

January 2019

ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION AMONG THE POST GRADUATE STUDENTS IN BHARATHIDASAN UNIVERSITY

Abu KS
abumutd@protonmail.com

Dr Balasubramani R
Bharathidasan University, lisbala@gmail.com

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

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

KS, Abu and R, Dr Balasubramani, "ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION AMONG THE POST GRADUATE STUDENTS IN BHARATHIDASAN UNIVERSITY" (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2143.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2143>

**ASSEESING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION AMONG THE POST GRADUATE STUDENTS IN
BHARATHIDASAN UNIVERSITY**

Abu K.S* **Dr.R.Balasubramani****

*Research Scholar, DLIS, Bharathidasan University, Trichy, Tamil Nadu.

**Assistant Professor, DLIS, Bharathidasan University, Trichy, Tamil Nadu

ABSTRACT

Library instruction plays a vital role in facilitating the patrons in imaginative and artistic thinking about research and information resources. In the present technological era, libraries need to interact with the patrons more in order to help them in locating the information resource and organizing the resources in such a way that the patrons can find their information with assistance. This study investigates the effectiveness of library instruction among the Post Graduate students in Bharathidasan University. The study adopted a survey method and structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. The Study found out that majority of the students were able to make use of the library resources and services without much help of the library staff.

Keywords: Library Instruction, Information Needs, Survey Method

1. INTRODUCTION

The term “Library instruction” which is also commonly known as bibliographic instruction, user education and library orientation, or initiation to the freshman, comprises of instructional agendas, proposed to educate library patrons in order to assist them in locating their

information needs swiftly and efficiently. The instructional design usually includes the organization of library resources, the design of the literature in the field, research methodologies suitable to the academic scenario and exact resources and locating tools such as library catalog, indexes and abstracting services, bibliographic databases, etc. Further, it equip the individuals to make instant and enduring use of information efficiently by enlightening the notions and logic of information access and evaluation, and also by nurturing information independence and spontaneous thinking. Library Instruction is very much essential to know about the function of the library and also to develop a rapport between the librarian and the Patrons. Hence, this gave the researcher an idea to study about the perception of library instruction among the Post Graduate students of Bharathidasan University. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of library instruction among the Post Graduate students of Bharathidasan University.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Dugan and Herson (2002) in their study on “An action plan for outcomes assessment in your library” explained that, universities and other regional accrediting bodies give emphasis on learning results and outcomes rather than students perception during the instruction session. Riddle and Hartman (2000) found out in their study that instructional outputs do not measure changes in skills of the individual. Maughan (2001) explained in his study that the tradition might have value to a personal teaching style and might provide insight to the library's physical surroundings but does not address students and their needs. Meulemans (2002) in his study on “Educating instruction librarians: A model for library and information science education” claims that measuring information competencies is a means of marketing the overall library instruction program. This present study is mainly carried out to ascertain whether the given instruction program was effective to students or not.

3. OBJECTIVES

The present study is framed with the following objectives:

- ✓ To find out the frequency of library visit by the patrons
- ✓ To determine the main purpose of library visit by the patrons.
- ✓ To know whether the Instruction material was presented in an effective manner
- ✓ To recognize whether the library Instruction was relevant to the information needs of patrons.
- ✓ To find out whether the library facilities were easy to access during instruction.
- ✓ To know whether the instruction helped the patrons to understand and use the various library resources without assistance.
- ✓ To find out the overall rating of library instruction

4. HYPOTHESIS

The following hypothesis have been framed for the present study.

- There is no significant difference between the frequency of library visit with regards to dimensions of library instruction
- There is an association between male and female students with regard to frequency of library visit
- There is an association between male and female students with regard to purpose of library visit

5. METHODOLOGY

The main aim of this study is to assess the effectiveness of library instruction among the Post Graduate students in Bharathidasan University. The study adopted a survey method and a well-designed structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. A total of 140 questionnaires were distributed to the students of the various departments who attended the instruction programme and out of that

only 129 questionnaires were received. The response rate is 92.14%. and convenient sampling method was used to determine the sample size. The data collected through the questionnaire were tabulated accordingly and further analysis were made using differential and inferential statistics.

6. CONTENTS OF THE LIBRARY INSTRUCTION DELIVERED TO STUDENTS

The following topics were covered while delivering instruction to the students:

- Brief history about the library
- Library working hours
- Resources available in the library
- How to make use of various Library services available in the library (CAS,SDI, DDC etc)
- How to access e- resources subscribed by the library
- How to make use of Institutional repository developed by the library (Dspace)
- Various search strategies used for information retrieval (Boolean, Phrased searching etc)

These instruction were delivered to the students during their freshmen year and regular instructions were provided when new resources or services is introduced. Further, one on one instruction is also given to the students who are in need of them.

7. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

On the basis of responses received from the Post graduate students of Bharathidasan University through questionnaire, the data have been planned and tabulated by using tables of frequency and other descriptive and inferential statistics.

7.1. FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISIT

Table 1: Frequency of Library Visit

Frequency of Library Visit	Total= 129	Gender-Wise Respondents	
		Male n= 75	Female n= 55
Daily	49 (38%)	29 (39.2%)	20 (36.4%)
Weekly	37 (28.7%)	20 (27%)	17 (30.9%)
Monthly	28 (21.7%)	15 (20.3%)	13 (23.6%)
Occasionally	15 (11.6%)	10 (13.5%)	5 (9.1%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 1 depicts the frequency of library visit by the Post graduate students of Bharathidasan University. It is clearly seen from the table that 38% of the respondents visit the library daily, which is followed by 28.7% of the students who visit the library weekly. It is also noticed that only 11.6% of the students visit the library occasionally.

7.2. PURPOSE OF LIBRARY VISIT

Table 2: Purpose of Library Visit

Purpose of	Total	Gender-Wise Respondents
------------	-------	-------------------------

Library visit	n= 129	Male n= 74	Female n= 55
Reading books	12 (9.3%)	7 (9.5)	5 (9.1%)
Borrowing Books	20 (15.5%)	11(14.9%)	9 (16.4%)
Reading Magazines	28 (21.7%)	16 (21.6%)	12 (21.8%)
Accessing Internet	42 (32.6%)	23 (31.1%)	19 (34.5%)
Accessing Scholarly journals	7 (5.4%)	3 (4%)	4 (7.3%)
Reading Newspapers	20 (15.5%)	14 (18.9%)	6 (10.9%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 2 presents the purpose of library visit by the Post graduate students of Bharathidasan University. It is apparently seen from the table that majority of the users (32.6%) visit the library for accessing internet., which is followed by 21.7% of the students who visit the library for reading magazines.

7.3.PRESENTATION OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Table 3: Presentation of Library Instruction

Whether the Library Instruction was presented in an effective manner	Total n= 129	Gender-Wise Respondents	
		Male n= 74	Female n= 55
Strongly Agree	82 (63.6%)	50 (67.6%)	32 (58.2%)
Agree	37 (28.7%)	19 (25.7%)	18 (32.8%)
Strongly Disagree	3 (2.3%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (3.6%)
Disagree	4 (3.1%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (3.6%)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3 (2.3%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.8%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 3 analyzes the effectiveness of the presentation of library instruction delivered to the Post graduate students of Bharathidasan University. It is evidently observed from the table that majority of the users (63.6%) strongly agree that the library instruction was delivered in an effective manner and 3 students strongly disagree that that the library instruction was delivered in an effective manner.

7.4.RELEVANCY OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Table 4: Relevancy of Library Instruction

The library instruction was relevant to the information need of the patrons	Total n= 129	Gender-Wise Respondents	
		Male n= 74	Female n= 55
Strongly Agree	89 (69%)	56 (75.6%)	33 (60%)
Agree	31 (24.1%)	14 (18.9%)	17 (31%)
Strongly Disagree	3 (2.3%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.6%)
Disagree	3 (2.3%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.8%)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3 (2.3%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.6%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 4 examines the relevancy of the library instruction delivered to the Post graduate students of Bharathidasan University. It is plainly noticed from the table that 69% of the respondents strongly agree that the library instruction delivered was relevant to their information needs. It is also observed that only 3 students strongly disagree that the library instruction delivered was relevant to their information needs.

7.5. ACCESS TO LIBRARY FACILITIES

Table 5: Access to Library Facilities

The library facilities were easy to access during instruction	Total n= 129	Gender-Wise Respondents	
		Male n= 74	Female n= 55
Strongly Agree	54 (41.9%)	26 (35.2%)	28 (51%)
Agree	64 (49.6%)	41 (55.4%)	23 (41.8%)
Strongly Disagree	3 (2.3%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.8%)
Disagree	5 (3.9%)	3 (4%)	2 (3.6%)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3 (2.3%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.8%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 5 presents the details regarding the access of library facilities by the respondents during instruction. It is clearly observed from the table that nearly 50% of the respondents agree that the library facilities were easy to access during instruction and only 5 students strongly disagree that the library facilities were easy to access during instruction.

7.6.UNDERSTANDING AND USE OF LIBRARY RESOURCES

Table 6: Understanding and Use of Library Resources

The library instruction helped the patrons to understand and use of library resources without assistance	Total n= 129	Gender-Wise Respondents	
		Male n= 74	Female n= 55
Strongly Agree	71 (55%)	38(51.4%)	33 (60%)
Agree	43 (33.3%)	29 (39.2%)	14 (25.5%)
Strongly Disagree	5 (3.9%)	3 (4%)	2 (3.6%)
Disagree	7 (5.4%)	3 (4%)	4 (7.3%)
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3 (2.4%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.6%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 6 discusses about whether the library instruction helped the respondents to understand use the library resources without any assistance. It is evidently visible from the table that majority of the users (55%) strongly agree that the library instruction helped them to

understand use the library resources without any assistance and only 5 students strongly disagree that the library instruction helped them to understand use the library resources without any assistance.

7.7.EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Table 7: Effectiveness of Library Instruction

How is your overall rating of this library instruction	Total n= 129	Gender-Wise Respondents	
		Male n= 74	Female n= 55
Very Satisfied	50 (38.7%)	22 (29.7%)	28 (50.4%)
Satisfied	66 (51.2%)	46 (62.2%)	20 (36.4%)
Very Dissatisfied	3 (2.3%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.6%)
Dissatisfied	5 (3.9%)	3 (4%)	2 (3.6%)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5 (3.9%)	2 (2.7%)	3 (5.5%)
TOTAL	129	74	55

Table 7 portrays the overall effectiveness of library instruction delivered to the Post graduate students of Bharathidasan University. It is visibly seen from the table that majority of the students were satisfied with the library instruction provided to them and only 3 students were very dissatisfied with the library instruction provided to them.

8. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

8.1. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE SCORES ON LIBRARY INSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO FREQUENCY LIBRARY VISIT

Table 8: Mean and Standard Deviation of the scores on Library Instruction with respect to Frequency Library Visit

Variables	Daily N = 49 (1)		Weekly N = 37 (2)		Monthly N = 28 (3)			Occasionally N = 15 (4)		F - ratio	Level of Significance	Group Differed Significantly
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		Mean	S.D			
Presentation of Library Instruction	4.00	0.00	3.86	0.35	3.04	0.19		1.67	1.18	124.52	P < 0.01	(1,3) (1,4) (2,3) (2,4) (3,4)

Relevancy of Library Instruction	4.00	0.00	3.89	0.31	3.25	0.44		1.73	1.22	92.80	P < 0.01	(1,3) (1,4) (2,3) (2,4) (3,4)
Access of Library Facilities	3.94	0.24	3.22	0.42	3.00	0.00		1.53	1.13	107.57	P < 0.01	(1,2) (1,3) (1,4) (2,3) (2,4) (3,4)
Use of Library Instruction	4.00	0.00	3.59	0.50	2.86	0.45		1.40	1.06	120.65	P < 0.01	(1,2) (1,3) (1,4) (2,3) (2,4) (3,4)
Overall Rating of Library Instruction	3.86	0.35	3.22	0.42	2.93	0.26		1.27	1.22	94.11	P < 0.01	(1,2) (1,3) (1,4) (2,3) (2,4) (3,4)

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency of library visit with regards to dimensions of library instruction

This table presents the Mean and Standard Deviation of the scores on Library Instruction with respect to Frequency Library Visit by the respondents. The calculated F-ratio are found to be significant at 0.01 level, hence the stated hypothesis is rejected.

From the analysis of mean scores, it is known that students who visit library daily have better perception towards library instruction when compared with other students. The analysis proved that sustained practices influences more information in knowing and understanding about the library comprehensively. Further, students who visit the library often are easily able to access the library resources and other library services without much help of the library staffs.

8.2. CHI – SQUARE VALUE AND CONTINGENCY CO – EFFICIENT FOR ASSOCIATION BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISIT AND GENDER

Table 9: Chi – Square value and Contingency Co – efficient for Association between Frequency of Library Visit and Gender

		Gender			Chi-square	df	Level of Significance	Contingency Co-efficient	Level of Significance
		Male	Female	Total					
Frequency of Library Visit	Daily	29 (28.1) 22.5%	20 (20.9) 15.5%	49 (49.0) 38.0%	0.93	3	P > 0.05	0.08	P > 0.05
	Weekly	20 (21.2) 15.5%	17 (15.8) 13.2%	37 (37.0) 28.7%					
	Monthly	15 (16.1) 11.6%	13 (11.9) 10.1%	28 (28.0) 21.7%					
	Occasionally	10 (8.6) 7.8%	5 (6.4) 3.9%	15 (15.0) 11.6%					
Total		74 (74.0) 57.4%	55 (55.0) 42.6%	129 (129.0) 100.0%					

Hypothesis 2: There is an association between male and female students with regard to frequency of library visit

This table displays the Chi – Square value and Contingency Co – efficient for Association between Frequency of Library Visit and Gender. From the analysis of the Chi – Square value, it is evident that there is no association between male and female students with regard to frequency of library visit and hence the stated hypothesis is rejected.

8.3. CHI – SQUARE VALUE AND CONTINGENCY CO – EFFICIENT FOR ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PURPOSE OF LIBRARY VISIT AND GENDER

Table 10: Chi – Square value and Contingency Co – efficient for Association between Purpose of Library Visit and Gender

		Gender			Chi-square	df	Level of Significance	Contingency Co-efficient	Level of Significance
		Male	Female	Total					
Purpose of Library Visit	Reading Books	7 (6.9) 5.4%	5 (5.1) 3.9%	12 (12.0) 9.3%	2.08	5	P > 0.05	0.13	P > 0.05
	Browsing Books	11 (11.5) 8.5%	9 (8.5) 7.0%	20 (20.0) 15.5%					
	Reading Magazines	16 (16.1) 12.4%	12 (11.9) 9.3%	28 (28.0) 21.7%					

	Accessing Internet	23 (24.1) 17.8%	19 (17.9) 14.7%	42 (42.0) 32.6%					
	Accessing Journal	3 (4.0) 2.3%	4 (3.0) 3.1%	7 (7.0) 5.4%					
	Reading Paper	14 (11.5) 10.9%	6 (8.5) 4.7%	20 (20.0) 15.5%					
	Total	74 (74.0) 57.4%	55 (55.0) 42.6%	129 (129.0) 100.0%					

Hypothesis 2: There is an association between male and female students with regard to purpose of library visit

This table displays the Chi – Square value and Contingency Co – efficient for Association between Purpose of Library Visit and Gender. The calculated Chi – Square value is not significant even at 0.05 level, hence the stated directional hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is no association between male and female students with regard to purpose of library visit.

9. CONCLUSION

The advent of Internet and new technologies are renovating the customs in which information is produced, scattered, stored, disseminated and accessed. Hence in the present digital era, libraries have to bind to the technological changes and utilize it to accomplish their task that of providing access to the information needs of the patrons. Patrons are the main source of a library and hence libraries have to interact with them

in order to know their needs and hindrances in using library facilities and resources. Further, Library Instruction should not be overlooked in the digital environment and with the emergence of Information Technology Library instruction plays a vital role in helping the patrons in locating their information needs, which are scattered in diverse sources. This study evaluated the effectiveness of library instruction among the post graduate students in Bharathidasan University and found out that majority of the students were able to make use of the library resources and services without much help of the library staff.

REFERENCES

York, A. C., & Vance, J. M. (2009). Taking library instruction into the online classroom: Best practices for embedded librarians. *Journal of library administration*, 49(1-2), 197-209.

Oakleaf, M. (2009). The information literacy instruction assessment cycle: A guide for increasing student learning and improving librarian instructional skills. *Journal of Documentation*, 65(4), 539-560.

Tancheva, K., Andrews, C., & Steinhart, G. (2007). Library instruction assessment in academic libraries. *Public Services Quarterly*, 3(1-2), 29-56.

Wong, G., Chan, D., & Chu, S. (2006). Assessing the enduring impact of library instruction programs. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(4), 384-395.

Portmann, C. A., & Roush, A. J. (2004). Assessing the effects of library instruction. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(6), 461-465.

Carter, E. W. (2002). "Doing the best you can with what you have:" lessons learned from outcomes assessment. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 28(1), 36-41.

Dugan, R. E., &Hernon, P. (2002). Outcomes assessment: Not synonymous with inputs and outputs. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 28(6), 376-380.

Meulemans, Y. N., & Brown, J. (2002). Educating instruction librarians: A model for library and information science education. *Research Strategies*, 18(4), 253-264.

Maughan, P. D. (2001). Assessing information literacy among undergraduates: A discussion of the literature and the University of California-Berkeley assessment experience. *College & Research Libraries*, 62(1), 71-85.

Riddle, J. S., & Hartman, K. A. (2000). "But are they learning anything?" Designing an assessment of first year library instruction. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 7(2), 59-69.

Ren, W. H. (2000). Library instruction and college student self-efficacy in electronic information searching. *The journal of academic librarianship*, 26(5), 323-328.

Williams, J. L. (2000). Creativity in assessment of library instruction. *Reference Services Review*, 28(4), 323-335.

Tobin, T., &Kesselman, M. (1999). Evaluation of Web-Based Library Instruction Programs.

Stamatoplos, A., &Mackoy, R. (1998). Effects of library instruction on university students' satisfaction with the library: a longitudinal study. *College & Research Libraries*, 59(4), 322-333.

Daugherty, T. K., & Carter, E. W. (1997). Assessment of outcome-focused library instruction in psychology. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 24(1), 29

Thomas, J. (1994). Faculty Attitudes and Habits Concerning Library Instruction: How Much Has Changed Since 1982?. *Research Strategies*, 12(4), 209-23.

Barclay, D. A. (1993). Evaluating library instruction: Doing the best you can with what you have. *RQ*, 33(2).

Phipps, B. H. (1968). Library instruction for the undergraduate. *College & Research Libraries*, 29(5), 411-423.