

Library Resource Searching Skills by the University Students : A Case Study

S.K. Abdul Gaffar

Biju Patnaik Central Library, National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, Odisha, India.

Email id: gaffaramu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The rapid adoption of the Internet and computing technologies by all sectors of modern society has made a vital part of our daily work and life. Access to these resources is taken for granted by public agencies providing Services to the community, by those who conduct business and commerce, and by those who use them to stay current on public affairs and in touch with their families and friends on a daily basis. Yet not all individuals have consistent access to these resources they may be unable to afford them, they may need basic training in how to use them, or they may be displaced from their normal access points. Fortunately, public libraries have taken on the role as the provider of free public access to the Internet and computers for those who are not able to gain access elsewhere.

Many studies have been conducted by various researchers to identify the user's attitudes, confidence level of using library as well as awareness level of library resources. It can improve an individual's ability to think critically and analytically, improve level of confidence while using library and enhance the library skills status within its community (Powell, R.R.1997). The study display, what library resource searching skills have among the Pondicherry university students. This study will be effective to analyses the factors which developed the library resource searching skills among students in present situation.

Keywords: *Searching skills, Library Resources, E-resources, OPAC, Digital Library, Pondicherry university students.*

INTRODUCTION

Search syntax is defined rules for the user to how most frequently search the database or library resources. Being the IT development in library while information searching is easier in present context. Sophisticated syntax makes for a better search because there will be no chance to miss the information while retrieving the resources. Students having the different kinds of searching skills like, manual Catalogue, OPAC, Boolean search i.e. "AND, OR, NOT", federated search and web searching engine. Above searching tools are help them to easily locate their required information. Ananda Rangapillai

central library of Pondicherry University which is a fully automated library. So, here the study discover the information searching skills of Pondicherry University's students.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Objectives of the study include the following:

- i. To assess the purpose of using library among the students.
- ii. Attitude of spending time to using different resources.
- iii. To assess the attitude of Pondicherry University Students towards using library.

RESEARCH SCOPE/ IMPLICATIONS

The scope of this paper limits to: i) library resource searching skills: Different searching tools and various library resources are subscribed by the library; ii) Respondents: Only Pondicherry University students are taken into consideration.

ORIGINALITY/ VALUE

The paper found real library resource searching skills by Pondicherry university students. Today ICTc is empowering the library and its resource management. Therefore users also need to know different searching methods to retrieving their required information through the OPAC and library portal. In OPAC there are different searching options are there like: author, title, and call no. and publisher to searching and retrieving information. Advance method like Boolean operator also use to getting information more progressive. The study found that, what library searching skills having of Pondicherry university students prospectively.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Survey method is very much suitable for my topic, so adopted the method and used structured questionnaire to collect primary data from the students of various courses and disciplines. Total 200 questionnaires have been used to complete the study. The collected data were analyzed by using SPSS. The data were presented by tables

METHODOLOGY

Survey data: A survey will be the most appropriate method for this study. This survey, however, is different from previous ones, because the survey questionnaire is mounted on the Web. Research Subjects will be requested to go to the Web to fill it out. Therefore, for the present study, primary

data are collected through survey method by preparing Close-ended and Open-ended Structured Questionnaire.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The gathered data were analyzed and interpreted with the help of tables. Using several statistical tools namely Cross tabulation, descriptive statistics, reliability test followed by one-way ANNOVA are used in the study to meet the objectives and hypotheses of the study. Cross tabulation, descriptive statistics, and reliability test were used to analyze the primary data which were collected from the sample population. Both the categories of data were collected viz. qualitative and quantitative. The quantitative data were analyzed and interpreted by using Cross tabulation, descriptive statistics and reliability test whereas qualitative data were interpreted by manual methods. The collected data were presented with the help of table and figures for easy and lucid understanding.

1. Age group of the survey population

Table1: Age Groups of the Survey Population

Discipline			Age groups			Total
			18-20	21-25	above 25	
Science	Gender	Male	0	36	4	40
		Female	0	29	6	35
		Total	0	65	10	75
Social Science	Gender	Male	1	22	2	25
		Female	0	10	2	12
		Total	1	32	4	37
Management	Gender	Male	0	7	0	7
		Female	0	7	0	7
		Total	0	14	0	14
Humanities	Gender	Male	0	15	7	22
		Female	0	1	0	1
		Total	0	16	7	23

The respondents participated in the survey ranges various ages from 18 years to above 25 years old. The respondents are categorized in 3 different age groups as shown in the Table 1. 84.41% of the respondents belong to 21-25 age groups, 14.79 % of the respondents are above 25 years and 0.70% of

the respondents are between 18-21 age groups. The result shows that majority of the respondents chosen for the study falls between the age group of 21-25. In the case of genders, 94 respondents (66.19%) out of 142 are male including 8 Ph.D. Scholars; and 48 respondents (33.80%) are female including 4 Ph.D. Scholars

2. Regular use of library

Table 2: Regular use of library

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Regular use of library	Yes	4	0	0	1	5
		No	3	0	0	4	7
	Total	7	0	0	5	12	
PG	Regular use of library	Yes	44	17	2	10	73
		No	24	20	5	8	57
	Total	68	37	7	18	130	

Table 2 shows that 78 (54.92%) of the respondents in both PhD. and PG students from various discipline and courses, they have the habit of attending library or they use library regularly. Whereas 64(45.07%) of the respondents do not use library regularly. Overall results show that most of the students use library regularly. While, only 64(45.07%) of the respondents do not use library regularly and stated that they have access to WI-FI connection throughout the campus including their hostel rooms. Therefore, access to library resources is convenient were through the library web portal of Ananda Rangapillai Library.

3. Time spent by users in a week in using library

Table 3: Quantum of time spent in library

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Time	1 to 3 hrs.	5	0	0	2	7
		4 to 6 hrs.	1	0	0	2	3
		7 to 9 hrs.	1	0	0	1	2
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	Time	1 to 3 hrs.	44	22	6	12	84
		4 to 6 hrs.	14	10	1	3	28
		7 to 9 hrs.	8	2	0	1	11
		More than 10Hrs	2	3	0	2	7
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 3 shows that 12 respondents belong to Ph.D. courses. The amount of time spent in the library varies across disciplines, 7 respondents stated that they spend 1 to 3 hours per week in the library followed by 3 respondents spending 4 to 6 hours and 2 respondents stating 7 to 9 hours per week. Similarly from the PG courses, 8 respondents spent 1 to 3 hours per week in the library, 28 respondents spent 4 to 6 hours, 11 respondents spent 7 to 9 hours and only 7 respondents spend more than 10 hours in the library per week.

4. Purpose of using library

Table 4: Indicating the Purpose of using library of the respondents

Resource	Coerce	Low	Medium	High	Total
Assignment and Seminars	Ph.D.	3	5	4	12
	PG	46	52	32	130
	Total	49(34.51%)	57(40.14%)	36(25.35%)	142(100%)
Peer Pressure	Ph.D.	7	5	0	12
	PG	73	40	17	130
	Total	80(56.38%)	45(31.70%)	17(11.97%)	142(100%)
Academic excellence	Ph.D.	0	6	6	12
	PG	35	56	39	130
	Total	35(24.65%)	62(43.66%)	45(31.69%)	142(100%)

Preparing class notes	Ph.D.	4	1	7	12
	PG	43	52	35	130
	Total	47(33.09%)	53(37.33%)	42(29.57%)	142(100%)
Casual reading	Ph.D.	4	5	3	12
	PG	46	55	29	130
	Total	50	60(42.25%)	32(22.53%)	142(100%)
General awareness	Ph.D.	4	4	4	12
	PG	52	53	25	130
	Total	56(39.44%)	57(40.14%)	29(20.42%)	142(100%)
Research assignment	Ph.D.	6	1	5	12
	PG	53	44	33	130
	Total	59(41.55%)	45(31.69%)	38(26.76%)	142(100%)
Critical enquiry	Ph.D.	5	3	4	12
	PG	64	49	17	130
	Total	69(48.60%)	52(36.61%)	21(14.78%)	142(100%)
Socializing	Ph.D.	6	6	0	12
	PG	69	47	14	130
	Total	75(52.82%)	53(37.32%)	14(9.85%)	142(100%)

Table 4: shows that 57(40.14%) of the respondents chose “medium”, 49(34.51%) of the respondents chose “low”, 36(25.35%) of the respondents chose “high” for purpose of using library in the case of “Assignment and Seminars” and followed by 80(56.38%) of the respondents prefer “low”, 45(31.70%) of the respondents chose “medium” and 17(11.97%) of the respondents prefer “high” for “Peer Pressure”, 62(43.66%) of the respondents chose “medium”, 35(24.65%) of the respondents prefer “low” and 45(31.69%) of the respondents say “high” for “Academic excellence”, 53(37.33%) of the respondents prefer “medium”, 47(33.09%) of the respondents chose „low” and 42(29.57%) of the respondents said “high” for “Preparing class notes”, 60(42.25%) of the respondents said “medium”, 60(42.25%) of the respondents said “ low” and 32(22.53 of the respondents said “high” in the case of “Casual reading”, 57(40.14%) of the respondents told “medium”, 56(39.44%) of the respondents said “low” and 29(20.42%) of the respondents said “high” for ”General awareness”, 59(41.55%) of the respondents said “low”, 45(31.69%) of the respondents told “medium”, 38(26.76%) of the respondents said “high” for “Research assignment”, 69(48.60%) of the respondents told “low”, 52(36.61%) of the respondents told “medium” and 21(14.78%) of the respondents said “high” for “Critical enquiry” and for “Socializing” 75(52.82%) of the respondents prefer “low”, 53(37.32%) of the respondents said „medium” and only 14(9.85%) of the respondents said “high” in the case of Socializing.

5. Users level of library skill

Table 5: Self-assessment of library skills

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Users level of library skills	Very good	5	0	0	0	5
		Good	2	0	0	5	7
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	Users level of library skills	Excellent	5	1		1	7
		Very good	16	9	3	7	35
		Good	37	23	3	8	71
		Poor	8	2	1	0	11
		No opinion	2	2	0	2	6
Total				37	7	18	130

Table 5 shows that the respondents self-assessment of library skills. 12 respondents represented Ph.D. courses from different disciplines and 130 respondents represented PG courses having different level of library skills. 7(4.93%) of the respondents self-assess their skills to be “excellent”, 40(28.17%) of the respondents self-assess their skills to be “very good skills”, 78(54.92%) of the respondents assess their skill to be “good” in using the library, on the other hand 11 (7.74%) of the respondents assess themselves to be “poor” in library skills and 6(4.22%) respondents don’t have any “opinion”.

6. Finding information using several tools

Table 6: Library skills in locating information

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Required information Locate by	Self	2	0	0	4	6
		Friends	1	0	0	1	2
		OPAC	2	0	0	0	2

		Others	2	0	0	0	2
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	Required information locate by	Self	24	25	5	6	60
		Friends	19	7	1	3	30
		OPAC	21	4	1	8	34
		Library staff	2	1	0	1	4
		Others	2	0	0	0	2
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 6 represents the respondents from both PG and PhD scholar library skills in locating information. From both Ph.D. and PG students 66(46.48%) of the respondents were able to locate their required information by themselves without an expert intervention, followed by 32(22.53%) of the respondents engaging friends for help; 36(25.35%) of the respondents use OPAC help, 4(2.81%) of the respondents use library staff assistance and 4(2.81%) of the respondents use others help like, internet and so on.

7. Users level of library skill

Table 7: Self-assessment of library skills

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Users level of library skills	Very good	5	0	0	0	5
		Good	2	0	0	5	7
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	Users level of library skills	Excellent	5	1	0	1	7
		Very good	16	9	3	7	35
		Good	37	23	3	8	71
		Poor	8	2	1	0	11
		No opinion	2	2	0	2	6
Total			0	37	7	18	130

Table 7 shows that the respondents self-assessment of library skills. 12 respondents represented Ph.D. courses from different disciplines and 130 respondents represented PG courses having different level of library skills. 7(4.93%) of the respondents self-assess their skills to be “excellent”, 40(28.17%) of the respondents self-assess their skills to be “very good skills”, 78(54.92%) of the respondents assess their skill to be “good” in using the library, on the other hand 11 (7.74%) of the respondents assess himself to be “poor” in library skills and 6(4.22%) respondents don’t have any “opinion”.

8. Purpose of using library

Table 8: Indicating the Purpose of using library of the respondents

Resource	Coerce	Low	Medium	High	Total
Assignment and Seminars	Ph.D.	3	5	4	12
	PG	46	52	32	130
	Total	49(34.51%)	57(40.14%)	36(25.35%)	142(100%)
Peer Pressure	Ph.D.	7	5	0	12
	PG	73	40	17	130
	Total	80(56.38%)	45(31.70%)	17(11.97%)	142(100%)
Academic excellence	Ph.D.	0	6	6	12
	PG	35	56	39	130
	Total	35(24.65%)	62(43.66%)	45(31.69%)	142(100%)
Preparing class notes	Ph.D.	4	1	7	12
	PG	43	52	35	130
	Total	47(33.09%)	53(37.33%)	42(29.57%)	142(100%)
Casual reading	Ph.D.	4	5	3	12
	PG	46	55	29	130
	Total	50	60(42.25%)	32(22.53%)	142(100%)
General awareness	Ph.D.	4	4	4	12
	PG	52	53	25	130
	Total	56(39.44%)	57(40.14%)	29(20.42%)	142(100%)
Research assignment	Ph.D.	6	1	5	12
	PG	53	44	33	130
	Total	59(41.55%)	45(31.69%)	38(26.76%)	142(100%)
Critical enquiry	Ph.D.	5	3	4	12
	PG	64	49	17	130
	Total	69(48.60%)	52(36.61%)	21(14.78%)	142(100%)

Socializing	Ph.D.	6	6	0	12
	PG	69	47	14	130
	Total	75(52.82%)	53(37.32%)	14(9.85%)	142(100%)

Table 8 shows that 57(40.14%) of the respondents chose “medium”, 49(34.51%) of the respondents chose “low”, 36(25.35%) of the respondents chose “high” for purpose of using library in the case of “Assignment and Seminars” and followed by 80(56.38%) of the respondents prefer “low”, 45(31.70%) of the respondents chose “medium” and 17(11.97%) of the respondents prefer “high” for “Peer Pressure”, 62(43.66%) of the respondents chose “medium”, 35(24.65%) of the respondents prefer “low” and 45(31.69%) of the respondents say “high” for “Academic excellence”, 53(37.33%) of the respondents prefer “medium”, 47(33.09%) of the respondents chose „low” and 42(29.57%) of the respondents said “high” for “Preparing class notes”, 60(42.25%) of the respondents said “medium”, 60(42.25%) of the respondents said “ low” and 32(22.53 of the respondents said “high” in the case of “Casual reading”, 57(40.14%) of the respondents told “medium”, 56(39.44%) of the respondents said “low” and 29(20.42%) of the respondents said “high” for ”General awareness”, 59(41.55%) of the respondents said “low”, 45(31.69%) of the respondents told “medium”, 38(26.76%) of the respondents said “high” for “Research assignment”, 69(48.60%) of the respondents told “low”, 52(36.61%) of the respondents told “medium” and 21(14.78%) of the respondents said “high” for “Critical enquiry” and for “Socializing” 75(52.82%) of the respondents prefer “low”, 53(37.32%) of the respondents said “medium” and only 14(9.85%) of the respondents said “high” in the case of Socializing.

9. Cataloguing terms adopted for retrieving information

Table 9: User cataloguing terms adopted for retrieving information

			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
PH.D	options	Author	3	0	0	4	7
		Subject title	4	0	0	1	5
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	options	Author	30	18	2	9	59
		Subject title	35	17	4	9	65
		Class no.	2	2	1	0	5
		Accession	1	0	0		1
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 9 shows that respondents are belong to PG and Ph.D. courses from various disciplines. 66(46.48%) of the respondents indicated that they prefer author name when searching information and followed by 70(49.30%) of the respondents prefer subject title for searching information, 5(3.52%) respondent prefer class numbers and 1(0.70%) respondents prefer accession numbers.

10. periodical use behavior of the respondents

Table 10: periodicals use by respondents

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Phd	Periodical use regularly	Yes	6	0	0	1	7
		No	1	0	0	4	5
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	Periodical use regularly	Yes	21	11	2	3	37
		No	47	26	5	15	93
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 10 represents the frequency of periodical use in the library by PhD and Postgraduate students of the university. The result suggests that 44(30.99%) of the respondents irrespective of their disciplines regularly use periodical and 98(69.01%) of the respondents do not use periodicals regularly.

11. Use preference of print and electronic format of periodicals

Table 11: User's preference of print format and electronic format periodical

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Format	Print	4	0	0	4	8
		Electronic	3	0	0	1	4
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	Format	Print	51	25	4	15	95
		Electronic	17	12	3	3	35
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 11 shows that users prefer print format and electronic format periodical use in the library by PhD and Postgraduate students of the university. The result indicates that respondents from different

disciplines and courses, 103(72.54%) of the respondents who use print journals and 39(27.46%) of the respondents are use electronic journals. So majority of 103(72.54%) respondents use print journals.

12. Latest information keeps abreast by respondents

Table 12: Latest information keeps abreast by using journal

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
PhD	latest issue	Yes	5	0	0	2	7
		No	2	0	0	3	5
Total			7	0	0	5	12
PG	latest issue	yes	24	17	2	8	51
		No	42	20	5	10	79
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 12 shows that medium use for keeping abreast of the latest trends and technique in the library by PhD and Postgraduate students of the university. The result shows that 58(40.85%) of the respondents use journals to keep abreast of the latest information. Whereas 84(59.16%) of the respondents do not use journals to keep abreast of the latest information. Therefore, majority of 84(59.16%) respondents do not use journals to keep abreast of the latest information.

13. Sources/tools for updating with latest information

Table 13: Respondents used different tools to keep latest information

Course		Options	Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Current information update	Journal site visit	6	0	0	2	8
		Periodical section visit	1	0	0	2	3
		Friends with similar interest	0	0	0	1	1
		Total	7	0	0	5	12
PG	Current information update	RSS	5	3	0	0	8
		Journal site visit	34	14	2	9	59
		Periodical section visit	25	17	3	7	52

	Friends with similar interest	4	3	2	2	11
Total		68	37	7	18	130

Table 13 shows that respondents of Ph.D. and PG Courses from different disciplines. 67 (47.19%) of the respondents who “journal site visit” to retrieve the current information and followed by 55(38.73%) of the respondents who visit “library periodical section”, 12(8.45%) of the respondents follow their “friends with similar interest”. Only PG courses from 8(5.63%) of the respondents visits RSS to retrieve the current information. So majority of 67(47.19%) respondents who “journal site visit” to retrieve the current information.

14. Sources of access to journal

Table 14: Respondent mode of journal access

Course			Discipline				Total
			Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Ph.D.	Favorite journal access	periodical section visit	0	0	0	4	4
		Wi-Fi	8	0	0	0	8
Total			8	0	0	4	12
PG	Favorite journal access	Periodical section visit	11	4	2	1	18
		Wi-Fi	57	33	5	17	112
Total			68	37	7	18	130

Table 14 represents that respondent of Ph.D. and PG Courses from different disciplines and their mode of journal access. The data reveal that 22(15.50%) of the respondents access their favourite journals from periodical section of the library and 120(84.50%) of the respondents use Wi-Fi to access their favourite journals from hostel through internet. Therefore, majority of 120(84.50%) respondents use Wi-Fi to access their favourite journals from hostel through internet.

15. Research scholar’s awareness level of library resources

Table 15: Research scholar’s awareness level of library resource

Course	Discipline	Total
--------	------------	-------

Ph.D.		Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Monographs	Yes	4	0	0	3	7
	No	3	0	0	2	5
	Total	7	0	0	5	12
Patents/Reports/ Standards/specifications	Yes	4	0	0	3	7
	No	3	0	0	2	5
	Total	7	0	0	5	12
Conference/workshop/ seminars	Yes	4	0	0	3	7
	No	3	0	0	2	5
	Total	7	0	0	5	12
Database/Archives	Yes	5	0	0	3	8
	No	2	2	0	2	4
	Total	7	2	0	5	12
Review articles/Theses	Yes	6	0	0	5	11
	No	1	0	0	0	1
	Total	7	0	0	5	12
Internet/internet/ Audio/video/ CD-ROMs	Yes	6	0	0	2	8
	No	1	0	0	3	4
	Total	7	0	0	5	12
Original research papers/professional news	Yes	6	0	0	3	9
	No	1	0	0	2	3
	Total	0	0	0	5	12

Reference resource (Encyclopedia, Dictionary)	Yes	7	0	0	3	10
	No	0	0	0	2	2
	Total	0	0	0	5	12

16. PG student's awareness level of library resources

Table 16 : PG student's awareness level of library resources

Course	Discipline					Total
	PG	Science	Social Science	Management	Humanities	
Monographs	Yes	56	32	6	16	110
	No	12	5	1	2	20
Patents/Reports/Standards/specifications	Yes	23	7	1	4	35
	No	44	30	6	15	95
Conference/workshop/seminars	Yes	33	15	4	9	61
	No	35	22	3	9	69
Database/Archives	Yes	37	19	4	10	70
	No	31	18	3	8	60
Review articles/Theses	Yes	40	25	7	12	84
	No	28	12	0	6	46
Internet/internet/Audio / video/CD-ROMs	Yes	49	16	4	13	82
	No	19	21	3	5	48
Original research	Yes	43	19	5	10	77
	No	25	18	2	8	53

papers/professional news						
Reference resource(Encyclopedia, Dictionary)	Yes	52	21	5	15	93
	No	16	16	2	3	37

Table 15 and table 16 represent the Ph.D. and post graduate student awareness and use of library resources in the university library. The data suggest that 117(83%) of the respondents are aware of “Monographs”, 42(30%) of the respondents know “Patents/Reports/Standards/specifications”, 68(48%) of the respondents aware about “Conference/workshop/seminars”. On the other hand 78(55%) of the respondents using “Database/Archives”, 95(67%) of the respondents using “Review articles/Theses”, 90(64%) of the respondents are using “Internet/intranet/Audio/video/CD-ROMs”, 86(61%) of the respondents told that they using “original research papers/professional news” and 103(72%) of the respondents using Reference resource (Encyclopedia, Dictionary). The study found that in the case of respondent’s awareness level of library resources most (83%) of the respondents are aware of “Monographs”, and 30% of the respondents know “Patents/Reports/Standards/specifications”, up to 48% of the respondents aware about “Conference/workshop/seminars” and more than 55% of the respondents told that they aware about “Database/Archives” and 67% of the respondents using “Review articles/Theses”, quarter three (64%) of the respondents are using “Internet/intranet/Audio/video/CD-ROMs”. on the other hand 72% of the respondents told that they aware about reference resource like Encyclopedia.

FINDINGS

Implication of the major themes that emerged from the present study of student's library orientation and library skills will certainly has value for other academic library. The outcome of the study leads to the following observation:

MAJOR FINDINGS

- ❖ Above 50% of the respondents are regular users of library. Therefore, students are a regular visitor of library.
- ❖ The respondent of the study comes from heterogeneous group belonging to different States of the country. The majority of the students were doing postgraduate degree in the university and their ages were varying from 21-25 years. Among the respondents 67% are male including 8 Ph.D. scholars. All of the respondents belonged to 5 different disciplines from PG and Ph.D. courses.
- ❖ More than 76% of the respondents attended university library.
- ❖ The findings shows 64% of the respondents use library 1-3 hours in a week. Only 5% of the respondents use library more than 10 hours in a week. 47% of the respondents were able to locate their required information all by themselves without an expert intervention and 23% of the respondents engaging friends for help, 25% of the respondents use OPAC help, 3% of the respondents use library staff help and 4% of the respondents use others help like, internet and library portals to find out their required Information through these tools.
- ❖ The study also found that the most (55%) of the respondents assess their skill to be "good" in using the library while on the other hand 5% of the respondents self-assess their skills to be "excellent" of using the library.
- ❖ 41% of the respondents chose "medium" for "Assignment and Seminars", on the other hand 44% of the respondents chose "medium" for "Academic excellence", 30% of the respondents chose "high" for "Preparing class notes", 43% of the respondents chose "medium" for "Casual reading", 41% of the respondents chose "medium" for "General awareness", 42% of the respondents chose "low" for "Research assignment", 49% of the respondents chose "medium" for "Critical enquiry" and 53% of the respondents chose "low" for "Socializing".

- ❖ In the case of retrieving information users prefer different Cataloguing terms, findings shows 50% of the respondents prefer “subject title” for searching information and 47% of the respondents indicated that they prefer “author name”.
- ❖ Around one third (31%) of the respondents use periodicals regularly irrespective of their disciplines and majority (73%) of the respondents use print journals. On the other hand 41% of the respondents use journals to keep abreast of the latest information. Some of the respondents use some others options like newspapers and general knowledge books etc. They told that 85% of the respondents use Wi-Fi to.
- ❖ Access their favorite journals from hostel through internet and 16% of the respondents access their favorite journals from periodical section of the library.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Author expresses his heartiest gratitude to Dr. Mangkhollen Singson (Assistant Professor, DLIS, and Pondicherry University); Dr. R. Sevukan (Associate Professor & Head, DLIS, and PU); Professor C. K. Ramaiah (former Head of DLIS, PU); Dr. Rekha Rani Vargheese; Mr. M. Leeladharan (Asst Professor of DLIS, PU) and he would also like to thank Ph.D. scholar, Mr. Mohammad Tanzeem Raza. Department of Commerce, for his valuable time and encouragement.

REFERENCES

1. Moore, B. (1995). Library skills. 2(1), 215 - 266. S
2. Powell, R. (1997). User’s confidence and awareness level of library resources. 3(2), 58 – 89
3. Powel, R. R. & Greenwich, C. T Ablex (1997). Basic research methods for librarians (3rd ed.).
4. Powell, R. R. & Connaway, L. S. (2004). Basic research methods for librarians (4thed.). Westport, C .T: Libraries Unlimited.
5. Stamatoplos, A. & Mackoy, R. (1998). Effects of library instruction on university students’ satisfaction with the library: a longitudinal study. *College & Research Libraries*, 59(4), 322-333.
6. Yu, J., & Cooper, H. (1983). A quantitative review of research design effects on response rates to questionnaires. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36-44.
7. <http://www.ala.org/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume11998slmqo/carey>
8. <http://210.212.230.223/index.php>