

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

12-14-2019

## Usefulness of Library and Information Services at the Higher Education level: a study of deemed to be university libraries in Andhra Pradesh

Kona Ramakrishna

*Knowledge Resource Centre, GITAM (Deemed to be University), ramakrishnakonasbt@gmail.com*

Rudraksha Gowridevi

*Department of Library and Information Science, Andhra University, gowridevirudraksha18@gmail.com*

Chagari Sasikala

*Knowledge Resource Center, GITAM (Deemed to be University), profsasikala@gmail.com*

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



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

---

Ramakrishna, Kona; Gowridevi, Rudraksha; and Sasikala, Chagari, "Usefulness of Library and Information Services at the Higher Education level: a study of deemed to be university libraries in Andhra Pradesh" (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 3768.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/3768>

# **Usefulness of Library and Information Services at the Higher Education level: a study of deemed to be university libraries in Andhra Pradesh**

**K.Ramakrishna**

Assistant Librarian, Knowledge Resources Centre, GITAM (Deemed to be University), Andhra Pradesh, India, ramakrishnakonasbt@gmail.com

**R.Gowridevi**

Research Scholar, Guest faculty, Department of Library and Information Science, Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh, India, gowridevirudraksha18@gmail.com

**C.Sasikala**

Advisor, In charge Chief Librarian, Knowledge Resources Centre, GITAM (Deemed to be University) and Retired Professor in Department of Library and Information Science, Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh, India, prof.csasikala@gmail.com

## **ABSTRACT**

The Study examined usefulness of library and Information Services in Deemed to be University libraries in Andhra Pradesh. In this study the questionnaires were circulated among 1164 library users (nearly 20% of the Universe) (faculty members, research scholars and postgraduate students) out of whom 1030 responses were received representing 88 percent of the total sample to whom the questionnaire was distributed. It is evident from the analysis that majority of users opinioned book lending service as effective. Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from GITAM is more compared to others. Further the study found that remaining all library information services opinioned as somewhat effective. The study suggested that most of the services and facilities offered by the libraries of deemed to be universities were rated as somewhat effective. In order to make them effective, measures to be taken by the library management. Developing user-oriented services instead of generalized services based on the regular feed back from them will improve the value and usefulness of the service to the intended users.

**Keywords:** Higher Education, Academic Libraries, University Libraries, Library and Information Services, User Study

## **INTRODUCTION**

Academic library plays crucial role in deciding the quality of teaching and learning facilitated by the parent institution. Especially libraries at the college and university level play a very significant role in shaping students' creativity, personality and all sorts of abilities that help him or her to be successful in their future accomplishments. The present study mainly focuses on

deemed university libraries serving higher education institutions. A brief discussion about higher education in India and the role of university libraries in imparting higher education has been presented in the following sections of the chapter.

### **The Present Scenario of Indian Higher Educational Institutions**

The Higher education institutions in Indian fall into following broad categories:

- a. **Central Universities:** The central universities in India are established by the Government of India, by the Act of Parliament.
- b. **State Universities:** These are established by the State Government by State Legislature.
- c. **Deemed to be Universities:** These universities are given deemed to be Universities status by the Central Government on the recommendation of the UGC in terms of section 3 of the UGC Act.
- d. **Private Universities:** These Institute are established by various state governments through their own legislation.
- e. **Open Universities:** Open Universities can be a central or state university imparting education which is through distance mode in any branch or branches of knowledge.
- f. **Institutes of National Importance:** The Institutes are declared as such by the Government of India by an Act of Parliament and are empowered to award degrees. In a few cases, such Institutes are also set up by the Government through an Act of state Legislation.
- g. **Premier Institutes of Management:** These are the Institutes that have been set up by the Central Government and are outside the formal university system. They offer Post Graduate Diploma Programmes which are equivalent to Master Degree Programs in management.

### **Deemed to be Universities**

According to the Ministry of the Higher Education an Institution of Higher education, other than a university, working at a very high standard in specific area of study can be declared 'deemed' by the Central Government on the advice of the UGC as an Institution 'Deemed to-be-University' (MHRD 2014). These institutions enjoy academic status and privileges of a university. Such in institution can be under both private as well government management. There

are two ways to attain the ‘Deemed-to-be-University’ status. The first is the general route, where institutions with 15 years of standing and excellent research in the concerned field can apply for the deemed status. The second route is applying under the de-novo category. The ‘Deemed-to-be-a-University’ status was initially given to leading institutions offering programmes at an advanced level to facilitate in to award degrees. Indian Institute of Science(IISc) at Bangalore and Indian Agricultural Research Institute(IARI) at Delhi were the first two institutions to be declared as ‘Deemed-to-be-Universities’ in 1958, there is a advancement of education and research in the field of basic sciences and agriculture respectively.

Earlier, this status was granted only to government and government aided institutions. The first privately managed and self-financial institution to be declared as Deemed-to-be-University was the Manipal Academy for Higher Education (MAHE) in 1976.

In the year 2000, the UGC simplified and liberalized the guidelines for granting; Deemed-to-be-a –University’ status, so as to encourage the participation of private players in the higher education sector. The provisions of granting this status to de-novo institutions was also introduced for the first time, so that the institutions which may not be fulfilling the conditions laid down the guidelines, to have promise of excellence, could be considered for the status. For instance, the Energy and Resource Institute (TERI) is declared deemed under the de-novo category, while Symbiosis International University is declared deemed under the general category.

## **NEED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY**

The Universities, especially deemed universities are under severe pressure to maintain quality and demand in the highly competitive world of higher education in India. Good infrastructure facilities and academics with high quality and standards area mandatory not only to meet the expectation of accreditation agencies but also to reach out the students’ expectation and market demands. Well maintained and modernized library and information facility is one of the key factors that attributes to the quality and high standards of education and training offered by the university. The four university libraries selected for study are operating in different locations in the state of Andhra Pradesh. Three of the four universities were started as Engineering colleges by private management. Both GITAM and K L College of engineering were started in 1980 where as Vignan Engineering College was started in1997. RSVP was established in 1961 by

Government of India in Tirupathi, Andhra Pradesh. Later all the four universities attained the deemed-to-be Universities status, RSVP in 1987, GITAM in 2007, Vignan in 2008 and KLU in 2009. Though the libraries of all these four universities are well established and serving the parent organizations for many decades, so far no study has been undertaken to assess the usefulness of library services.

### **SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The study covers only four deemed universities from the state of Andhra Pradesh. The user sample is heterogeneous in nature. Since there is no response from Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning to the present survey, it has not been covered in the study. The present study has been carried out taking a sample from the following four deemed university libraries. All the four universities under study are arranged in a chronological order according to their year of establishment.

1. Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidya Peetha (RSVP), Tirupati, established in 1961.
2. Gandhi Institute of Technology and Management (GITAM), Visakhapatnam, established in 1980
3. Koneru Lakshmaiah University (KLU), Guntur, established in 1980
4. Vignan University (VU), Guntur, established in 1997.

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The title of the present study is “Usefulness of Library and Information Services at Higher education level: a study of Deemed to be University libraries in Andhra Pradesh”.

### **SAMPLE SIZE**

The study covered librarians of selected deemed university libraries in Andhra Pradesh. All the 4 librarians (100%) responded to the survey. On the other hand the questionnaires were circulated among 1164 library users (nearly 20% of the Universe) (faculty members, research scholars and postgraduate students) out of whom 1030 responses were received representing 88 percent of the total sample to whom the questionnaire was distributed.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- To study frequency of visiting to university libraries
- To study opinion on convenience of library working hours

- To study purpose of visiting the university library
- To study usefulness of library information services

## **METHODOLOGY**

There are different methods and procedures used to gather data for qualitative research that include survey method, historical method, descriptive method and case study method.

For collecting primary data for the present study, the investigator adopted the survey method. The tool employed for collecting data is questionnaire. The questionnaire is designed in such a way to collect the data from the library users (faculty members, research scholars and postgraduate students) of selected deemed university libraries in Andhra Pradesh. The observation and interview techniques are also used where ever they are necessary for the collection of primary data. The data collected is analysed in the light of the objectives stated.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

**Arshad and Ameen (2010)** made a study to measure service quality of academic libraries of University of Punjab excluding the main library from student's perspectives and to determine their own performance towards meeting users expectations. A survey method was chosen as methods of investigating and modified SERVQUAL questionnaire was used for data collection. The study exposed that users expectations were high as compared to their perceptions and a inconsistency was found between expectations and awareness of all 22 SERVQUAL statements. Users were satisfied with the courteous and caring behavior of the library staff. The researcher recommended the need to take remedial actions to improve library staff competency and physical facilities.

**Hassanzadesh and others (2010)** studied the assessment of service quality of central library of management and planning organization, the research was conducted in two stages. The study found that no important deference among organizational and nonorganizational users opinions about the quality of services. Here was a connection between the rate at which the library conformed to the national values and users expectations of quality.

**Kiran (2010)** studied service quality and user satisfaction in university libraries. The main aim of this study helpful to academic libraries to improve library services, particularly in supporting university teaching staff in teaching and research. The quality of library services are supposed as

just above average, academic will continue to use the library resources and be dependent on university librarians for their information requirements. The study was questionnaire-based survey using SERVQUAL tool. The findings of this study described the results of a study to observe the insight of teaching staff on the quality of the university library services. The study also efforts to evaluate the impact of library service on their work and their supposed point of satisfaction towards academic library services.

**Anil Kumar (2011)** conducted a study on awareness and use of library resources and services in different university libraries in Delhi. The study was a hoe to provide library information and services for their library user. The study found that they have not been sufficient knowledge of new users like students, faculty members and research scholars to make appropriate use of library information resources and services made available in the libraries. Library and information professionals also need continuing professional development programmers as new ways of providing information resources and services were developed

**Negahban and Venkataesha (2011)** conducted a study assessment of user competence and library services among research scholars, the sample size was 68 research scholars which 57 were male scholars and 11 were female scholars, the study using chi-square statistical method. The study revealed that most of the users respond that news papers and magazines were adequate, reference books, textbooks, journals & periodicals, thesis, and dissertations were to be moderately adequate. It was found that maps, atlases, and charts electronic resources were to be inadequate. Finally, the study found that majority of users expressed their opinion the library services and internet facilities were the good and selective dissemination of information (SDI), Current Awareness Service (CAS), indexing and abstracting services were poor.

**Ayyanar and Kanakaraj (2012)** examined the availability of library infrastructure at university libraries in Tamilnadu state. The study found that the majority of libraries maintain good infrastructure. The study would give distinction possible clarification to develop library services and user needs of the university library.

**Madhusudhan and Nagabhusan (2012)** discussed the web-based library service in the Indian university libraries India. The survey was conducted through the questionnaire among the university librarians and the response rate was 100%. The findings of this study most of the university libraries were yet to use the full potential of the web forms and the lagging behind in

the effective use of the library website. The study revealed that a few of the libraries offered innovative web-based library services in various sections. The study found specific ways in which the web helps university libraries to develop the innovative and creative web-based library services. The study also exposed institutional characteristics and resources dedicated to the web-based services.

**Madhusudhan and Nagabhusan (2012)** examined the use of the web-based library services in the selected university libraries. The study found that most of the university libraries were yet to develop the full potential of web forms and cover behind in the effective use of library website. It revealed that a few university libraries were offered innovative electronic library services against which they can benchmark their own electronic library services by the university librarians in India.

**Sajid Mirza and Khalid (2012)** conducted a survey about the effectiveness of the electronic resources and services in Pakistan university libraries. The study sampling was eight selected universities in Pakistan; the examiner distributed 800 questionnaires to the library users. The study found that the selected universities were offering helpful electronic resources and services to the library users.

**ShafiqRehman (2012)** conducted a study on measuring service quality in private university libraries. In this study, data were collected through the LIBQUAL tool questionnaires from 1473 library users of 23 private universities in Pakistan. The study found that important difference in the service quality among private university libraries. The examiner found very attractive findings that small collection generates opportunities and it was easy to meet or satisfy the users of the small library collection. The study also discussed the findings, implications of results and limitations of the study.

**Suresh Kumar (2012)** conducted a survey user satisfaction and service quality of the university library in Kerala. The university libraries user satisfaction and awareness of quality depends on the level to which user expectations were coordinated by information resources and services provided by the university library. In this study, the data was gathered from 842 library users from the university library through a well-designed questionnaire. This study found that the quality of library services provided by the university libraries was moderately good. The study examined the majority of the library users were satisfied with various features of service quality



excluding responsiveness and were moderately satisfied with the physical facilities, resources, and services.

**Fehitola and others (2013)** studied about utilization of library resources and services by postgraduate students in Nigerian private university libraries. In this study, the examiner distributed 100 questionnaires and collected 70% of filled questionnaires. The study main purpose of visiting the library was to consult research materials. The study found that most of the respondents do not use the library regularly. The Study revealed that the library users used more electronic resources and their major challenge was lack of time. The study suggested that improve the library services.

**Ogbuiyi and Okpe (2013)** evaluated the use of library materials, the main objective of this study to evaluate the level of usage of the university library resources and services, user awareness on the adequacy of the available library resources and services and level of user satisfaction, In this study distributed 255 registered library users and collected 200 filled questionnaires. The study found that the majority of users respond inadequately of library collection of materials.

**Olayinka and Fema (2013)** Studied about the assessment of user satisfaction of library users of Ekiti State University library. The study main was evaluating the levels of library users satisfaction with library services provided by the selected university library. The study findings revealed among others, that there was a need to generate more awareness about some library services and as well to strengthen users orientation and education programme.

**Palaniappan (2013)** conducted a comparative study about the library information services in the university libraries in Tamilnadu state. The study exposed that in Alagappa university 31% of library users visited the library daily, 30% of users respond visited weekly, 29% of students respond visited library alternative days, 4% of respondents and 5% of respondents visited library monthly and occasionally. The study highlighted in Bharatidasan University majority of 47% users respond visited library alternative days, 29 of respondents visited daily, 20% of respondents weekly, 2% of respondents visited monthly and only 0.4% of respondents occasionally. The study found from the overall respondent that 41% of users respond visited library alternative days, 30% users visited daily, 23% of respondents visited library weekly and only 2% of library user visited library monthly and occasionally.

**Archana and others (2014)** discussed the electronic resources and services in university libraries. The study was conducted through a questionnaire survey of the library users. The study also decided the satisfaction level of library users regarding electronic services, preferred search engines and problems faced by library users in using information technology in libraries. In this study library, users planned a variety of measures of formal direction and training in electronic resources and services to become more effective library users.

**Dhanavandan (2014)** discussed utilization of electronic resources and services in university libraries by faculty members, here the examiner administered 200 questionnaires and received 175 filled questionnaires from faculty members, the response rate was 87%. The study found that Faculty members visited the library for purpose of gathering material for their class subjects and 55% of faculty members expressed their opinion the library has an excellent collection. The study found that 34% of faculty members were satisfied with the arrangement of reading material in the library.

**Einasto (2014)** studied about electronic service quality criteria in the university library, This study provided to the literature by recognizing the main electronic service assessment criteria from the point of view of users of the leading university library. The study revealed that technological and marketing move toward electronic service quality may be balanced by further one a social advance based on communication, user participation, and feedback

**Sohail and Andleeb (2014)** studied about web-based library resources in Aligarh Muslim University library by medical students. The examiner distributed well-structured questionnaires to 120 medical students and collected the data from 92 students; the response rate was 76%. The study examined that it was probably counterproductive to evaluate users as one group. The different divisions of library users have very different varied use patterns of electronic resources depending on the study area, study class, psychological characters, and other demographic aspects.

**Sharmistha Mitra and others (2014)** studied library services in University of Calcutta and Jabalpur university libraries by Differently abled library users. The study exposed the situation of others central universities, recently some university libraries have taken steps in this regard. The study revealed that UNESCO and IFLA have issued some guidelines to provide equal library services to all including people with disabilities, the government of India also issued guidelines

in this regard. The study was highlighted the special equipment, library infrastructure and library services that the libraries were predictable to provide for the disabled library users.

**Chigozirim and others (2015)** conducted a survey about the user awareness and use of information technology-based library service at the Nigerian Private University. The main aim of this study was to examine the level of information communication technology based service awareness in the university library using as a case study. The study found that there was requirement for tertiary institutions to accept the use of information communication technology in their university library services and also to use various awareness programs for their students at every point of staffing. It's revealed that the awareness program was not only helpful to the university students but also to the library professional staff towards effective consumption and use the technology.

**Divya and Pillai (2015)** Studied about the use of internet tools, the study focus on the use of internet and services by the research scholars at University of Kerala, it was questionnaire-based study collected 59 questionnaires, 41 are female users and 18 male users. The study revealed that majority of the users was under the age group of 26-30. The found that most of the respondents use internet for electronic journal access to for their research purpose. Majority of users access the internet from the department and spent more time on internet access. The study examined major problems faced by users are an overload of information and from the primary purpose of accessing the internet.

**Meher and Ajay Kumar (2015)** Studies about library resources and services of the selected university libraries in Haryana state. The study discussed functioning the library resources and services of the university libraries. The study highlighted collection development, library membership, staff position, working hours, services accessible and electronic resources subscribed by the university libraries.

**Rakesh and Anil Kumar (2015)** studied service quality and user satisfaction of the Punjab university library. The study was used SERVQUAL tool was used to examine to supposed library service quality and the level of user satisfaction. The found that the library surroundings and library services extensively forecast the library user satisfaction. This study will be useful to the libraries to improve their quality of services and increase user satisfaction.

**Dodamani and Brahma (2016)** Studied user awareness of library services at Tata Institute of Social Sciences. The study discussed to understand the awareness of students, staff, and faculty of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences about the library and its services. Tata Institute of Social Sciences has intended and executed its own digital repository, created and implemented 24x7 digital library and has recognized a state the art computer lab for the users with a visual injury. The findings of this study authenticate the above stated maintain and at the same time point out some areas that need development.

**Ekene and others (2016)** studied assessment of library resources and services of medical university libraries. The study found that the medical university libraries under study provided by the services listed by the researcher. It was revealed that the majority of user respond to reference services, medical databases, and current awareness services were most adequate

**Nasra and Thomas (2016)** evaluated the library service quality. This study conducted between 123 users at Aga Khan University library users, the main aim of this study examined the quality of its services based on the satisfaction of library users. with the services and as expressed by and based on users opportunity and awareness. In this study, information was collected thorough the SERVQUAL structured questionnaire and 63% of respondents were appreciated. The study found that there are service quality gaps in a number of services offered by the library.

**Savitha and Geetha (2016)** studied about the use of information sources and services at Karnataka University by students and users satisfaction level. The study found that majority of users respond use the library for online resources and found that some of the users preferred to use books and news papers. Here most of the users suggested have to arrange new books and journals because a lot of books was damaged.

**Ramakrishna and others (2016)** studied the status and usage of library resources and services and library use opinion about library working hours, library physical facilities, library information sources and service of K L University. The collection development, library membership, staff position, working hours, library automation, services offered and availability of online resources are also discussed. A well structured questionnaire was managed to 300 faculty members, Research scholars and post graduation students to collect the primary data from respondents. A total number of 270 filled in questionnaires were received showing overall response rate of counterproductive to evaluate library users. The study found that majority

library users fully satisfied with library facilities, library working hours, information sources and library information services.

**Ramakrishna and others (2016)** studied the status and usage of library resources and services of Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati. The collection development, library membership, staff position, working hours, library automation, services offered and availability of online resources are also discussed. A well-structured questionnaire was administered to 200 faculty members, Research scholars and post-graduation students to collect the primary data from respondents. A total number of 180 filled in questionnaires were received showing overall response rate of counterproductive to evaluate library users. The study examined that majority 47.22% of the respondents belongs to post graduate students, majority 21.11% of users visiting daily, 36.11% of users visiting library research purpose, majority 28.80% of users using books lending service; here users convey their majority opinion about library working hours (36.11%), physical facilities (48.33%), Library services (37.22%) and library resources (37.77%). The study found that the library users fully satisfied with library facilities, library working hours, information sources and library information services.

**Ramakrishna and others (2016)** studied library resources and services of selected Deemed to be University libraries in Andhra Pradesh, India. The study examined collection development, library membership, staff position, working hours, library automation, services offered and availability of online resources.

**Olajide and others (2017)** conducted a study Utilization of Library Resources by undergraduate students Federal University. The main aim of this study find out the level of usage statistics of resources and satisfaction of the university undergraduate students, in this study 400 questionnaires were distributed and collected 384 questionnaires. The study found that the majority of library users respond useful library resources, sufficient reading space, irregular power supply, and users suggested require physical facilities like toilets, large reading rooms and conference halls.

**Ramakrishna and others (2017)** studied collection development, library membership, staff position, working hours, library automation, usage of library and information resources and services of selected deemed university , distributed 1000 questionnaires in selected four deemed universities and collected 914 responses. The study found that all selected deemed university

libraries maintain good collection library information resources, services (electronic & print), and majority of library users expressed their opinion about library working hours, physical facility, library information resources and services excellent and good.

**Ramakrishna and others (2018)** studied user opinion about effectiveness of library and information services of K L Deemed University, Andhra Pradesh. The study found that majority of users expressed their opinion about effectiveness of library and information services as very effective and effective, majority 42% of user's expressed their opinion on interlibrary loan service respond as ineffective and 34 percent of users respond as ineffective. Finally majority of research scholars satisfied on the resources and services of the university library.

**Gowridevi and others (2018)** examined the effectiveness and usage of library information resources and services in GITAM Deemed to be university In this study the investigator distribute a simple questionnaire among 150 research scholars from all departments, 120 research scholars are submit filled questionnaires. The study found that majority of research scholar fully satisfied with library and information resources and services, 75% of respondents very effective on library and information sources, majority 81% of research scholars respond very effective on library and information services

## DATA ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

### 1. University & Designation wise Distribution of Questionnaires

Present study is based on survey method. Questionnaires were used for collection of primary data from the librarians and library users. The sample of library users comprises of faculty, research scholars and P.G. students of four deemed universities identified for the survey.

**Table No.1**

#### University & user category wise Distribution of the sample

Details	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	
Distribution of Questionnaires	76	70	145	76	70	145	76	70	145	76	70	145	1164
Questionnaire Received	76 100	64 91.42	136 93.79	69 90.78	63 90	130 89.65	65 85.52	63 90	139 95.86	54 71.05	48 68.57	123 84.82	1030 88.48

\*FM: Faculty Members \*RS: Research Scholars \*PS: P.G. Students

Above table shows the composition of the sample selected for the survey of libraries and their users viz, faculty, research students and PG students of four deemed universities in Andhra Pradesh. The response rate among the faculty fluctuated between 71 and 100 percent, among the research scholars it ranged between 68 and 91 percent and among PG students it varied between 95 and 84 percent.

## 2. Frequency of visits to University Libraries

Library users may visit their institutional library with different frequencies. For the purpose of the survey, seven point scale has been used to know the frequency with which different users visit the library. The responses of users on their frequency of library visits are tabulated university wise and user category wise in the following table.

**Table No.2**  
**Frequency of visits to University Libraries**

Frequency	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
<b>Daily</b>	6 7.89	10 15.63	21 15.44	9 13.04	7 11.11	17 13.08	7 10.77	9 14.29	19 13.67	0 0	3 6.25	13 10.57	<b>121</b> <b>11.75</b>
<b>Once in a week</b>	15 19.74	13 20.31	32 23.53	13 18.84	15 23.81	36 27.69	24 36.92	11 17.46	38 27.34	13 24.07	15 31.25	34 27.64	<b>259</b> <b>25.15</b>
<b>Twice in a week</b>	15 19.74	6 9.37	25 18.38	16 23.19	9 14.29	22 16.92	9 13.85	14 22.22	26 18.71	6 11.11	3 6.25	15 12.2	<b>166</b> <b>16.12</b>
<b>Thrice in a week</b>	10 13.15	7 10.94	18 13.24	12 17.39	12 19.05	19 14.62	6 9.23	12 19.05	22 15.83	8 14.81	2 4.17	10 8.13	<b>138</b> <b>7.86</b>
<b>Fortnightly</b>	7 9.21	9 14.06	13 9.56	7 10.14	6 9.52	8 6.15	4 6.15	5 7.94	6 4.32	3 5.55	4 8.33	9 7.32	<b>81</b> <b>13.39</b>
<b>Once in a month</b>	15 19.74	11 17.19	16 11.76	8 11.59	9 14.29	19 14.62	8 12.31	7 11.11	16 11.51	9 16.67	11 22.92	26 21.14	<b>155</b> <b>15.05</b>
<b>Occasionally</b>	8 10.53	8 12.5	11 8.09	4 5.79	5 7.93	9 6.92	7 10.77	5 7.94	12 8.63	15 27.78	10 20.83	16 13.01	<b>110</b> <b>10.68</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b> <b>100</b>	<b>64</b> <b>100</b>	<b>136</b> <b>100</b>	<b>69</b> <b>100</b>	<b>63</b> <b>100</b>	<b>130</b> <b>100</b>	<b>65</b> <b>100</b>	<b>63</b> <b>100</b>	<b>139</b> <b>100</b>	<b>54</b> <b>100</b>	<b>48</b> <b>100</b>	<b>123</b> <b>100</b>	<b>1030</b> <b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value= 11.348      * $\chi^2$ table Value=21.026      *df=8      *Nature of Relation= Not Significant													

The inferences drawn from the analysis of responses in general on frequency of visits shows that highest percent (25%) of them are found to be visiting the university library once in a week. Second highest percent (16%) are visiting the library twice in a week. D.f=Daily visits to the library are made only by 12 percent of the users. Frequency wise analysis of visits also shows

some variation among the users of University libraries. Among daily visitors, users from GITAM are more (30%) compared to other universities whereas it is only 13 percent in the case of RSKV. In contrast to this the percentage of occasional visitors (28%) is more from RSKV compared to other deemed universities. In this group of occasional visitors to the library KLU stands in the last place with 7 percent. User category wise responses also show that majority of the library users (ranging between 23 and 29 %) irrespective of their category are visiting the library once in a week.

### 3. Opinion on convenience of library working hours

Extent of use of the institutional library by users is also influenced by the pattern of working hours (opening and closing hours) of the library. Opinions of all types of users on this issue have been analyzed in the following table.

**Table No.3**  
**Opinion on convenience of library working hours**

Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	
Convenient	74 97.37	59 92.19	130 95.59	64 92.75	60 95.24	128 98.46	63 96.92	60 95.24	135 97.12	50 92.59	45 93.75	119 96.75	987 95.83
Not Convenient	2 2.63	4 6.25	6 4.41	5 7.25	3 4.76	2 1.54	2 3.08	3 4.76	4 2.88	4 7.41	3 6.25	4 3.25	43 4.17
Total	76 100	64 100	136 100	69 100	63 100	130 100	65 100	63 100	139 100	54 100	48 100	123 100	1030 100
* $\chi^2$ Value= 3.834      * $\chi^2$ table Value=5.991      *df =2      *Nature of Relation= Not Significant													

Survey findings reveal that majority of the users of four deemed universities (nearly 96 %) responded positively and expressed their view that the existing timings as convenient to avail the library facility in the campus. Irrespective of university and user category majority pronounced that the library timings are convenient

### 4. Purpose of visiting the university library

Libraries at universities are approached and accessed by users for various reasons. Various options are enumerated in the questionnaire indicating the reasons behind visiting the library. The responses of users on this item are analyzed in the following table.





It is clearly evident from the above table that majority of the users (49%) visited the library for borrowing library books. Second highest percent of them visited the library for availing the internet facility(34%).Other significant reasons for visiting the library include-for referring books(31%),for accessing e-resources (30%),for referring print journals(nearly 30%) and for referring project reports and/or Ph.D theses. Few of them are visiting the library for the purpose of consulting audio-visual material (3%).

Institution wise analysis shows that among those visiting the library for borrowing purposes, the percentage of users of GITAM is more (29%) compared to other users. In terms of visits made to the library to refer books and access e-resources users of KL stood in the first place with 29 percent and 38 percent respectively. Users of GITAM who visited the library for referring project reports/Ph.ds (38%) and print journals (30%) are more compared to the users of other three universities. When it comes to visits made to the library for accessing internet, Vignan stood first with 33 percent followed by KL with 29percent.Among those users who are visiting the library for reading newspapers the percentage of users from KL is more(31%) compared to the users of other deemed universities.

## **5. Effectiveness of Library services provided by University Libraries**

Number of services and facilities are provided by deemed university libraries to facilitate the users to get the required document and /or information. Following tables from 5 to 18 examine the opinion of users regarding different services offered by deemed to be university libraries.

**Table No.5****User opinion about effectiveness of Book Lending**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	17	13	32	15	11	21	12	10	28	5	7	15	186
	9.14	6.99	17.2	8.06	5.91	11.29	6.45	5.38	15.05	2.69	3.76	8.06	100
	22.36	20.31	23.52	21.73	17.46	16.15	18.46	15.87	20.14	9.25	14.58	12.19	18.05
Effective	41	27	81	33	36	79	27	23	83	13	12	27	482
	8.50	5.60	16.8	6.85	7.47	16.39	5.60	4.77	17.22	2.69	2.49	5.60	100
	53.94	42.18	59.55	47.82	57.14	60.76	41.53	36.5	59.71	24.07	25	21.95	46.79
Somewhat effective	18	23	19	17	13	25	25	26	26	31	25	79	327
	5.50	7.03	5.81	5.2	3.98	7.65	7.65	7.95	7.95	9.48	7.65	24.16	100
	23.68	35.93	13.97	24.63	20.63	19.23	38.46	41.26	18.7	57.4	52.08	64.22	31.75
Ineffective	0	1	3	3	2	3	1	3	1	5	3	1	26
	0	3.85	11.54	11.54	7.69	11.54	3.85	11.54	3.85	19.23	11.54	3.85	100
	0	1.56	2.2	4.34	3.17	2.3	1.53	4.76	0.71	9.25	6.25	0.81	2.52
Very ineffective	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	9
	0	0	11.11	11.11	11.11	22.22	0	11.11	11.11	0	11.11	11.11	100
	0	0	0.73	1.44	1.58	1.53	0	1.58	0.71	0	2.083	0.81	0.87
Total	76	64	136	69	63	130	65	63	139	54	48	123	1030
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $\chi^2$ Value=14.639      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation=Not Significant													

It is evident above table that majority of (46%) users opined the services as effective. Further 31 percent users also opinioned it as somewhat effective. Only 18 percent of them found it as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from GITAM is more (33% and 30% respectively) compared to others. Among those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, RSVP users are more in percentage than other users (nearly 41%),

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 14.639 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for access books lending service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of book lending.

**Table No. 6****User opinion about effectiveness of Reference service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
<b>Very effective</b>	13	10	19	11	9	13	7	9	22	11	7	14	<b>145</b>
	8.97	6.89	13.1	7.59	6.21	8.97	4.83	6.21	15.17	7.59	4.83	9.66	<b>100</b>
	17.1	15.62	13.97	15.94	14.28	10	10.76	14.28	15.82	20.37	14.58	11.38	<b>14.08</b>
<b>Effective</b>	36	15	62	27	19	23	11	13	41	17	13	32	<b>309</b>
	11.65	4.85	20.06	8.74	6.15	7.44	3.56	4.21	13.27	5.50	4.21	10.36	<b>100</b>
	47.36	23.43	45.58	39.13	30.15	17.69	16.92	20.63	29.49	31.48	27.08	26.01	<b>30</b>
<b>Somewhat effective</b>	26	35	51	29	31	87	41	36	72	24	21	71	<b>524</b>
	4.96	6.68	9.733	5.53	5.92	16.6	7.82	6.87	13.74	4.58	4.8	13.55	<b>100</b>
	34.21	54.68	37.5	42.02	49.2	66.92	63.07	57.14	51.79	44.44	43.75	57.72	<b>50.87</b>
<b>Ineffective</b>	1	3	2	1	3	5	4	4	3	2	5	5	<b>38</b>
	2.63	7.89	5.263	2.63	7.89	13.16	10.53	10.53	7.895	5.26	13.16	13.16	<b>100</b>
	1.31	4.68	1.47	1.44	4.76	3.84	6.15	6.34	2.15	3.7	10.41	4.06	<b>3.69</b>
<b>Very ineffective</b>	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	1	<b>14</b>
	0	7.14	14.29	7.14	7.14	14.29	14.29	7.143	7.14	0	14.29	7.14	<b>100</b>
	0	1.56	1.47	1.44	1.58	1.53	3.07	1.58	0.71	0	4.16	0.81	<b>1.36</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=13.938      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation=Not Significant													

Above table explains user opinion about effectiveness of reference services offered by the libraries surveyed. Highest percent of (50%) users rated it as somewhat effective and 30 percent of users found it as effective. Only 14 percent user considered it as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as effective and very effective the percentage of users from GITAM are more (28% and 36% respectively) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, KLU users are more in percentage than other users (30%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 13.938 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of reference service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of reference service.

**Table No. 7**

**User opinion about effectiveness of Reprographic service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	11	9	19	7	13	15	9	11	21	12	7	15	149
	7.38	6.04	12.75	4.69	8.73	10.07	6.04	7.38	14.09	8.05	4.69	10.07	100
	14.47	14.06	13.97	10.14	20.63	11.53	13.84	17.46	15.1	22.22	14.58	12.19	14.47
Effective	15	17	61	13	16	39	17	15	49	17	17	26	302
	4.967	5.63	20.2	4.15	5.29	12.91	5.63	4.97	16.23	5.63	5.63	8.61	100
	19.73	26.56	44.85	18.84	25.39	30	26.15	23.8	35.25	31.48	35.41	21.13	29.32
Somewhat effective	47	35	48	43	31	67	33	34	62	23	19	74	516
	9.11	6.78	9.30	8.33	6.08	12.98	6.39	6.59	12.02	4.46	3.68	14.34	100
	61.84	54.68	35.29	62.31	49.2	51.53	50.76	53.96	44.6	42.59	39.58	60.16	50.09
Ineffective	3	2	5	5	2	5	4	2	4	1	3	5	41
	7.32	4.88	12.2	12.2	4.88	12.2	9.75	4.88	9.76	2.44	7.33	12.2	100
	3.94	3.12	3.67	7.24	3.17	3.84	6.15	3.17	2.87	1.85	6.25	4.06	3.98
Very ineffective	0	1	3	1	1	4	2	1	3	1	2	3	22
	0	4.55	13.64	4.55	4.55	18.18	9.09	4.55	13.64	4.55	9.09	13.64	100
	0	1.56	2.2	1.44	1.58	3.07	3.07	1.58	2.15	1.85	4.16	2.43	2.14
Total	76	64	136	69	63	130	65	63	139	54	48	123	1030
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $\chi^2$ Value=11.146      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation=Not Significant													

Analysis of user opinions indicate that majority of (50%) users rated it as somewhat effective. About 29 percent of users considered it as effective. Some of the users found it as very effective (14%).

Among those users who considered it as very effective, percentage (27%) of users from VU is more than others. Further percentage of users who considered it as effective GITAM users is more (30%) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, KLU users stood first in the table with 27 percent.

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 11.146 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of reprographic service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of reprographic service.

**Table No. 8****User opinion about effectiveness of Literature search service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	9	11	19	6	9	23	0	0	0	9	5	3	<b>94</b>
	9.57	11.7	20.21	6.38	9.57	24.47	0	0	0	9.57	5.32	3.19	<b>100</b>
	11.84	17.18	13.97	8.69	14.28	17.69	0	0	0	16.66	10.41	2.43	<b>9.13</b>
Effective	13	17	26	11	15	34	0	0	0	11	9	7	<b>143</b>
	9.09	11.89	18.18	7.69	10.49	23.78	0	0	0	7.69	6.29	4.89	<b>100</b>
	17.1	26.56	19.11	15.94	23.8	26.15	0	0	0	20.37	18.75	5.69	<b>13.88</b>
Somewhat effective	51	34	87	45	33	68	0	0	0	29	25	49	<b>421</b>
	12.11	8.08	20.67	10.69	7.84	16.15	0	0	0	6.88	5.95	11.64	<b>100</b>
	67.1	53.12	63.97	65.21	52.38	52.3	0	0	0	53.7	52.08	39.83	<b>40.87</b>
Ineffective	2	1	2	4	5	3	57	51	99	3	5	53	<b>285</b>
	0.70	0.35	0.702	1.40	1.75	1.05	20	17.89	34.74	1.05	1.75	18.6	<b>100</b>
	2.63	1.56	1.47	5.79	7.93	2.3	87.69	80.95	71.22	5.55	10.41	43.08	<b>27.67</b>
Very ineffective	1	1	2	3	1	2	8	12	40	2	4	11	<b>87</b>
	1.15	1.15	2.299	3.45	1.15	2.29	9.195	13.79	45.98	2.29	4.59	12.64	<b>100</b>
	1.31	1.56	1.47	4.34	1.58	1.53	12.3	19.04	28.77	3.7	8.33	8.94	<b>8.45</b>
Total	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=14.334      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation=Not Significant													

Above table shows opinions of users on the level of effectiveness of literature search service.

It is noticed that majority of users(40%) opinioned that this service is somewhat effective.

About 27 percent rated it as ineffective. Only 9 percent of users found it as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and somewhat effective, the percentage of users from GITAM is more (41% and 40% respectively) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as effective, KLU users occupied first place in the table with 41 percent.

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 14.334 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of Literature search service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of literature search service.

**Table No. 9****User opinion about effectiveness of Internet Browsing**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	19	17	31	13	9	23	11	8	27	1	0	0	159
	11.95	10.69	19.5	8.18	5.66	14.47	6.92	5.03	16.98	0.63	0	0	100
	25	26.56	22.79	18.84	14.28	17.69	16.92	12.69	19.42	1.85	0	0	15.44
Effective	23	26	56	19	17	31	21	18	41	4	6	4	266
	8.65	9.77	21.05	7.14	6.39	11.65	7.89	6.77	15.41	1.50	2.26	1.50	100
	30.26	40.62	41.17	27.53	26.98	23.84	32.3	28.57	29.49	7.4	12.5	3.25	25.83
Somewhat effective	34	21	44	36	35	71	31	31	59	42	31	19	454
	7.49	4.63	9.69	7.93	7.71	15.64	6.83	6.83	13	9.25	6.83	4.19	100
	44.73	32.81	32.35	52.17	55.55	54.61	47.69	49.2	42.44	77.77	64.58	15.44	44.08
Ineffective	0	0	3	1	2	3	2	5	9	5	6	96	132
	0	0	2.27	0.76	1.52	2.273	1.52	3.79	6.818	3.79	4.55	72.73	100
	0	0	2.2	1.44	3.17	2.3	3.07	7.93	6.47	9.25	12.5	78.04	12.82
Very ineffective	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4	19
	0	0	10.53	0	0	10.53	0	5.26	15.79	10.53	26.32	21.05	100
	0	0	1.47	0	0	1.53	0	1.58	2.15	3.7	10.41	3.25	1.84
Total	76	64	136	69	63	130	65	63	139	54	48	123	1030
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $\chi^2$ Value=75.6      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

Above table shows effectiveness of internet browsing based on opinions of library users. It is found that majority of (44%) users rated it as somewhat effective. Another 25 percent considered it as effective. Only 15 percent of users found it as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective, the percentages of users from GITAM are more (42% and 39% respectively). In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, percentage of KLU users is more in (nearly 31%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 75.6 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of internet browsing service. This indicates that there is significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of internet browsing.

**Table No. 10****User opinion about effectiveness of Current awareness service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	7	8	5	2	5	13	8	6	13	0	0	0	<b>67</b>
	10.45	11.94	7.46	2.99	7.46	19.4	11.94	8.96	19.4	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
	9.21	12.5	3.67	2.89	7.93	10	12.3	9.52	9.35	0	0	0	<b>6.5</b>
Effective	13	11	19	7	9	29	15	13	26	0	0	0	<b>142</b>
	9.16	7.75	13.38	4.93	6.34	20.42	10.56	9.16	18.31	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
	17.1	17.18	13.97	10.14	14.28	22.3	23.07	20.63	18.7	0	0	0	<b>1.79</b>
Somewhat effective	51	42	99	55	41	68	36	33	78	0	0	0	<b>503</b>
	10.14	8.35	19.68	10.93	8.15	13.52	7.16	6.56	15.51	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
	67.1	65.62	72.79	79.71	65.07	52.3	55.38	52.38	56.11	0	0	0	<b>48.83</b>
Ineffective	4	3	12	4	5	18	4	8	19	45	39	112	<b>273</b>
	1.47	1.09	4.39	1.47	1.83	6.59	1.47	2.93	6.96	16.48	14.29	41.03	<b>100</b>
	5.26	4.68	8.82	5.79	7.93	13.84	6.15	12.69	13.66	83.33	81.25	91.05	<b>26.5</b>
Very ineffective	1	0	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	9	9	11	<b>45</b>
	2.22	0	2.22	2.22	6.67	4.44	4.44	6.67	6.667	20	20	24.44	<b>100</b>
	1.31	0	0.73	1.44	4.76	1.53	3.07	4.76	2.15	16.66	18.75	8.94	<b>4.37</b>
Total	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=13.596      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation= Not Significant													

It is evident from the above table that majority of (48%) user ranked this service as somewhat effective. 26 percent of respondents found it as ineffective. Only 6 percent of users considered it as very effective. It is found that RSVP library is not providing this service to users.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from VU are more (40% and 38% respectively). In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, GITAM users are more than others (nearly 38%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 13.596 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of current awareness service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of current awareness service.



**Table No.11**

**User opinion about effectiveness of printed periodical indexing service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
<b>Very effective</b>	2	1	6	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	26
	7.69	3.85	23.08	19.23	11.54	26.92	0	0	0	0	7.69	0	<b>100</b>
	2.63	1.56	4.41	7.24	4.76	5.38	0	0	0	0	4.16	0	<b>2.52</b>
<b>Effective</b>	9	14	19	11	14	19	2	1	0	1	1	3	<b>94</b>
	9.57	14.89	20.21	11.7	14.89	20.21	2.13	1.06	0	1.06	1.06	3.19	<b>100</b>
	11.84	21.87	13.97	15.94	22.22	14.61	3.07	1.58	0	1.85	2.08	2.43	<b>9.13</b>
<b>Somewhat effective</b>	61	44	89	48	39	76	13	7	15	15	11	19	<b>437</b>
	13.96	10.07	20.37	10.98	8.92	17.39	2.98	1.60	3.43	3.43	2.52	4.35	<b>100</b>
	80.26	68.75	65.44	69.56	61.9	58.46	20	11.11	10.79	27.77	22.91	15.44	<b>42.43</b>
<b>Ineffective</b>	3	3	19	3	6	25	48	52	91	37	32	98	<b>417</b>
	0.72	0.72	4.56	0.72	1.44	5.99	11.51	12.47	21.82	8.87	7.67	23.5	<b>100</b>
	3.94	4.68	13.97	4.34	9.52	19.23	73.84	82.53	65.46	68.51	66.66	79.67	<b>40.49</b>
<b>Very ineffective</b>	1	2	3	2	1	3	2	3	33	1	2	3	<b>56</b>
	1.77	3.57	5.36	3.57	1.79	5.36	3.57	5.36	58.93	1.79	3.57	5.36	<b>100</b>
	1.31	3.12	2.2	2.89	1.58	2.3	3.07	4.76	23.74	1.85	4.16	2.439	<b>5.44</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=29.783                      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507                      *df =8                      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

Analysis in the above table indicates that majority of (42%) users rated this service as somewhat effective, second highest percent (40%) of users found it as ineffective. Only 9 percent of users opinioned it as effective.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective KLU stood in the first as well as second place in the list with 57 percent and 46 percent respectively). In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, GITAM users are more than others (44%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 29.783 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for effectiveness of printed periodicals. This indicates that there is significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of printed periodical indexing service.

**Table No.12****User opinion about effectiveness of Institutional Repository service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
	40	0	0	40	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	100
	2.63	0	0	2.89	0	0	1.53	0	0	0	0	0	0.49
Effective	5	2	0	3	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	17
	29.41	11.76	0	17.65	5.88	0	23.53	5.88	5.88	0	0	0	100
	6.57	3.125	0	4.34	1.58	0	6.15	1.58	0.71	0	0	0	1.65
Somewhat effective	37	7	15	12	4	7	12	9	4	0	0	0	107
	34.58	6.54	14.02	11.21	3.74	6.54	11.21	8.41	3.74	0	0	0	100
	48.68	10.93	11.03	17.39	6.34	5.38	18.46	14.28	2.87	0	0	0	10.39
Ineffective	29	51	117	49	52	119	45	51	129	51	46	115	854
	3.39	5.97	13.7	5.74	6.09	13.93	5.27	5.97	15.11	5.97	5.37	13.47	100
	38.15	79.68	86.02	71.01	82.53	91.53	69.23	80.95	92.8	94.44	95.83	93.49	82.91
Very ineffective	3	4	4	3	6	4	3	2	5	3	2	8	47
	6.38	8.51	8.51	6.38	12.77	8.51	6.38	4.26	10.64	6.38	4.26	17.02	100
	3.94	6.25	2.94	4.34	9.52	3.07	4.61	3.17	3.59	5.55	4.16	6.5	4.56
Total	76	64	136	69	63	130	65	63	139	54	48	123	1030
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $\chi^2$ Value=106.543      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

Opinions of users indicate that majority of (82%) users rated this service offered by the libraries surveyed as ineffective. 10 percent of users considered it as somewhat effective. Only 1 percent of users respond as effective and 0.49 percent as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as somewhat effective and effective the percentage of users from GITAM are more (55% and 41% respectively).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 106.543 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for effectiveness of Institutional Repository service. This indicates that there is significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of institutional repository service opinion about effectiveness of institutional repository service.

**Table No.13****User opinion about effectiveness of Inter-Library Loan service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	13	9	31	8	2	1	7	3	1	11	4	15	<b>105</b>
	12.38	8.57	29.52	7.62	1.91	0.95	6.667	2.86	0.95	10.48	3.81	14.29	<b>100</b>
	17.1	14.06	22.79	11.59	3.17	0.76	10.76	4.76	0.71	20.37	8.33	12.19	<b>10.19</b>
Effective	21	12	43	26	6	9	19	13	15	17	11	26	<b>218</b>
	9.63	5.51	19.72	11.93	2.75	4.18	8.72	5.96	6.88	7.79	5.05	11.93	<b>100</b>
	27.63	18.75	31.61	37.68	9.52	6.92	29.23	20.63	10.79	31.48	22.91	21.13	<b>21.17</b>
Somewhat effective	39	39	57	31	48	81	35	41	79	21	28	72	<b>571</b>
	6.83	6.83	9.98	5.43	8.41	14.19	6.13	7.18	13.84	3.67	4.90	12.61	<b>100</b>
	51.31	60.93	41.91	44.92	76.19	62.3	53.84	65.07	56.83	38.88	58.33	58.53	<b>55.44</b>
Ineffective	2	2	4	3	4	32	3	4	39	3	4	6	<b>106</b>
	1.89	1.89	3.77	2.83	3.77	30.19	2.83	3.22	36.79	2.83	3.77	5.66	<b>100</b>
	2.63	3.12	2.94	4.34	6.34	24.61	4.61	6.34	28.05	5.55	8.33	4.87	<b>10.29</b>
Very ineffective	1	2	1	1	3	7	1	2	5	2	1	4	<b>30</b>
	3.33	6.67	3.33	3.33	10	23.33	3.33	6.67	16.67	6.67	3.33	13.33	<b>100</b>
	1.31	3.12	0.73	1.44	4.76	5.38	1.53	3.17	3.59	3.7	2.08	3.25	<b>2.91</b>
Total	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=61.122      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

Above table shows user opinion about effectiveness of interlibrary loan service offered by deemed university libraries. It is found that majority of (55%) users rated it as somewhat effective. Further 21 percent of users considered it as effective. Only 10 percent of users found it as very effective. Same percent of users (10%) also found this service as ineffective.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from GITAM are more (50% and 34% respectively) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, KLU users are more in percentage than other users (nearly 28%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 61.122 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for effectiveness of Inter-Library Loan service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of inter-library loan service.

**Table No. 14**

**User opinion about effectiveness of Photocopy service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	7	9	11	8	6	13	9	12	19	5	7	9	<b>115</b>
	6.09	7.83	9.57	6.96	5.22	11.3	7.83	10.43	16.52	4.35	6.09	7.83	<b>100</b>
	9.21	14.06	8.08	11.59	9.524	10	13.84	19.04	13.66	9.25	14.58	7.31	<b>11.17</b>
Effective	16	19	27	12	16	75	14	21	27	11	13	18	<b>269</b>
	5.95	7.06	10.04	4.46	5.95	27.88	5.20	7.81	10.04	4.09	4.83	6.69	<b>100</b>
	21.05	29.68	19.85	17.39	25.39	57.69	21.53	33.33	19.42	20.37	27.08	14.63	<b>26.12</b>
Somewhat effective	52	33	91	47	36	37	41	28	82	35	25	89	<b>596</b>
	8.73	5.54	15.27	7.89	6.04	6.21	6.88	4.69	13.76	5.87	4.19	14.93	<b>100</b>
	68.42	51.56	66.91	68.11	57.14	28.46	63.07	44.44	58.99	64.81	52.08	72.35	<b>57.86</b>
Ineffective	1	2	4	1	3	4	1	1	6	2	3	6	<b>34</b>
	2.94	5.88	11.76	2.94	8.82	11.76	2.94	2.94	17.65	5.88	8.82	17.65	<b>100</b>
	1.31	3.13	2.94	1.44	4.76	3.07	1.53	1.58	4.31	3.7	6.25	4.87	<b>3.3</b>
Very ineffective	0	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	5	1	0	1	<b>16</b>
	0	6.25	18.75	6.25	12.5	6.25	0	6.25	31.25	6.25	0	6.25	<b>100</b>
	0	1.56	2.2	1.44	3.17	0.76	0	1.58	3.59	1.85	0	0.81	<b>1.55</b>
Total	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=16.741      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df=8      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

It is clear for the above table that majority of (57%) users rated this facility as somewhat effective and only 26 percent of users found it as effective. However 11 percent of respondents also as very effective.

Among those users who considered it as very effective, percentage (34%) of users from VU is more than others. Further among those who rated it as the effective percentage of users is more from KLU (38%) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, GITAM users are more than other users ( 29%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 16.741 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for effectiveness of Photocopy service. This indicates that there is significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of photocopy service.

**Table No. 15**

**User opinion about effectiveness of printing facility**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
<b>Very effective</b>	5 5.05 6.57	13 13.13 20.31	15 15.15 11.02	7 7.07 10.14	6 6.06 9.52	12 12.12 9.23	9 9.09 13.84	5 5.05 7.93	12 12.12 8.63	5 5.05 9.25	3 3.03 6.25	7 7.07 5.69	<b>99</b> <b>100</b> <b>9.61</b>
<b>Effective</b>	18 7.86 23.68	21 9.17 32.81	31 13.54 22.79	15 6.55 21.73	18 7.86 28.57	23 10.04 17.69	16 6.99 24.61	18 7.86 28.57	27 11.79 19.42	12 5.24 22.22	9 3.93 18.75	21 9.17 17.07	<b>229</b> <b>100</b> <b>22.23</b>
<b>Somewhat effective</b>	51 8.06 67.1	27 4.24 42.18	82 12.87 60.29	43 6.75 62.31	36 5.65 57.14	84 13.19 64.61	37 5.81 56.92	39 6.12 61.9	89 13.97 64.02	35 5.49 64.81	33 5.18 68.75	81 12.72 65.85	<b>637</b> <b>100</b> <b>61.84</b>
<b>Ineffective</b>	2 4.08 2.63	2 4.08 3.12	5 10.2 3.67	3 6.12 4.34	2 4.08 3.17	9 18.37 6.92	2 4.08 3.07	1 2.04 1.58	7 14.29 5.03	2 4.08 3.7	2 4.08 4.16	12 24.49 9.75	<b>49</b> <b>100</b> <b>4.76</b>
<b>Very ineffective</b>	0 0 0	1 6.25 1.56	3 18.75 2.2	1 6.25 1.44	1 6.25 1.58	2 12.5 1.53	1 6.25 1.53	0 0 0	4 25 2.87	0 0 0	1 6.25 2.08	2 12.5 1.62	<b>16</b> <b>100</b> <b>1.55</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b> <b>100</b>	<b>64</b> <b>100</b>	<b>136</b> <b>100</b>	<b>69</b> <b>100</b>	<b>63</b> <b>100</b>	<b>130</b> <b>100</b>	<b>65</b> <b>100</b>	<b>63</b> <b>100</b>	<b>139</b> <b>100</b>	<b>54</b> <b>100</b>	<b>48</b> <b>100</b>	<b>123</b> <b>100</b>	<b>1030</b> <b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=15.171      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      Nature of Relation=Not Significant													

Above table shows analysis the opinion of users about printing facility available in deemed university libraries. It is noticed that majority of users (61%) found it as somewhat effective. Whereas 22 percent of users rated it as effective. Only 9 percent of users considered as very effective.

Among those who considered this facility as very effective and effective, the percentage of users from GITAM is more (33% and 30% respectively) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, VU users are more in percentage than other users (nearly 25%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 15.171 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for effectiveness of printing service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of printing facility.

**Table No.16****User opinion about effectiveness of scanning services**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	2	5	3	7	4	9	3	5	7	0	0	0	45
	4.44	11.11	6.67	15.56	8.89	20	6.67	11.11	15.56	0	0	0	100
	2.63	7.81	2.2	10.14	6.34	6.92	4.61	7.93	5.03	0	0	0	4.37
Effective	7	9	19	14	11	15	11	13	18	0	0	0	117
	5.98	7.69	16.24	11.97	9.40	12.82	9.40	11.11	15.38	0	0	0	100
	9.21	14.06	13.97	20.28	17.46	11.53	16.92	20.63	12.94	0	0	0	11.36
Somewhat effective	55	47	87	43	44	89	46	39	91	0	0	0	541
	10.17	8.69	16.08	7.95	8.13	16.45	8.50	7.21	16.82	0	0	0	100
	72.36	73.43	63.97	62.31	69.84	68.46	70.76	61.9	65.46	0	0	0	52.52
Ineffective	10	2	24	4	3	15	3	5	18	52	44	109	289
	3.46	0.69	8.30	1.38	1.04	5.19	1.04	1.73	6.23	17.99	15.22	37.72	100
	13.15	3.13	17.64	5.79	4.76	11.53	4.61	7.93	12.94	96.29	91.66	88.61	28.06
Very ineffective	2	1	3	1	1	2	2	1	5	2	4	14	38
	5.263	2.63	7.89	2.63	2.63	5.263	5.26	2.63	13.16	5.263	10.53	36.84	100
	2.63	1.56	2.2	1.44	1.58	1.53	3.07	1.58	3.59	3.7	8.33	11.38	3.69
Total	76	64	136	69	63	130	65	63	139	54	48	123	1030
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $\chi^2$ Value=12.41      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation=Not Significant													

The analysis of responses in the above table shows that majority of users (52%) rated scanning services as, 28 percent of user found it as ineffective. Further 11 percent of users considered it as effective. Only 4 percent of users rated it as very effective.

Among those users who rated this service as very effective percentage of users (23%) from KLU is more than others. Further percentage of users who rated it as effective from VU is more (nearly 35%) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, GITAM users are more than others (34%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 12.41 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is less than the Chi-Square tabulated value for effective of scanning service. This indicates that there is not significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of scanning services.

**Table No. 17****User opinion about effectiveness of new arrivals alert services**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	9	7	13	5	3	9	6	3	7	2	0	5	<b>69</b>
	13.04	10.14	18.84	7.25	4.35	13.04	8.69	4.35	10.14	2.89	0	7.25	<b>100</b>
	11.84	10.93	9.55	7.24	4.76	6.92	9.23	4.76	5.03	3.7	0	4.06	<b>6.7</b>
Effective	18	19	27	14	9	14	11	15	17	9	11	9	<b>173</b>
	10.4	10.98	15.61	8.09	5.20	8.09	6.36	8.67	9.83	5.20	6.36	5.202	<b>100</b>
	23.68	29.68	19.85	20.28	14.28	10.76	16.92	23.8	12.23	16.66	22.91	7.31	<b>16.8</b>
Somewhat effective	44	35	87	39	45	87	41	33	88	35	33	87	<b>654</b>
	6.73	5.35	13.3	5.96	6.88	13.3	6.27	5.05	13.46	5.35	5.05	13.3	<b>100</b>
	57.89	54.68	63.97	56.52	71.42	66.92	63.07	52.38	63.3	64.81	68.75	70.73	<b>63.5</b>
Ineffective	3	3	5	9	5	15	4	9	21	7	2	19	<b>102</b>
	2.94	2.94	4.90	8.82	4.90	14.71	3.92	8.82	20.59	6.86	1.96	18.63	<b>100</b>
	3.94	4.68	3.67	13.04	7.93	11.53	6.15	14.28	15.1	12.96	4.16	15.44	<b>9.9</b>
Very ineffective	2	0	4	2	1	5	3	3	6	1	2	3	<b>32</b>
	6.25	0	12.5	6.25	3.12	15.63	9.36	9.38	18.75	3.12	6.25	9.38	<b>100</b>
	2.63	0	2.94	2.89	1.58	3.84	4.61	4.76	4.31	1.85	4.16	2.43	<b>3.11</b>
Total	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=17.2      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

Opinions of users indicate that majority of them (63%) consider providing of new arrival services in deemed university libraries as somewhat effective. Further 16 percent of users found it as effective. Only 6 percent of users rated it as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from GITAM are more (42% and 36% respectively) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, KLU users are more in percentage than other users (nearly 26%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square values are 17.2 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of new arrival service. This indicates that there is significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of new arrivals alert services.

**Table No. 18****User opinion about effectiveness of News paper clipping service**

User Opinion	GITAM			KLU			VU			RSVP			Total
	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	FM (%)	RS (%)	PS (%)	(%)
Very effective	2	5	9	6	4	9	3	2	11	4	3	6	<b>64</b>
	3.13	7.81	14.06	9.38	6.25	14.06	4.69	3.13	17.19	6.25	4.69	9.38	<b>100</b>
	2.63	7.81	6.61	8.69	6.34	6.92	4.61	3.17	7.91	7.4	6.25	4.87	<b>6.21</b>
Effective	5	9	16	11	13	19	9	12	16	7	7	13	<b>137</b>
	3.65	6.57	11.68	8.03	9.49	13.87	6.57	8.76	11.68	5.11	5.11	9.49	<b>100</b>
	6.57	14.06	11.76	15.94	20.63	14.61	13.84	19.04	11.51	12.96	14.58	10.56	<b>13.09</b>
Somewhat effective	63	45	87	48	39	83	44	43	79	35	36	87	<b>689</b>
	9.14	6.53	12.63	6.97	5.66	12.05	6.39	6.24	11.47	5.08	5.23	12.63	<b>100</b>
	82.89	70.31	63.97	69.56	61.9	63.84	67.69	68.25	56.83	64.81	75	70.73	<b>66.89</b>
Ineffective	5	3	22	3	4	17	5	4	25	7	1	15	<b>111</b>
	4.51	2.70	19.82	2.73	3.60	15.32	4.51	3.60	22.52	6.31	0.90	13.51	<b>100</b>
	6.57	4.68	16.17	4.34	6.34	13.07	7.69	6.34	17.98	12.96	2.08	12.19	<b>85.38</b>
Very ineffective	1	2	2	1	3	2	4	2	8	1	1	2	<b>29</b>
	3.45	6.89	6.89	3.45	10.34	6.89	13.79	6.89	27.59	3.45	3.45	6.89	<b>100</b>
	1.31	3.13	1.47	1.44	4.76	1.53	6.15	3.17	5.75	1.85	2.08	1.62	<b>2.82</b>
Total	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1030</b>
	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
* $\chi^2$ Value=24.523      * $\chi^2$ table value =15.507      *df =8      *Nature of Relation= Significant													

Above table shows the finding of users opinion about news paper clipping service. It is found that majority of users (66%) found this service as somewhat effective. Further 14 percent of users rated it as effective. Only 6 percent of users considered it as very effective.

Among those who considered the facility as effective and very effective the percentage of users from KLU are more (31% and 29% respectively) compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, GITAM users are more in percentage than other users (nearly 28%).

Further it is found that calculated Chi-square value is 24.523 while Chi-Square tabulated value with 8 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 15.507. It is observed that the calculated Chi-Square value is more than the Chi-Square tabulated value for use of news papers clipping service. This indicates that there is significant variation among faculty from four university libraries regarding user opinion about effectiveness of News paper clipping service.



## **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **1. Sample and characteristics of Library Users**

. The response rate among the faculty fluctuated between 71 and 100 percent, among the research scholars it ranged between 68 and 91 percent and among PG students it varied between 84 and 95 percent. Gender wise distribution of respondents shows that the sample selected for survey is dominated by male users. Male users ranged between 61 to 81 percent whereas the representation of female users ranged between 18 to 41 percent of the sample. Female faculty are more in the sample of VU whereas male representations are high among the research scholars of RSVP.

### **2. Frequency of visits to University Libraries**

Library users may visit their institutional library with different frequencies. For the purpose of the survey, seven point scales have been used to know the frequency with which different users visit the library. The inferences drawn from the analysis of responses in general on frequency of visits shows that highest percent of them are found to be visiting the university library once in a week followed by those who are visiting the library twice in a week. Frequency wise analysis of visits also shows some variation among the users of University libraries. Among daily visitors, users from GITAM are more compared to other universities. In contrast to this the percentage of occasional visitors is more from RSKV compared to other deemed universities. In this group of occasional visitors KLU stands in the last place with 7 percent. User category wise responses also show that majority of the library users irrespective of their category are visiting the library once in a week.

### **3. Opinion on convenience of library working hours**

Extent of use of the institutional library by users is also influenced by the pattern of working hours (opening and closing hours) of the library. Analysis of opinions of all types of users on this issue reveal that majority of the users of four deemed universities responded positively and expressed their view that the existing timings as convenient to avail the library facility in the campus. Irrespective of university and user category majority pronounced the existing library timings as convenient.

#### **4. Purpose of visiting the university library**

Libraries at universities are approached and accessed by users for various reasons. Various options are enumerated in the questionnaire indicating the reasons behind visiting the library. It is clearly evident from the responses of users that majority of them visited the library for borrowing library books. Second highest percent of them visited the library for availing the internet facility. Other significant reasons for visiting the library include-for referring books, for accessing e-resources ,for referring print journals and for referring project reports and/or Ph.D theses. Few of them are found to be visiting the library for the purpose of consulting audio-visual material.

Institution wise analysis shows that among those visiting the library for borrowing purposes, the percentage of users of GITAM is more compared to other users. In terms of visits made to the library to refer books and access e-resources users of KL stood in the first place. Users of GITAM who visited the library for referring project reports/Ph.ds and print journals are more compared to the users of other three universities. When it comes to visits made to the library for accessing internet, users of Vignan stood first followed by library users of KL .Among those users who are visiting the library for reading newspapers the percentage of users from KL is more compared to the library users of other deemed universities

#### **5. Effectiveness of Library services in University Libraries**

The library services of the libraries have brought their resources to the doorsteps of users. Users can access their library resources without difficulty. Significantly, the library system has enhanced the awareness and usage of even otherwise unused library resources.

- a. It is evident from the analysis that majority of users opined book lending service as effective. Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from GITAM is more compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, RSVP users are more in percentage than other users.
- b. Regarding the effectiveness of reference services, majority of users opinioned it as somewhat effective. Among those who considered the facility as effective and very effective the percentage of users from GITAM are more compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, KLU users are more in percentage than other users.

- c. Majority of library users considered Reprographic service as somewhat effective. Further among those who considered it as effective, percentage of users from GITAM is more compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as somewhat effective, KLU users are more in percentage than others.
- d. Majority of users considered Literature Search Service as somewhat effective. Among those who considered the facility as very effective and some effective the percentage of users from GITAM are more compared to others. In terms of those who considered this facility as effective, KLU users are more in percentage than other users
- e. Majority of users found internet browsing facility provided in the library as somewhat effective. Only one fourth of them rated it as effective.
- f. Majority of users considered Current Awareness Service offered by the library as somewhat effective. It is also noticed that more than one quarter of them treated it as ineffective. Only RSVP library is not providing this service.
- g. Regarding printed periodical indexing service, majority of users found this service as somewhat effective. Among those who considered the facility as very effective and effective the percentage of users from KLU are more compared to others.
- h. About Institutional Repository Service, majority of users found it as ineffective.
- i. Majority of users surveyed found Inter-Library Loan service offered by their library as somewhat effective.
- j. Majority of them considered Photocopying Service provided in the library as somewhat effective
- k. About Printing facility, majority of users considered it as somewhat effective
- l. It is observed that majority of users treated scanning services as somewhat effective. Among those who considered this service as very effective, percentage of users from KLU are more.
- m. User opinion about effectiveness of New arrivals service indicate that majority of them found new arrival services offered by libraries as somewhat effective.
- n. About Newspaper Clipping Service shows that majority of users found it as somewhat effective. However among those who considered this facility as effective and very effective the percentage of users from KLU are more compared to others.

## REFERENCES

1. Anil Kumar (2011). Awareness and use of library information resources and services different university libraries in Delhi. *Journal of Library and Information Technology*, 7, 19-32.
2. Archana Singh,, Krishna, K.M.,& Jaiswal, Shika (2014). Use of ICT Based Resources and Services and its Impact on Users: a case study of the University of Allahabad. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 51(2), 93-98.
3. Arshad,Alia.,& Ameen Kanwal (2010). Service quality of the University of Punjab's libraries: An exploration of users perception. *Performance measurement and metrics*, 11(3), 313-325.
4. Ayyanar, K.,& Kanakaraj, M. A. (2012).Study on library Infrastructure and information services in the Constituent colleges of Vinayakamission University in Tamilnadu, India. *Library Progress (International)*, 32(2), 213-232.
5. Chigozirim,Ajaegbu., Maria, Ehiaghae.,& Adesgun Oreoluwa, A. (2015). Awareness and Utilization of ICT Based library services: a case study of a Nigerian Private University. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(9), 40-46.
6. Dhanavandan, S. (2014). Knowledge and utilization of e-resources and services in Annamalai University library. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 4(1), 95-100.
7. Divya, L.R., & Pillai Sudhier, K.G. (2015). Use of Internet tools and services by research scholars of the University of Kerala. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 52(6), 471-478.
8. Dodamani Anand, M.,& Brhma, Tularam (2016). User's Perception of Library Services in Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 36(6), 411-416.
9. Einasto, Olga (2014). E-service Quality criteria university library: a focus group study. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 147, 561-566.
10. Ekene,Umenwa.,Agbo Amaoge,Dorathy., & Onyekweodiri Nnamadi, Emmanuel (2016). Assessment of available resources and library services provided in two medical libraries in South East Nigeria. *International Journal of Library Science*, 5(1), 1-6.
11. Fehitola Nike,Onifade.,Sysan Udoaku, Ohbuiyi.,& Sturday, Omeluzor, U (2013). Library resources and services utilization by postgraduate students at a Nigerian private university. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 5(9), 289-294.
12. Gowridevi, R.,Ramakrishna, K., & Sasikala, C (2018). Use of Library and Information Resources and Services by Research Scholars of GITAM Deemed to be University- a study. *International Journal of Library and Information Studies*, 8(1), 453-459.
13. Hassanzadesh, M., Rezaei Sharifabadi, S.,& Derakshan, M. (2010). Assessment of Service Quality at the Central Library of Management and Planning Organization (MPO), Iran. *International Journal of Information Science and Management*, 8(1), 107-118.
14. Kiran, Kaur (2010). Service Quality and customer satisfaction in academic libraries Perspectives from a Malasian University. *Library Review*, 59(4), 261-273.
15. Madhusudhan, M. (2012). Web-based library services in university libraries in India: an analysis of librarians perspective. *Electronic Library*, 30(5), 569-588.

16. Madhusudhan, M., & Nagabhusan, V. (2012). Use of web-based library services in selected university libraries in India: a study. *International journal of library and Information Studies*, 2(1), 1-20.
17. Mehar, Singh., & Ajay Kumar, Arora (2015). Library Resources and Services in the selected University Libraries of Haryana, India. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 35(1), 47-53.
18. Muhammad, Sajid Mirza., & Khalid, Mahamood (2012). Electronic resources and services in Pakistani university libraries: a survey of users satisfaction. *The International Information & Library Review*, 44, 123-131.
19. Nasra, Gthoni., & Thomas, Vander Walt (2016). Evaluating library service quality at the Aga Khan University library: application of a total quality management approach. *Journal of Librarianship and Information science*, 1-14.
20. Negahban, Mohammad Bagher., Selvaraja, A., & Venkataesha, Y. (2011). Assessment of user Adequacy and services of library collections among research scholars of the University of Mysore. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 48(1), 51-56.
21. Ogbuiyi, Sussan Udoaku., & Okpe, Isaac John (2013). Evaluation of Library Material Usage and Services in Private Universities in Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(8), 33-41.
22. Olajide, Olabode., & Adio, Gboyega (2017). Effective Utilization of University Library Resources by Undergraduate Students: a case study of Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1503.
23. Olayinka, Folorunso., & Femi, Joseph Folorunso (2013). An Assessment of users satisfaction with library services at Ekiti state university library, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, *Library Herald*, 51(3), 199-205.
24. Palaniappan, M. (2013). Library services in the university libraries in Tamilnadu: a comparative study. *International Journal of social science & Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(9), 47-67.
25. Rakesh, Mohindra., & Anil Kumar (2015). User Satisfaction regarding Quality of library services of A.C. Joshi library, Panjab University, Chandigarh. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 35(1), 54-60.
26. Ramakrishna, K., Doraswamy Naick, B.R., & Sasikala, C. (2018). Effectiveness of Library and Information Services of K.L Deemed to be university, Andhra Pradesh, India- A Study: *Journal of Advancements in Library Science*, 5(1), 89-97.
27. Ramakrishna, K., Sasikala, C., & Gowridevi, R. (2016). Status and Usage of Library Information Resources and Information Services of Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 6(2), 74-84.
28. Ramakrishna, K., Sasikala, C., & Gowridevi, R. (2016). Availability and Usage of Library and Information Resources and Services at K L University, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh, India. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Paper 1423.
29. Ramakrishna, K., Sasikala, C., & Gowridevi, R. (2016). Library Resources and Services of Selected Deemed University Libraries in Andhra Pradesh, India. *PEARL: A Journal of Library and Information Science*, 10(3), 207-208.
30. Ramakrishna, K., Sasikala, C., & Gowridevi, R. (2017). Use of Library Resources and Services in selected Deemed University Libraries in Andhra: a study. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 1506
31. Savitha, K.S., & Geetha, M. (2016). Utilization of Information Sources and Services by Science Students: A Case Study at Karnataka University, Dharwad. *Research Journal of Library Sciences*, 4(2), 9-13.

32. Shafiq Rehman, Ur. (2012). Measuring service quality in public and private sector university libraries of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Library & Information Science*, 13, 1-11.
33. Sharmistha,Mitra.,Archan, Shukla.,& Sen. B.K. (2014). University library services for the Differently abled people: a pilot study. *Library Herald*, 52(3), 251-268.
34. Sohail, Md., & Shakil, Ahmad (2017). Use of Electronic Resources and Services by Faculty Members and Students of Fiji National University. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*. 39(3), 165-171.
35. Suresh Kumar, P.K. (2012). User Satisfaction and Service Quality of the University Libraries in Kerala. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 2(1), 24-30.