

September 2019

Access attitude on the Scholarly Information through Electronic Resources among Faculty members in the Universities of Southern Tamilnadu.

M. Prasad

Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India, prasdeep25@gmail.com

C. Baskaran

Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India, cbklis@gmail.com

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



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

Prasad, M. and Baskaran, C., "Access attitude on the Scholarly Information through Electronic Resources among Faculty members in the Universities of Southern Tamilnadu." (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2676.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2676>

Access attitude on the Scholarly Information through Electronic Resources among Faculty members in the Universities of Southern Tamilnadu.

M. Prasad,

*Research Scholar, Dept. of Library & Information Science, Alagappa University,
Karaikudi-630 003, India*

Dr. C. Baskaran,

Librarian & Research Supervisor, Alagappa University, Karaikudi-630 003, India

Abstract

The study analyzes the access attitude on the Scholarly Information through Electronic Resources among Faculty members in the Universities of Southern Tamilnadu. The study found that Madurai Kamaraj University and Alagappa University have respondents of each 130 (34.21%), 85 (22.36%) respondents are belonging to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University. It could be seen that out of 380 respondents, 177 (46.57 %) are belonging to faculty of Science. It is understood that 104 (27.36 %) respondents are coming under faculty of Arts, 52 (13.68%) of them belonging to faculty of Management, 47 (12.39%) respondents are from faculty of Education. Out of 380 respondents, Assistant Professor Respondents are found 265 (69.74%) which is followed by Professor Respondents 65(17.11%) and Associate Professor Respondents 50 (13.15%). 380 (100%) respondents are aware of E-Resources available in the University Library. the majority of 259 (98.50%) respondents are got training from the University Library for accessing the E – Resources and Only 4 (1.50%) male respondents are not getting training from the University Library. It is also seen that out of 117 (30.80%) female respondents.

Keywords: Scholarly Information, E- Resources, UGC- INFONET, E- Journals, E-Books and E-databases

Introduction

The basic foundation of a discipline is its literature that constitutes the accumulation of facts and achievements of human progress, derived from observation and experiment and such information are being utilised by the users. Nowadays Electronic resources are playing a vital role to provide scholarly information to its users especially for the scholars. In olden days only books, periodicals and newspapers etc., constitute the sources of information. Due to the rapid advancement of electronic era, the electronic resources and electronic services have occupied the place to provide scholarly information to the users. New technological developments in the context of information communication technology, the University Libraries are implementing modern Electronic resources and services to their students, faculty members and other end users.

Sharma stated that the application of computers to information processing has brought several products and services to the current scenario. Consequently, the academic community has undergone tremendous changes during these years, assuming new dimensions influenced by technology-driven applications. Libraries have witnessed a great metamorphosis in recent years both in their collection development and in their service structures. Thus Libraries are using technology to improve the management of scholarly information to strengthen and speed access to scholarly information not held locally. 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 (Sharma, 2009)¹

Review of Literature

Mohammed Nasser Al-Suqri (2011)¹ examined that Introduction: Models of information-seeking behaviour are based almost entirely on research conducted in Western countries, and were generated at a time when electronic methods of information-seeking were still uncommon. Jetta Carol Culpepper (2012)² revealed that the purpose of this study is to critique management reports provided by electronic databases. This will be done by discussing three database reports, an electronic report prepared locally and a local faculty assessment. Erin Dorris Cassidy et al. (2012)³ have focused on usage of electronic books (e-books) among advanced researchers, including graduate students and faculty, at a four-year academic institution. The researchers aimed to highlight differences in behaviour, perception, and attitude between users and non-users of e-books. Shiv Kumar (2012)⁴ revealed that the information-searching behaviour of academicians was changing significantly in the web environment. A large number of users explored the web to garner relevant information for academic purposes. Baskaran (2011)⁵ explained that tackles systemic problems first rather than individual pieces of technology within that system. In this respect, information science can be seen as a response to technological determination, the belief that technology" develops by its own laws, that it realizes its own potential, limited only by the material resources available, and must therefore be regarded as an autonomous system controlling and ultimately permeating all other subsystems of society. Baskaran, (2018)⁶ explored that distance education is the most renowned descriptor used when referencing distance learning. It often describes the effort of providing access to learning for those who are geographically distant. During the last two decades, the relevant literature shows that various authors and researchers use inconsistent definitions of distance education and distance learning. As computers became involved in the delivery of education, a proposed definition identifies the delivery of instructional materials, using both print and electronic media. Baskaran (2018)⁷ explained that MOOC has been around since 2008, but the concept began to generate significant media attention and debate in 2012 with the launch of MOOCs offered by or in association with prestigious US institutions through providers such as EdX, Coursera, and Udacity. In response to widespread media attention and debate, uptake of MOOCs has since spread globally. Coursera and EdX have partnered with elite institutions in Europe, Asia, and Australasia, and new MOOC

platforms have been developed including Future Learn in the UK, OpenupEd, and iVersity in Europe and Open2 Study in Australia. Baskaran and Ramesh (2019)⁸. 31 (6%) respondents have completed Arts, Science and Management studies graduates by the faculty members, 91 (17.5%) have completed graduation in Engineering. highest number of respondents that about 409 6(33%) makes this sources for use of e-journals among the respondents. maximum number of 251 (48.3%) respondents rated that information sought from e-books are "Excellent" large number of 280 (53.8%) respondents "Agree" that electronic journals save the time of the user. majority of 337 (64.8%) of the respondents "Agree" that e-resources are help them to keep abreast of knowledge. Binu PC and Baskaran C. (2019)⁹ analysed that the respondents of the study were 421 from selected State Universities in Kerala State, India. The Respondents categorize include Teaching faculty, Research Scholars and PG Students, the analysis made effective use of Electronic resources in rely on academic research prevalence of their needs in the Six State Universities of Kerala. The results examined out of 421 respondents, 220 (52.3%) of them belong to Research scholar. majority of respondents 109 (25.9%) are post graduates and 75 (17.8%) are having PG with NET qualification. Mean value for 'To borrow books' was 3.86 and assigned the rank one. Majority of respondents 416 (98.8%) are searching for educational and research Information. Baskaran and Ramesh (2019)¹⁰ analyses the faculty members have tried to get the e-resources for them needful in terms of academic research at South State Universities of Tamilnadu. It analyses that Out of 380 respondents, the male respondents are found 263(69.21%), the Ph.D. qualified respondents are found 285(75%). it is found that Madurai Kamaraj University and Alagappa University have respondents of each 130 (34.21%). Prasad M and Baskaran C. (2019)¹¹ analyses the faculty members have tried to get the e-resources for them needful in terms of academic research at South State Universities of Tamilnadu. It analyses that Out of 380 respondents, the male respondents are found 263(69.21%), the Ph.D. qualified respondents are found 285(75%). it is found that Madurai Kamaraj University and Alagappa University have respondents of each 130 (34.21%). it is found that all 380 (100%) respondents are aware of E-Resources available in the University Library.

Objectives of the study

1. To find out the University wise distribution of respondents and Faculty wise distribution of respondents in the Selected State Universities Southern Tamilnadu
2. To observe the Designation wise distribution of respondents
3. To find out the Aware of E-Resources available in the University Library by the respondents and Gender VS. Training provided by University Library
4. To examine the Level of Satisfaction by the respondents on training provided by University Library for using E-Resources
5. To observe the Satisfaction of respondents for their information needs by accessing E-Resources and services provided by University Libraries.
6. To analyze the Universities wise vs. Level of Satisfaction of Faculty members on Accessing University Library website

Methodology

The present study has adopted data collection among four universities in the South Tamil Nadu using a structured questionnaire. A vast literature survey was carried out on the topic of research and other related fields. This has done with the help of online databases, via internet mode and other reference sources. Considering the comments and suggestions of the respondents, some modifications are made in the questionnaire and used for the final survey. The main survey was conducted between 2014 -2015 in four State Universities in South Tamil Nadu. Out of 450 questionnaires distributed, the 400 (88.88%) were received back. Out of 400 questionnaires 20 were not be used for the final analysis as they were incomplete. Hence finally 380 questionnaires are used for final analysis.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 University wise distribution of respondents

Sl. No.	Name of the University	No. of the Respondents	Percentage
1	Manonmaniam Sundaranar University	85	(22.36)
2	Madurai Kamaraj University	130	(34.21)
3	Alagappa University	130	(34.21)
4	Mother Teresa Women's University	35	(9.22)
	Total	380	(100)

*Source Computed

* * Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

University wise distribution of respondents

Table 1 observed that the University wise respondents are accounted for this study. Out of 380 respondents, it is found that Madurai Kamaraj University and Alagappa University have respondents of each 130 (34.21%), 85 (22.36%) respondents are belonging to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, 35(9.22%) respondents are from Mother Teresa Women's University 1.




Figure 1: University wise Distribution of Respondents

Table 2 Faculty wise distribution of respondents

Faculty	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Arts	104	(27.36)
Science	177	(46.57)
Management	52	(13.68)
Education	47	(12.39)
Total	380	(100)

*Source Computed

* * Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Faculty wise distribution of respondents

Data presented in table 2 represents the Faculty wise respondents of the selected state Universities. They are four faculties namely Arts, Science, Management and Education. It could be seen that out of 380 respondents, 177 (46.57 %) are belonging to faculty of Science. It is understood that 104 (27.36 %) respondents are coming under faculty of Arts, 52 (13.68%) of them belonging to faculty of Management, 47 (12.39%) respondents are from faculty of Education (Fig. 2).




Figure 2 Faculty wise Distribution of Respondents

Table 3 Designation wise distribution of respondents

Designation	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Assistant Professor	265	(69.74)
Associate Professor	50	(13.15)
Professor	65	(17.11)
Total	380	(100)

*Source Computed

* * Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Designation wise distribution of respondents

The data in Table 3 indicate the distribution of respondents according to Designation wise. Out of 380 respondents, Assistant Professor Respondents are found 265 (69.74%) which is followed by Professor Respondents 65(17.11%) and Associate Professor Respondents 50 (13.15%) (Fig.6).




Figure 3 Designation wise Distribution of Respondents

Table 4 Aware of E-Resources available in the University Library by the respondents

Aware of E-Resources available in the University Library by the respondents	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	380	(100)
Total	380	(100)

*Source Computed

** Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Aware of e-resources available in the university library by the respondents

The data in Table 4 found the distribution of respondents according to the awareness of E-Resources available in the University Library. Out of 380 respondents,

it is found that all 380 (100%) respondents are aware of E-Resources available in the University Library

Table 5 Gender VS. Training provided by University Library

Sl. No.	Gender	Training provided by University Library		Total
		Yes	No	
1.	Male	259 (98.50)	4 (1.50)	263(69.20)
2.	Female	112(95.70)	5(4.30)	117 (30.80)
	Total	371 (97.60)	9(2.40)	380 (100)

*Source Computed

* * Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Gender VS. training provided by university library

Table 5 indicates the distribution of respondents according to Gender vs. Training provided by the University Library. Gender is one of the important factors in determining the opinion of the faculty members. Out of 380 respondents it is found that there are 263(69.20%) male respondents and 117(30.80%) female respondents. Out of 263 male respondents, the majority of 259 (98.50%) respondents are got training from the University Library for accessing the E – Resources and Only 4 (1.50%) male respondents are not getting training from the University Library. It is also seen that out of 117 (30.80%) female respondents, the majority of 112 (95.70%) respondents are got training from the University Library and only 5(4.30%) female respondent are not getting training from the University Library.

Table 6 Level of Satisfaction by the respondents on training provided by University Library for using E-Resources

Level of Satisfaction by the respondents on training provided by University Library for using E-Resources	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Extremely Satisfied	72	(18.94)
Very Satisfied	136	(35.78)
Moderately Satisfied	141	(37.10)
Slightly satisfied	22	(5.78)
No Comment/Not Trained	9	(2.36)
Total	380	(100)

*Source Computed

** Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Level of satisfaction by the respondents on training provided by university library for using e-resources

Table 6 analyzed the distribution of the respondents according to the level of satisfaction on training provided by the University Library. Out of 380 respondents it is seen that 141 (37.10%) respondents are moderately satisfied on the training provided by the University Library. It is also found that 136(35.78%) respondents are very satisfied, 72(18.94%) respondents are extremely satisfied, 22(5.78%) respondents are slightly satisfied and 9(2.36%) respondents give the option as no comment/not trained on the training provided by the University Library.

It is very clear from the above discussion that the majority of the respondents are moderately satisfied which percentage rate is 37.10%.

Table 7 Satisfaction of respondents for their information needs by accessing E-Resources and services provided by University Libraries.

LibraryE-Resources/Services	Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Slightly Satisfied	No Comment/ Not Used
CDs/DVDs	90(23.68)	110(28.94)	82(21.57)	72(18.94)	26(6.84)
E – Books	116(30.52)	127(33.42)	95(25)	25(6.57)	17(4.47)

E Journals	140(36.84)	131(34.47)	79(20.78)	18(4.73)	12(3.15)
E- Databases	205(53.90)	108(28.42)	42(11.05)	11(2.89)	14(3.68)
E-Theses and Dissertations	122(32.10)	140(36.84)	58(15.26)	32(8.42)	28(7.36)
E-Question Bank	94(24.73)	102(26.84)	106(27.89)	46(12.10)	32(8.42)
Email alert service	92(24.21)	112(29.47)	88(23.15)	52(13.68)	36(9.47)
OPAC/Web OPAC	210(55.26)	101(26.57)	47(12.36)	10(2.63)	12(3.15)
Automated Circulation Services	192(50.52)	125(32.89)	32(8.42)	18(4.73)	13(3.42)
Other-Resources/E- Services	72(18.94)	126(33.15)	75(19.73)	65(17.10)	42(11.05)

*Source Computed

* * Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Satisfaction of respondents for their information needs by accessing e-resources and services provided by university libraries.

Table 7 observed the distribution of respondents according to the level of Satisfaction for their information needs by accessing various E-Resources and services provided by University Libraries. Out of 380 respondents it is seen that 210 (55.26) respondents are extremely satisfied on OPAC/Web OPAC. 205(53.90) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Databases, 192(50.52) respondents are extremely satisfied on Automated circulation services, 140(36.84) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Journals, 122(32.10) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Theses and Dissertations, 116(30.52) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Books for their information needs by accessing the E-Resources and services provided by University Libraries. It is also seen that 94(24.73), 92(24.21), 72(18.94) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Question Bank, Email alert services, other E-Resources/E-services respectively provided by the University Libraries. It is found that 140(36.84) respondents are very satisfied with E-Theses and Dissertations and 106(27.89) respondents are moderately satisfied with E-Question Bank. It is also observed that 72(18.94) respondents are slightly satisfied with CD/DVDs and 42(11.05) respondents are given no comment/not used option on other E-resources/E-services provided by the University Library.

It is very clear from the above discussion that the majority of respondents are extremely satisfied on OPAC/Web OPAC (55.26%) provided by University Library followed by E-Databases (53.90%).

Table 8 Universities wise vs. Level of Satisfaction of Faculty members on Accessing University Library website

Sl. No.	University Wise	Level of Satisfaction of Faculty members on accessing University Library website					Total
		ES	VS	MS	SS	NC	
1.	MSU	4(4.70)	25(29.40)	32(37.60)	25(29.40)	3(3.50)	85(22.40)
2.	MKU	0 (0)	107(82.30)	19(14.60)	0 (0)	4(3.10)	130(34.20)
3	AU	28 (21.50)	87(66.90)	0(0)	14(10.80)	1(0.80)	130(34.20)
5	MTWU	3(8.60)	6(17.10)	6(17.10)	19(54.30)	1(2.90)	35(9.20)
	Total	35(9.20)	225(59.20)	57(15)	54(14.20)	9(2.40)	380(100)

* ES-Extremely Satisfied, VS-Very Satisfied, MS-Moderately Satisfied, SS- Slightly Satisfied NC – No Comment

*Source Computed

** Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Universities wise VS. level of satisfaction of faculty members on accessing university library website

Table 8 indicates the distribution of respondents according to Universities vs. Level of satisfaction on access of University Library website. Out of 380 respondents it is seen that 85 (22.40%) respondents from MSU are accessed the University Library web site, 130 (34.20%) respondents from MKU are accessed the University Library website, 130 (34.20%) respondents from AU are accessed the University Library website, 35 (9.20%) respondents from MTWU are accessed the University Library website. Out of 85(22.40%) respondents from MSU it is seen that 32(37.60%) respondents are moderately satisfied with the University Library website. 25(29.40), 25(29.40), 4(4.70), 3(3.50) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as very satisfied, slightly satisfied, extremely satisfied and no comment on accessing the University Library website respectively. Out of 130(34.20%) respondents from MKU it is seen that 107(82.30%) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 19(14.60%) and 4(3.10%) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as moderately satisfied and no comment on accessing the University Library website respectively. Out of 130(34.20%) respondents from AU it is seen that 87(66.90%) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 28 (21.50%), 14(10.80%), 1(0.80%) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as extremely satisfied, Slightly satisfied and no comment on accessing the University Library website respectively. Out of 35(9.20%) respondents from MTWU it is seen that 19(54.30%) respondents are slightly satisfied with the University Library website. 6(17.10%), 6(17.10%), 3(8.60%), 1(2.90%) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as very satisfied, moderately satisfied, extremely satisfied and no comment on accessing the University Library website respectively.

It is very clear from the above discussion that the majority of 32(37.60%) respondents from MSU are moderately satisfied with the University Library website, the

majority of 107(82.30%) respondents from MKU are very satisfied with the University Library website, the majority of that 87(66.90%) respondents from AU are very satisfied with the University Library website and the majority of that 19(54.30%) respondents from MTWU are slightly satisfied with their level of satisfaction on accessing the University Library website.

Table 9 Universities Wise vs. Level of Satisfaction Library Website – Chi-Square Test

Calculated value	188.122
Table value at 5 per cent	21.026
Degrees of freedom	12

The chi-square test was applied for further discussion in Table 9.. The computed value is greater than its tabulated value. Hence the Universities vs. Level of satisfaction on accessing University Library website among the respondents are statistically identified as significant. Therefore, it could be inferred that the Universities wise vs. Levels of satisfaction on accessing the University Library website have a significant relation for using of the Electronic Resources.

Table 10. Designation vs. Level of Satisfaction of Faculty members on accessing University Library website

Sl. No.	Designation	Level of Satisfaction of Faculty members on accessing University Library website					Total
		ES	VS	MS	SS	NC	
1.	Assistant Professor	22(8.30)	161(60.80)	43(16.20)	30(11.30)	9(3.40)	265(69.70)
2.	Associate Professor	1(2.0)	33(66.0)	6(12.0)	10(20.0)	0(0)	50(13.20)
3	Professor	12(18.50)	31(47.70)	8(12.30)	14(21.50)	0(0)	65(17.10)
	Total	35 (9.20)	225(59.20)	57(15.0)	54(14.20)	9(2.40)	380(100)

* ES-Extremely Satisfied, VS-Very Satisfied, MS-Moderately Satisfied, SS- Slightly Satisfied NC – No Comment

*Source Computed

** Figures in Parentheses denoted Percentages

Designation VS. Level of satisfaction of faculty members on accessing university library website

Table 10. indicates the distribution of respondents according to Designation vs. Level of satisfaction on access of University Library website. Out of 380 respondents it is seen that 265(69.70) respondents from Assistant Professor Designation are accessed the University Library web site, 50(13.20) respondents from Associate Professor Designation are accessed the University Library website, 65(17.10) respondents from Professor Designation are accessed the University Library website. Out of 265(69.70) respondents from Assistant Professor Designation it is seen that 161(60.80) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 43(16.20), 30(11.30), 22(8.30), 9(3.40) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as moderately satisfied, slightly satisfied, extremely satisfied and no comment on accessing the University Library website respectively. Out of 50(13.20) respondents from Associate Professor Designation it is seen that 33(66.0) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 10(20.0), 6(12.0), 1(2.0) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as slightly satisfied, moderately satisfied and extremely satisfied on accessing the University Library website respectively. Out of 65(17.10) respondents from Professor Designation it is seen that 31(47.70) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 14(21.50), 12(18.50), 8(12.30) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as slightly satisfied, extremely satisfied and moderately satisfied on accessing the University Library website respectively.

It is very clear from the above discussion that the majority of 161(60.80) respondents from Assistant Professor Designation are very satisfied with the University Library website, the majority of 33(66.0) respondents from Associate Professor Designation are very satisfied with the University Library website, the majority of the 31(47.70) respondents from Professor Designation are very satisfied with the University Library website.

Table 11 Designation vs. Level of Satisfaction University Library Website - Chi-Square Test

Calculated value	21.030
Table value at 5 per cent	15.507
Degrees of freedom	8

The chi-square test was applied for further discussion in Table 11. The computed value is greater than its tabulated value. Hence the Designation vs Level of satisfaction on accessing University Library website among the respondents are statistically identified as significant. Therefore, it could be inferred that the Designation vs. Levels of satisfaction on accessing the University Library website have a significant relation for using of the Electronic Resources.

Conclusion

The study analyzed above the respondents given their feedback while access scholarly information in the Selected State Universities in South Tamilnadu. The study concludes that 136(35.78%) respondents are very satisfied, 72(18.94%) respondents are extremely satisfied, 22(5.78%) respondents are slightly satisfied and 9(2.36%) respondents give the option as no comment/not trained on the training provided by the University Library. Out of 380 respondents it is seen that 210 (55.26) respondents are extremely satisfied on OPAC/Web OPAC. 205(53.90) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Databases, 192(50.52) respondents are extremely satisfied on Automated circulation services, 140(36.84) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Journals, 122(32.10) respondents are extremely satisfied on E-Theses and Dissertations. Out of 130(34.20%) respondents from MKU it is seen that 107(82.30%) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 19(14.60%) and 4(3.10%) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as moderately satisfied and no comment on accessing the University Library website respectively. Out of 130(34.20%) respondents from AU it is seen that 87(66.90%) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. Out of 50(13.20) respondents from Associate Professor Designation it is seen that 33(66.0) respondents are very satisfied with the University Library website. 10(20.0), 6(12.0), 1(2.0) respondents are given their level of satisfaction as slightly satisfied, moderately satisfied and extremely satisfied on accessing the University Library website respectively.

References

1. Mohammed Nasser Al-Suqri. (2011). Information-seeking behavior of social science scholars in developing countries: A proposed model. *The International Information & Library Review*, 43, 1-14. DOI: 10.1016/j.iilr.2011.01.001.
2. Jetta Carol Culpepper (2012). Watch Out and Listen: Faculty Assess Electronic Resources. *The Acquisitions Librarian*, 12 (24), 29 - 40. DOI:10.1300/J101v12n24_04.
3. Erin Dorris Cassidy., Michelle Martinez., & Lisa Shen. (2012). Not in Love, or Not in the Know? Graduate Student and Faculty Use (and Non-Use) of E-Books. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 38(6), 326–332.
4. Shiv Kumar. (2012). Impact of internet search engines on OPAC users: A study of Punjabi University, Patiala (India). *Program*, 46 (1), 56-70. DOI: [10.1108/00330331211204566](https://doi.org/10.1108/00330331211204566)

5. Baskaran C. (2011). User perception of library services in academic institutions in the southern districts of Tamil Nadu, India: A case study, *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 2011.
6. Baskaran, C. (2018). Emerging E-Learning Technology (ELT) in Open Distance Learning (ODL): The Contemporary Issues in Higher Education Context. In A. Kaushik (Ed.), *Library and Information Science in the Age of MOOCs* (pp. 191-203). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-5146-1.ch012.
7. Baskaran, C. (2018). MOOCs Applications in Open Distance Learning (ODL): Issues and Challenges. In A. Kaushik (Ed.), *Library and Information Science in the Age of MOOCs* (pp. 163-177). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-5146-1.ch010.
8. Baskaran, C and Ramesh, P (2019). Observation and Impact of the faculty attitude for disseminating Electronic information in the Engineering and Technology institutions, (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2161.<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2161>.
9. Binu PC and Baskaran C. (2019). Information acceleration into access on acquiring skill under consortium based resources in the selected Universities of Kerala, India, (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2246.<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2246>.
10. Baskaran, C and Ramesh P . (2019). Observation and Impact of the faculty attitude for disseminating Electronic information in the Engineering and Technology institutions" (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2161.<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2161>.
11. Prasad M and Baskaran C. (2019). Research Quantify with faculty member's perception and expectations in e-context at the academic sphere" (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2332.<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2332>

