | 390 | | 11 |
| SCOPUS | Percent | 16.6 | 18.4 | 32.5 | 32.5 | 2.8092 | 11 |
| DELNET | Frequency | 72 | 276 | 104 | 748 | 3.2733 | 6 |
| DELINEI | Percent | 6.0 | 23.0 | 8.7 | 62.3 | 5.2755 | 0 |
| | Frequency | 230 | 360 | 220 | 390 | 2 (417 | 14 |
| INFLIBNET | Percent | 19.2 | 30.0 | 18.3 | 32.5 | 2.6417 | 14 |
| DRO OUEST | Frequency | 74 | 276 | 104 | 746 | 2 2692 | 8 |
| PRO-QUEST | Percent | 6.2 | 23.0 | 8.7 | 62.2 | 3.2683 | 0 |
| Emonald Dublishing | Frequency | 88 | 286 | 118 | 708 | 2 20 70 | 9 |
| Emerald Publishing | Percent | 7.3 | 23.8 | 9.8 | 59.0 | 3.2050 | 9 |
| Springer (E Books) | Frequency | 124 | 311 | 135 | 630 | 2.0502 | 10 |
| Springer (E-Books) | Percent | 10.3 | 25.9 | 11.3 | 52.5 | 3.0592 | 10 |

The table VII shows that Subscribed Online Databases depicts that IEEE/IEL and DELNET subscription in the colleges 748(62.3%) are insisted that readily available in their institution. On the other hand ASME and ASCE

subscription 766 and 767 are recorded readily available. In case of science direct and proquest subscriptions only 86 and 74 respondents opined that these resources not available in their libraries.

| Difficulties of Accessing | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------|
| E-resources | Students | Asst. Professor | Associate Professor | Professor | Total |
| Unavailability of E-Resources | 45 | 19 | 20 | 11 | 95 |
| | 6.6% | 10.3% | 9.2% | 9.2% | 7.9% |
| Lack of Awareness About The | 126 | 19 | 19 | 21 | 185 |

| Library E-Resources | 18.6% | 10.3% | 8.8% | 17.5% | 15.4% |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|-------------------|--------|
| Technical Difficulties Like Power | 70 | 18 | 25 | 22 | 135 |
| Failure, Internet Connection, Etc. | 10.3% | 9.8% | 11.5% | 18.3% | 11.3% |
| Not Taking Proper Assistance | 65 | 16 | 22 | 9 | 112 |
| From The Library Staffs | 9.6% | 8.7% | 10.1% | 7.5% | 9.3% |
| Do Not know how to Use Online | 30 | 19 | 36 | 19 | 104 |
| Catalogue | 4.4% | 10.3% | 16.6% | 15.8% | 8.7% |
| | 76 | 15 | 14 | 6 | 111 |
| Lack of Facilities | 11.2% | 8.2% | 6.5% | 5.0% | 9.3% |
| Time Drasting Drain The Council | 50 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 75 |
| Time Duration During The Search | 7.4% | 4.9% | 4.6% | 5.0% | 6.3% |
| Distance To The Library | 37 | 7 | 16 | 7 | 67 |
| Distance to the Library | 5.4% | 3.8% | 7.4% | 5.8% | 5.6% |
| Lack of Knowledge in Using the | 51 | 10 | 23 | 8 | 92 |
| Library System | 7.5% | 5.4% | 10.6% | 6.7% | 7.7% |
| Some Information Materials Are | 129 | 52 | 32 | 11 | 224 |
| Too Old | 19.0% | 28.3% | 14.7% | 9.2% | 18.7% |
| Total | 679 | 184 | 217 | 120 | 1200 |
| 10101 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Pearson Chi-Square | Value | | df | Asymp (2-sic | |
| i carson Chi-square | 95.156 ^a | | 27 | 0.000 Rejected | |

According to table VIII Difficulties of Accessing Eresources 126 (18.6%) of students opined that Lack of awareness about the Library e-Resources, Next to this 76 (11.2%) of students insisted that lack of facilities provided in their libraries. In case of Associate professors 36(16.6%) of them pointed out do not know how to use online catalogue, next to this 22 (18.3%) of Professors recorded their opinion on technical Difficulties found during the access of e-resources Like Power Failure, Internet Connection, Etc.

| Update with ICT developments | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Students | Asst. Professor | Associate Professor | Professor | Total |
| Internet | 71 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 113 |
| | 10.5% | 8.2% | 6.5% | 10.8% | 9.4% |
| E-Mail | 43 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 71 |
| | 6.3% | 4.3% | 6.9% | 4.2% | 5.9% |
| Facilities from other department | 73 | 33 | 38 | 26 | 170 |
| | 10.8% | 17.9% | 17.6% | 21.7% | 14.2% |
| Workshops, seminars and conferences | 157 | 25 | 22 | 16 | 220 |
| | 23.1% | 13.6% | 10.2% | 13.3% | 18.3% |
| In-service | 78 | 12 | 20 | 3 | 113 |
| | 11.5% | 6.5% | 9.3% | 2.5% | 9.4% |
| Educational resource services | 42 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 50 |
| | 6.2% | 1.6% | 1.9% | .8% | 4.2% |
| Professional books/ journals | 28 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 42 |
| | 4.1% | 3.8% | .9% | 4.2% | 3.5% |
| News letters | 32 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 41 |

TABLE IX UPDATE WITH ICT DEVELOPMENTS VS DESIGNATION

R. Palani and V. Ramesh Babu

| | 4.7% | 2.2% | 1.9% | .8% | 3.4% |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|--------------------------|----------|
| Research journals | 25 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 43 |
| | 3.7% | 4.9% | 2.8% | 2.5% | 3.6% |
| Publisher catalogues | 54 | 27 | 42 | 14 | 137 |
| | 8.0% | 14.7% | 19.4% | 11.7% | 11.4% |
| World Wide Web | 34 | 5 | 25 | 11 | 75 |
| | 5.0% | 2.7% | 11.6% | 9.2% | 6.3% |
| ICT vendors | 42 | 36 | 24 | 22 | 124 |
| | 6.2% | 19.6% | 11.1% | 18.3% | 10.3% |
| Total | 679 | 184 | 216 | 120 | 1199 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Pearson Chi-Square | Value | | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | |
| | 152.317 ^a | | 33 | 0.000 | Rejected |

The table IX depicts that 220 (18.3%) of the respondents are opined that they are insisted that workshop, seminars and conferences are required for to aware about the e-resources access. Next to this 113 (9.4%) of respondents are insisted to increase Internet speed, apart from that 43(3.6%) of them to increase research journals in their libraries.

VI. SUGGESTIONS

The following suggestions were given that to improve better usage of electronic resources

- 1. It is suggested that maximum No of respondents insisted that seminars, conferences to be conducted for user awareness programmers
- 2. Research journals to be increased in their libraries
- 3. Increase the computer systems and high bandwidth internet connection
- 4. UPS facility will be provided to avoid irregular power supply
- 5. Proper orientation to be given for library usage and internet access

VII. CONCLUSION

On the basis of analysis, it is observed that DELNET, IEEE resources plays vital role in Engineering colleges and their

usage is satisfied apart from that ASCE and ASME journals usage almost satisfied by the respondents. There are other commercial resources science districts, proquest database to be subscribed in most of the colleges. In case of awareness about the electronic resources proper training and retrieval techniques to be given to the library users. The overall respondents of the study are satisfactory level. There are many open sources electronic information available for higher educational institutions. It should be utilized by the users on proper user awareness programmers to be conducted. On the other hand the private institutions and management may take initiative to increase infrastructure for the sake of the users is need of the hour.

REFERENCES

- Srilakshmi, B & Sridhar, K (2018). Access and use of e-resources by the faculty members and students in University of Madras, *IALA Journal*, 6(1&2), 147-151.
- [2] Raja, I., Krishnamoorthy, P. & Muthusamy, C. (2018). Infrastructure and Internet Facilities in the Engineering Colleges for Faculty Members to Access Electronic Resources with Special Reference to Engineering Colleges in Thanjavur District, Tamil Nadu, *IALA Journal*, 6(1&2), 348-356.
- [3] Roshan Raina. (1995). An analysis of the students feedback on the library resources, facilities and services at a national level management institute, *Annals of Library Science and Documentation*, 42(3), 106-112.