

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

December 2018

# A STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE AND USAGE OF ELECTRONIC RESOURCES BY THE SC/ST RESEARCH SCHOLARS AND PG STUDENTS AMONG PERIYAR UNIVERSITY AFFILIATED COLLEGES

Kavitha ES

kavithaesk@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

ES, Kavitha, "A STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE AND USAGE OF ELECTRONIC RESOURCES BY THE SC/ST RESEARCH SCHOLARS AND PG STUDENTS AMONG PERIYAR UNIVERSITY AFFILIATED COLLEGES" (2018). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1999.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1999>

# **A STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE AND USAGE OF ELECTRONIC RESOURCES BY THE SC/ST RESEARCH SCHOLARS AND PG STUDENTS AMONG PERIYAR UNIVERSITY AFFILIATED COLLEGES**

**Dr. E. S. Kavitha,  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Library and Information Science,  
Periyar University, Salem, Tamil Nadu**

## **Abstract**

Advances in computer applications during the past few decades have brought radical changes in the way information is gathered, stored, organized, accessed, retrieved and consumed. The foremost focus of the research paper was to study the knowledge and use of electronic resources by SC/ST research scholars and PG students among colleges in Salem District affiliated to Periyar University. The study was carried out for SC/ST research scholars and PG students studying in colleges affiliated to Periyar University, Salem to explore their usage pattern of electronic resources. A Structured questionnaire was designed to achieve the objectives of the study and collect data from the research scholars. The results revealed that more number of research scholars and PG students were frequently using the e-resources for class assignments and preparation of examinations. Moreover, most of the users preferred to download the e-resources as in PDFformats. However some of the institutional based problems are being faced by the users.

**Keywords:** Electronic Resources, Research Scholars, SC/ST, PG Students, Periyar University

## **Introduction**

E-resources are increasingly important to all aspects of education – from teaching and learning, through to the collection of student data, administration and marketing activities the institutions engage in. Advances in computer applications during the past few decades have brought radical changes in the way information is gathered, stored, organized, accessed, retrieved and consumed. The application of computers in information processing has brought several products and services to the scene. The Internet and the Web are constantly influencing the development of new modes of scholarly communication; their potential for delivering goods is quite vast, as they overcome successfully the geographical limitations associated with the print media. Electronic resources are online information resources, including bibliographic databases, electronic reference books, search engines for full text collections, digital collections of data and data sets. Non reference e-books and e-journals will be referred to as e-resources in this report. With the information explosion, the internet has revolutionized the research processes and made information retrieval very convenient. The electronic resources which come in the form of e-books and e-journals accessed through various databases have made research activities conveniently available. E-resources are convenient to use and make research a lot easier in that, they enable one to search for information at a faster rate because search engines are utilized as opposed to manual searches. Libraries have witnessed a great metamorphosis in recent years both in their

collection development and in their service structure. Over the last several years, a significant transformation has been noticed in collection development policies and practices. Print medium is increasingly giving way to the electronic form of materials.

**Bala, Suniti (2018)** explored the use of open access resources (OARs) by researchers of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana. The findings of the study shows that research articles, theses and e-books are extensively used open access resources for course and research work. Training and online tutorials can be helpful in overcoming the problems faced by researchers in using OARs. **Yebowaah, Franklina Adjoa (2017)** examined the use of electronic resources by lecturers of the University for Development Studies, Wa campus. The study recommended that efforts to improve the use of e-resources in the Library should include ways of creating user awareness, training/workshops for users and staff, and responding to the challenges confronting utilization. **Amusa, Oyintola Isiaka (2016)** surveyed the level of availability, use and constraints to use of electronic resources among law lecturers in Nigeria. The study recommended regular subscriptions to electronic resources and provision of basic information literacy skills with emphasis on how to access, retrieve, download and print electronic resources for the law lecturers. **Viswanathan, V (2016)** attempted to deal with users opinion regarding the usage of Library Electronic Resources of selected arts and science colleges in Tamil Nadu. This paper provided few suggestions for the effective use of the resources among arts and science college libraries. **Jogan, Sushma N (2015)** examined the views of postgraduate students' on the access, awareness and usage in facilitating their research and their satisfaction with the sources and services currently provided. It suggested further for an improvement in the access facilities with high Internet speed and subscription to more e-resources by the University Library. The study attempted to encounter different problems faced by the students during accessing e-resources. **Kumar, Devendra (2015)** analyzed the awareness and usage of EIRS among the Teachers and Students of IIMS. The study demonstrated and elaborated the various aspects of the purpose of using EIRS, types, methods and linking pattern of EIRS. The study discussed with the reason for using EIRS and suggested to make the EIRS more beneficial. **Kwadzo, Gladys (2015)** examined the awareness level and usage of electronic databases by graduate students in the University of Ghana. The study found that students were very much aware of the databases available and established that majority of students knew about the databases from their lecturers and most of them accessed from the central library. **Nazir, Tawfeeq (2015)** attempted to determine the use and satisfaction level with respect to the electronic resources provided by the University of Kashmir to its users. The findings could be helpful to know the different challenges and concerns faced by users while accessing and using e-resources. The study highlighted the current scenario of the faculties of University of Kashmir with reference to the awareness and usage of electronic resources. **Priyadharshini, R (2015)** described the awareness, access and use of electronic resources available in the Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai. The study focused on the use of different types of electronic information resources, awareness of users, access and use of digital resources freely available by the Post Graduate Students, Ph.D Scholars and Faculty Members.

### **Objectives**

The present study aimed to study the awareness and usage of electronic resources by SC/ST research scholars and PG students among Periyar University affiliated colleges.

## Methodology

The researcher used a design of empirical survey. This study involves both primary, secondary data and wide interaction with a sample group. Simple random sampling method is chosen as far as primary data is concerned. The researcher has personally visited all the above institutions, distributed 728 questionnaires and received 700 filled-in questionnaires from the respondents. The response rate is 96.15.

## Analysis

The analysis and interpretation of awareness and usage of e-resources as follow as

**TABLE NO: 1**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTION**

Sl. No	Institution	Percentage
1	University	21.6
2	Aided College	9.3
3	Self Finance College	50.7
4	Constituent College	2.1
5	Government College	16.3
	Total	100

The table no 1 shows the distribution of the respondents by their studying institutions. It is clear that 51% of the respondents are from Self Finance Colleges and 22% of the respondents are from Periyar University Campus. Around 16% of the respondents are from Government Colleges and 9% of the respondents are responded Aided colleges. A 2% of the respondents are from Periyar University Constituent Colleges.

**TABLE NO: 2**  
**AWARENESS ABOUT THE FOLLOWING E-RESOURCES**

Sl. No	Sources	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	E-journals	2.44	1.322	2
2	E-books	2.37	1.152	1
3	E-databases	2.69	1.277	3
4	E-magazines	2.89	1.301	4
5	E-dissertations and theses	3.09	1.331	7
6	Online Public Access Catalogues	2.92	1.414	5
7	E- audio visual resources	3.05	1.388	6

Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the awareness level of the respondents on various e-resources was ranked as follow as, e-books (M:-2.37, SD:-1.152) ranked first, e-journals ranked (M:-2.44, SD:-1.322) second, e-databases ranked (M:-2.69, SD:-1.277) third, e-magazines ranked (M:-2.89, SD:-1.301) fourth, OPAC ranked (M:-2.92, SD:-1.414) fifth, e- audio visual resources ranked (M:-3.05, SD:-1.388) sixth and e-dissertation and theses ranked(M:-3.09, SD:-1.331) seventh.

**TABLE NO: 3**  
**ANOVA BETWEEN AWARENESS LEVEL VARIOUS E-RESOURCES AND**  
**COURSE OF STUDY**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between awareness level on various e-resources and course of study*

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
E-journals	Between Groups	48.759	2	24.380	14.499	.000
	Within Groups	1171.955	697	1.681		
	Total	1220.714	699			
E-books	Between Groups	16.489	2	8.244	6.300	.002
	Within Groups	912.156	697	1.309		
	Total	928.644	699			
E-databases	Between Groups	14.539	2	7.269	4.491	.002
	Within Groups	1128.318	697	1.619		
	Total	1142.857	699			
E-dissertations and theses	Between Groups	58.556	2	29.278	17.294	.000
	Within Groups	1180.031	697	1.693		
	Total	1238.587	699			
E- audio visual resources	Between Groups	18.864	2	9.432	4.953	.005
	Within Groups	1327.285	697	1.904		
	Total	1346.149	699			

The table no. 3 shows the Analysis of Variance between awareness levels of various e-resources and Courses of study. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Calculated values of F are greater than the table value. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being ***“There is a significant difference between course what they study and their awareness level on various e-resources.”***

**TABLE NO: 4**  
**REGRESSION BETWEEN AWARENESS LEVEL ON VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**  
**AND THE INSTITUTION**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between awareness level on various e-resources and the institution where they study*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.243 <sup>a</sup>	.059	.049	1.233

a. Predictors: (Constant), E- audio visual resources, E-databases , E-dissertations and theses, E-magazines , Online Public Access Catalogues , E-journals , E-books

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	65.972	7	9.425	6.199	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	1052.062	692	1.520		
	Total	1118.034	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), E- audio visual resources, E-databases , E-dissertations and theses, E-magazines , Online Public Access Catalogues , E-journals , E-books

b. Dependent Variable: Institution

The table no 4 shows the regression between awareness level on various e-resources and the Institution where they study. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being ***“There is a significant difference between awareness level on various e-resources and the institution where they study”***.

**TABLE NO: 5**  
**FREQUENCY OF USE OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION RESOURCES**

Sl. No	Frequency	No of Respondent	Percentage
1	Daily	252	36
2	Twice a week	113	16.1
3	Thrice a week	61	8.7
4	Weekly	189	27
5	Occasionally	85	12.1
	Total	700	100

The table no 5 shows the frequency level of using the electronic information sources. It is noticed that majority (36%) of the respondents were using the electronic information sources on a daily basis. Around 27% of the respondents were using once in a weekly and 16% the respondents were using e-resources twice in a week. 12% of the respondents were using the e-resources occasionally and 9% of the respondents were using the e-resources thrice a week.

**TABLE NO: 6**  
**CHI-SQUARE TEST BETWEEN INSTITUTION AND PLACE OF ACCESSING THE E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no relationship between the institution where they study and place of accessing the e-resources*

Sl. No	Place	Pearson Chi-Square Test		
		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
1	Home	35.341 <sup>a</sup>	16	.004
2	Departmental Lab	35.341 <sup>a</sup>	16	.004
3	Main Library	35.142 <sup>a</sup>	16	.004
4	Other Places	65.561 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000

The table no 6 shows the chi-square between the Institution where they study and place of accessing the e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being *“There is a significant relationship between the institution where they study and place of accessing the e-resources”*

**TABLE NO: 7**  
**PURPOSES OF USING THE E-RESOURCES**

Sl. No	Purpose	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	Class Assignment	2.03	1.225	1
2	Research Paper	2.43	1.283	3
3	Seminar / Conference	2.42	1.15	4
4	Preparation for Exam	2.25	1.207	2
5	Update the Subject	2.56	1.337	5
6	Other	3.44	1.366	6

Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the various purpose of accessing the e-resources has been ranked as follows, Class assignment was ranked (M:-2.03, SD:-1.225) first, preparation of examination was ranked (M:-2.25, SD:-1.207) second, research paper was ranked (M:-2.43, SD:-1.283) third, preparing for seminars/ conferences was ranked (M:-2.42, SD:-1.15) fourth, updating the subject knowledge was ranked (M:-2.56, SD:-1.337) fifth and for other purposes was ranked (M:-3.44, SD:-1.366) sixth.

**TABLE NO: 8**  
**REGRESSION BETWEEN COURSE AND PURPOSE OF USING THE VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between course and purpose of using the various e-resources*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.319 <sup>a</sup>	.102	.094	.590

a. Predictors: (Constant), Purpose: Other, Purpose: Preparation for Exam, Purpose: Research Paper, Purpose: Class Assignment , Purpose: Seminar / Conference, Purpose: Update the Subject

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	27.258	6	4.543	13.054	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	241.170	693	.348		
Total	268.429	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Purpose: Other, Purpose: Preparation for Exam, Purpose: Research Paper, Purpose: Class Assignment , Purpose: Seminar / Conference, Purpose: Update the Subject

b. Dependent Variable: Course

The table no 8 shows the regression between course and purpose of using the various e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between course and purpose of using the various e-resources”**



**TABLE NO: 9**  
**REGRESSION BETWEEN INSTITUTION AND PURPOSE OF USING THE**  
**VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between Institution and purpose of using the various e-resources*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.190 <sup>a</sup>	.036	.028	1.247

a. Predictors: (Constant), Purpose: Other, Purpose: Preparation for Exam, Purpose: Research Paper, Purpose: Class Assignment , Purpose: Seminar / Conference, Purpose: Update the Subject

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	40.532	6	6.755	4.345	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	1077.503	693	1.555		
Total	1118.034	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Purpose: Other, Purpose: Preparation for Exam, Purpose: Research Paper, Purpose: Class Assignment , Purpose: Seminar / Conference, Purpose: Update the Subject

b. Dependent Variable: Institution

The table no 9 shows the regression between Institution and purpose of using the various e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being *“There is a significant difference between Institution and purpose of using the various e-resources”*.

**TABLE NO: 10**  
**FREQUENCY LEVEL OF USING THE E-RESOURCES**

Sl. No	Sources	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	E-journals	2.36	1.295	1
2	E-books	2.39	1.096	2
3	E-databases	2.79	1.24	3
4	E-magazines	3.07	1.189	6
5	E-dissertations and theses	3.04	1.303	5
6	Online Public Access Catalogues	2.94	1.438	4
7	E- audio visual resources	3.08	1.386	7

Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the frequency level of accessing the e-resources has been ranked as follows, e-journals was ranked (M:-2.36, SD:-1.295) first, e-books was ranked (M:-2.39, SD:-1.096) second, e-databases was ranked (M:-2.79, SD:-1.24) third, OPAC was ranked (M:-2.94, SD:-1.438) fourth, e-dissertations and theses ranked (M:-3.04, SD:-1.303) fifth, e-magazines ranked (M:-3.07, SD:-1.189) sixth and e-audio visual resources was ranked (M:-3.08, SD:-1.386) seventh.

**TABLE NO: 11**  
**REGRESSION BETWEEN INSTITUTION AND FREQUENCY OF ACCESSING THE VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between Institution and frequency of accessing the various e-resources*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.224 <sup>a</sup>	.050	.040	1.239

a. Predictors: (Constant), Frequency: E- audio visual resources, Frequency: E-books , Frequency: E-magazines , Frequency: E-dissertations and theses, Frequency: Online Public Access Catalogues , Frequency: E-journals , Frequency: E-databases

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	55.891	7	7.984	5.202	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	1062.143	692	1.535		
Total	1118.034	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Frequency: E- audio visual resources, Frequency: E-books , Frequency: E-magazines , Frequency: E-dissertations and theses, Frequency: Online Public Access Catalogues , Frequency: E-journals , Frequency: E-databases

b. Dependent Variable: Institution

The table no. 11 shows the regression between Institution and frequency of accessing the various e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being ***“There is a significant difference between Institution and frequency of accessing the various e-resources.”***

**TABLE NO: 12  
PREFERABLE FILE FORMAT**

Sl. No	Format	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	PDF	1.89	1.245	1
2	Full-text HTML	2.79	1.234	3
3	PPT	2.42	1.235	2
4	Other	3.49	1.39	4

Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the preferred file format to download has been ranked as follows, PDF was ranked (M:-1.89, SD:-1.245) first, PPT was ranked (M:-2.42, SD:-1.235) second, Full text HTML was ranked (M:-2.79, SD:-1.234) third and other file formats was ranked (M:-3.49, SD:-1.39) fourth.

**TABLE NO: 13  
REGRESSION BETWEEN COURSE OF STUDY AND PREFERRED FORMAT TO  
DOWNLOAD**

**H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between course of study and preferred format to download**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.151 <sup>a</sup>	.023	.017	.614

a. Predictors: (Constant), Preferred format: Other, Preferred format: PDF , Preferred format: Full-text HTML , Preferred format: PPT

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.114	4	1.528	4.049	.003 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	262.315	695	.377		
	Total	268.429	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Preferred format: Other, Preferred format: PDF , Preferred format: Full-text HTML , Preferred format: PPT

b. Dependent Variable: Course

The table no 13 shows the regression between course of study and preferred format to download. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being ***“There is a significant difference between course of study and preferred format to download.”***

**TABLE NO: 14**  
**Regression between Institution and preferred format to download**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between institution where they study and preferred format to download*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.143 <sup>a</sup>	.020	.015	1.255

a. Predictors: (Constant), Preferred format: Other, Preferred format: PDF , Preferred format: Full-text HTML , Preferred format: PPT

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.900	4	5.725	3.633	.005 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	1095.135	695	1.576		
	Total	1118.034	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Preferred format: Other, Preferred format: PDF , Preferred format: Full-text HTML , Preferred format: PPT

b. Dependent Variable: Institution

The table no 14 shows the regression between institution where they study and preferred format to download. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being ***“There is a significant difference between institution where they study and preferred format to download.”***

**TABLE NO: 15**  
**SATISFACTION LEVEL ON VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**

Sl. No	Sources	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	E-journals	1.97	0.996	1
2	E-books	2.07	0.874	2
3	E-databases	2.38	1.093	4
4	E-magazines	2.6	1.137	7
5	E-dissertations and theses	2.71	1.281	8
6	CD-ROMs	2.77	1.194	9
7	Online Public Access Catalogues	2.49	1.194	6
8	E-Images	2.33	1.159	3
9	E- audio visual resources	2.57	1.241	5

Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the satisfaction level on various e-resources has been ranked as follows, e-journals was ranked (M:-1.97, SD:-0.996) first, e-books ranked (M:-2.07, SD:-0.874) second, e-images was ranked (M:-2.33, SD:-1.159) third, e-databases was ranked (M:-2.38, SD:-1.093) fourth, e-audio visual resources was ranked (M:-2.57, SD:-1.241) fifth, OPAC was ranked (M:-2.49, SD:-1.194) sixth, e-magazines was ranked (M:-2.6, SD:-1.137) seventh, e- dissertation and theses was ranked (M:-2.71, SD:-1.281) eighth and CD-ROMs was ranked (M:-2.77, SD:-1.194) ninth.

**TABLE NO: 16**  
**REGRESSION BETWEEN COURSE AND LEVEL OF SATISFACTION ON**  
**VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between course of study and their satisfaction level on various e-resources.*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.194 <sup>a</sup>	.038	.025	.612

a. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction: E- audio visual resources, Satisfaction: E-journals , Satisfaction: E-magazines , Satisfaction: E-Images , Satisfaction: Online Public Access Catalogues , Satisfaction: E-databases , Satisfaction: CD-ROMs , Satisfaction: E-books , Satisfaction: E-dissertations and theses

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.096	9	1.122	2.996	.002 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	258.333	690	.374		
	Total	268.429	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction: E- audio visual resources, Satisfaction: E-journals , Satisfaction: E-magazines , Satisfaction: E-Images , Satisfaction: Online Public Access Catalogues , Satisfaction: E-databases , Satisfaction: CD-ROMs , Satisfaction: E-books , Satisfaction: E-dissertations and theses

b. Dependent Variable: Course

The table no. 16 shows the regression between course and satisfaction level on various e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being *“There is a significant difference between course of study and their satisfaction level on various e-resources.”*

**TABLE NO: 17**  
**REGRESSION BETWEEN INSTITUTION AND LEVEL OF SATISFACTION ON**  
**VARIOUS E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between Institution where they studying and their satisfaction level on various e-resources*

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.205 <sup>a</sup>	.042	.029	1.246

a. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction: E- audio visual resources, Satisfaction: E-journals , Satisfaction: E- magazines , Satisfaction: E-Images , Satisfaction: Online Public Access Catalogues , Satisfaction: E-databases , Satisfaction: CD-ROMs , Satisfaction: E-books , Satisfaction: E-dissertations and theses

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	46.891	9	5.210	3.356	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	1071.143	690	1.552		
	Total	1118.034	699			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction: E- audio visual resources, Satisfaction: E-journals , Satisfaction: E- magazines , Satisfaction: E-Images , Satisfaction: Online Public Access Catalogues , Satisfaction: E-databases , Satisfaction: CD-ROMs , Satisfaction: E-books , Satisfaction: E-dissertations and theses

b. Dependent Variable: Institution

The table no 17 shows the regression between Institution and satisfaction level on various e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being ***“There is a significant difference between Institution where they studying and their satisfaction level on various e-resources.”***

**TABLE NO: 18**  
**PROBLEMS FACED WHILE ACCESSING THE E-RESOURCES**

Sl. No	Problems	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	Slow network Connection	2.3	1.21	1
2	Electricity	2.72	1.214	3
3	Advertisements	2.53	1.277	2
4	Licensing	2.89	1.315	5
5	Scattered Data	3.15	1.289	8
6	Authentication	3.18	1.289	9
7	Misuse	3.21	1.378	10
8	Time Consuming	2.83	1.309	4
9	Document Saving Issues	3.07	1.262	6
10	Limited Information	3.09	1.331	7

Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the various problems faced by the respondents while of accessing the e-resources has been ranked as follows, slow network connection was ranked (M:-2.30, SD:-1.21) first, unwanted advertisement was ranked (M:-2.53, SD:-1.277) second, electricity problem was ranked (M:-2.72, SD:-1.214) third, time consuming was ranked (M:-, SD:-) fourth, Licensing problem was ranked (M:-2.89, SD:-1.315) fifth, Documents saving issues was ranked (M:-3.07, SD:-1.262) sixth, Limited information was ranked (M:-3.09, SD:-1.331) seventh, Scattered data was ranked (M:-3.15, SD:-1.289) eight, authentication was ranked (M:-3.18, SD:-1.289) ninth, misuse of data was ranked (M:-3.21, SD:-1.378) tenth.

**TABLE NO: 19**  
**CHI-SQUARE TEST BETWEEN FREQUENCY LEVEL USING THE E-RESOURCES AND PROBLEMS FACED WHILE ACCESSING THE E-RESOURCES**

*H<sub>0</sub>: There is no relationship between frequency level of using the e-resources and problems faced while accessing the e-resources*

Sl. No	Problems	Pearson Chi-Square Test		
		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
1.	Slow network Connection	62.002 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
2.	Electricity	76.914 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
3.	Advertisements	77.427 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
4.	Licensing	63.269 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
5.	Scattered Data	63.269 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
6.	Authentication	77.149 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
7.	Misuse	77.149 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
8.	Time Consuming	75.862 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
9.	Document Saving Issues	1.046E2 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000
10.	Limited Information	76.605 <sup>a</sup>	16	.000

The table no 19 shows the chi-square between the frequency of accessing the e-resources and problems faced while accessing the e-resources. From the above table it is clearly understood that significant value of the two variables is zero and lesser than the table value at the significant level of 5%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being *“There is a significant relationship between the frequency level of using the e-resources and problems faced while accessing the e-resources”*

## Findings

- ❖ The study indicated that 51% of the respondents were from Self Finance Colleges and 22% of the respondents were from Periyar University. Around 16% of the respondents were from Government Colleges and 9% of the respondents were responded Aided colleges.
- ❖ It is understood from the study that most of the respondents were higher aware of e-books, e-journals, e-databases and e-magazines. Some of the respondents had lesser level of awareness on OPAC, e- audio visual resources and e-dissertation and theses.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between course what they study and their awareness level on various e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between awareness level on various e-resources and the institution where they study” has been proved.
- ❖ The study indicated that 36% of the respondents were using the electronic information sources on a daily basis and 27% of the respondents were using weekly once.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant relationship between the institution where they study and place of accessing the e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the various purposes of accessing the e-resources has been ranked as follows, Class assignment was ranked first, preparation of examination was ranked second, research paper was ranked third, preparing for seminars/ conferences was ranked fourth, updating the subject knowledge was ranked fifth and for other purposes was ranked sixth.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between course and purpose of using the various e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between Institution and purpose of using the various e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the frequency level of accessing the e-resources has been ranked as follows, e-journals was ranked first, e-books was ranked second, e-databases was ranked third, OPAC was ranked fourth, e-dissertations and theses ranked fifth, e-magazines ranked sixth and e-audio visual resources was ranked seventh.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between Institution and frequency of accessing the various e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the preferred file format to download was ranked as follow as, PDF was ranked first, PPT was ranked second, Full text HTML was ranked third and other file formats was ranked fourth.
- ❖ The hypothesis proved that “There is a significant difference between course of study and preferred format to download.”
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between institution where they study and preferred format to download” has been proved.
- ❖ The study indicated the satisfaction level on various e-resources has been ranked as follows, e-journals was ranked first, e-books ranked second, e-images was ranked



third, e-databases was ranked fourth, e-audio visual resources was ranked fifth, OPAC was ranked sixth, e-magazines was ranked seventh, e- dissertation and theses was ranked eighth and CD-ROMs was ranked ninth.

- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between course of study and their satisfaction level on various e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant difference between Institution where they studying and their satisfaction level on various e-resources” has been proved.
- ❖ Based on the mean and Standard Deviation values, the various problems faced by the respondents while of accessing the e-resources have been ranked as follows, slow network connection was ranked first, unwanted advertisement was ranked second, electricity problem was ranked third, time consuming was ranked fourth, Licensing problem was ranked fifth, Documents saving issues was ranked sixth, Limited information was ranked seventh, Scattered data was ranked eight, authentication was ranked ninth, misuse of data was ranked tenth.
- ❖ The hypothesis “There is a significant relationship between the frequency level of using the e-resources and problems faced while accessing the e-resources” has been proved.

## **Conclusion**

It is of significant importance, essentially with respect to learning and teaching outcomes, that the usage of e-resources is constantly monitored among various target groups of users and reflected in the way in which institutions develop e-learning strategies and embed e-learning imperatives into other strategies. The study shows the use of e-resources is very common among the SC/ST PG students and research scholars of Periyar University and majority of the SC/ST PG students and research scholars are dependent on e-resources to get the desired and relevant information. But practical use of e-resources is not up-to the worth in comparison to investments made in acquiring these resources. The study also indicated the infrastructure and training programs should also be revised as per requirements. It is observed that the availability of e-resources on the campus was almost enough for all the existing disciplines but the infrastructure must also be adequately provided and consistently updated.

## **Acknowledgement**

**The author would like to thank the Indian Council of Social Science Research for it's Financial support under the ICSSR Minor Research Project F.No. 02 /448/2016-17/RP dt. 30.03.2017.**

## **Reference**

1. Adeyoyin, Samuel Olu (2016), Awareness, Access, and Use of Electronic Information Resources among the Seminarians in Nigeria, *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, 15 (1-2), 1-18
2. Akpojotor, Lucky O (2016) Awareness And Usage Of Electronic Information Resources Among Postgraduate Students Of Library And Information Science In Southern Nigeria, *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1408.<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1408>

3. Akussah, Maxwell (2015), Impact of Electronic Resources and Usage in Academic Libraries in Ghana: Evidence from Koforidua Polytechnic & All Nations University College, Ghana, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(33), 33-38
4. Amusa, Oyintola Isiaka (2016) Availability, Level of use and Constraints to use of Electronic Resources by Law Lecturers in Public Universities in Nigeria, *JLIS*, 7(3)
5. Bala, Suniti (2018), Awareness of Open Access Resources among the Researchers of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, *International Journal of Library Information Network and Knowledge*, 3(1), 139-145
6. Jogan, Sushma N (2015) Access, Awareness And Use Of Electronic Resources By Post Graduate Students In Gulbarga University, *International Journal of Informative & Futuristic Research (IJIFR)*, 2(6), 1540 - 1547
7. Joseph Jestin K J (2016) E-Resources in engineering College Libraries in Kerala: Awareness and Availability – A Study, *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 6(2), 85-90
8. Kaur, Kulveen (2016) Awareness and Use of E-resources: A Case Study of Mohinder Singh Randhawa Punjab Agricultural University Library, Ludhiana, *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 36(6), 396-404
9. Kumar, Devendra (2015) Use and Awareness of Electronic Information Resources and Services Among the Teachers and Students of Institute of Informatics and Management Sciences (IIMS) Meerut,U.P.(India): A Case Study, *International Journal of Information Library & Society*, 1(1), 8-18
10. Kwadzo, Gladys (2015), Awareness and usage of Electronic Databases by Geography and Resource Development Information Studies Graduate Students in the University Of Ghana, *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1210. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1210>
11. Nazir, Tawfeeq (2015) Use and adequacy of e-resources by the research scholars and students of the University Of Kashmir In Science & Social Science Faculties: A Case Study, *Brazilian Journal of Information Science*, 9(1).
12. Priyadharshini, R (2015), Awareness in usage of e-Resources among users at Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai: A case study, *European Academic Research*, II(11), 14816-14823.
13. Veena G (2016), Awareness and use of open access electronic information resources by university students: a study, *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 6(1), 113-120
14. Viswanathan, V. (2016) Use of Library Electronic Resources Among Selected Arts And Science Colleges In Tamil Nadu, *International Journal of Library Science and Research (IJLSR)*, 6(4), 17-22
15. Yebowaah, Franklina Adjoa Ms (2017), Awareness and Use of Electronic Resources in University Libraries: A Case Study of University for Development Studies Library, *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1562. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1562>.

