OPEN ACCESS

Int. Res. J. of Science & Engineering, 2015; Vol. 3 (5): 191-196 ISSN: 2322-0015

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Use of ICT in Agricultural Universities Libraries in Western India: User Survey

Patil Kishor[1] and Lihitkar Ramdas[2]

[1]Librarian, College of Agriculture, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dhule. India

[2]Librarian, Govt. Institute of Science, Nagpur. India

Corresponding Author Email: rlihitkar1975@gmail.com

Manuscript Details

Received : 03.07.2015
Revised :23.08.2015
Revised received : 09.09.2015
Accepted: 16.09.2015
Published: 05.10.2015

ISSN: 2322-0015

Editor: Dr. Arvind Chavhan

Cite this article as:
Patil Kishor and Lihitkar Ramdas . Use of ICT in Agricultural Universities Libraries, *Int. Res. J. of Science & Engineering,* 2015; Vol. 3 (5): 191-196.

ABSTRACT

The paper is an attempt of library user's survey and specially use of ICT in Agricultural Universities Libraries in Western India. The data representation consist of general information of users, library hours, reading room facilities, mode of information, utilization of library resources, library collection, user education program, frequency of use of ICT tools, library services, utilization of databases, assessment of library facilities and performance.

KEYWORDS ICT, Agriculture, University Libraries, User Survey, Western India

INTRODUCTION

India, being a largest democratic nation in the world, an agrarian country, the importance of agricultural education is vital and significant in the present context. The aim of the agricultural education is to accelerate the agricultural products and productivity to cater the needs of farmers and its stakeholders (Ahmed, 1989). The mission is marching towards hunger free and fearless nation. Moreover, the organizations like FAO, ICAR, various agricultural universities, deemed universities, central universities having faculty of agriculture imparting agricultural education, research and extension activities in different fields, the moving force of university libraries are to support the information needs of users (Angello and Wema, 2010). In this respect, the status of agricultural universities is changing due to the dramatic development in the information and communication technology. The LIS is service organization, which provides various

services, facilities and avenues. Users are major components of the library and information system. It was felt to study users of agricultural university libraries. In order to study the use of ICT in all the eight agricultural universities in western part of India, 400 users from these universities were selected (Ajegbomogun and Busayo, 2011). Nature of services being provided by the university libraries are similar and users are also from the categories of UG/PG students, research scholars, faculty members, scientists, extension specialists, agricultural staff, which is also common in all the universities, a random sample of 50 respondents (users) per university has been taken. Out of the 400 respondents selected for the study, 333 users have responded (Balsubhramanian and Baladhandayuthan, 2011). University-wise, users identified and responses received are given in the following table:

Table 1: University-wise Response Rate of Respondents

Sr. No.	Name of the University	Questionnaire Distributed	Questionnaire Received	%
1	AAU	50	34	68
2	BSKKV	50	38	76
3	JAU	50	40	80
4	MKV	50	47	94
5	MPKV	50	49	98
6	NAU	50	42	84
7	PDKV	50	39	78
8	SDAU	50	44	88
Total		400	333	83.25

Average 83 per cent respondents have indicated their opinion on use of ICT. The highest response percentage of 98 was from MPKV and the lowest was 68 % from AAU.

OBJECTIVESOF THE STUDY

1. To find out the level of automation, library management software, its modules, related services and constraints of automation in the library.
2. To examine the status of ICT infrastructure in respect of hardware and software, network connectivity use for library services.
3. To find out the various aspects of library and information services offered by the agricultural university libraries while using ICT.
4. To know the training and orientation needs of library staff to cope-up with new technologies, e-resources, problems if any faced in adopting.

The main objective of the study is to assess the usage of ICT in agricultural university libraries and information services provided, facilities made available to users, Using questionnaires technique, interviews and field visits were immensely useful to go ahead in this study. The response rate of 83.25 % of user respondents were analyzed and interpreted.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF USERS

In the first part of general information, nine questions were designed. This was regarding the specific names of user for identification and reliability. The question was asked to state the age of individual user on the date of filling up the questionnaire. However, age groups had been divided into eight categories. These are from 18-25 years as first group, 26-30 years as second group, 31-35 years as third group, 36-40 years as forth group, 41-45 years in fifth group, 46-50 years in sixth group, 51-55 years as seventh group and 56 and above as last group.

Age: It is seen from the data that 193 (57.96 %) respondents belongs to the age groupof 18-25 years, followed by 34 (10.21 %) respondents belongs to 26-30, 24 (7.21 %)respondents belongs to 46-50, 23 (6.91%) respondents belongs to 56 and above,22 (6.61 %) respondents belongs to 51-55, 14 (4.20 %) respondents belongs the age group of 21-35 and 12 (3.60 %) respondents belongs to the age group of 41-45 years and11 (3.30 %) respondents belongs to the age group of 36-40 years. It is evident that the highest respondents (58 %) were in the age group of 18-25 years.

Table 2: Gender-wise presentation of the Respondents

Sr. No	Respondents Category	No of Respondent	Male (%)		Female (%)	
1	UG/PG Student	193	133	(68.91)	60	(31.09)
2	Research Scholar	24	19	(79.17)	5	(20.83)
3	Faculty Member	78	72	(92.31)	6	(7.69)
4	Scientist	22	21	(95.45)	1	(4.55)
5	Extension Specialist Agricultural Staff	2	2	(100)	0	(0.00)
6	Agriculture Staff	6	6	(100)	0	(0.00)
	Others	8	7	(87.50)	1	(12.50)
	Total	333	260	(78.08)	73	(21.92)

The above Table 2 reveals that 133(68.91%) respondents were male and 60(31.09%) respondents were female in the category of 'UG/PG students, followed by 72(92.31%) were male and 6(7.69%) were female in the category of 'faculty members', 19(79.17%) were male and 5 (20.83 %) were female in the category of 'research scholar', 21(95.45 %) respondents were male and 1(4.55 %) respondent was female in the category of 'scientist', 6 (100 %) respondents were male and no female in the category of 'agricultural staff,' 2(100 %) respondents were male and no female in the category of 'extension specialists'. Whereas 7 (87.50 %) respondents were male and 1 (12.50 %) respondents were female, in the category of 'other', other means other than the option in the questionnaire. It was observed that use of ICT applications in the field of agriculture, generally dominated by the male members.

This question was addressed to the user category to know its educational and professional qualification. The objective of this question was to seek the particular status of respondents in population of present study. (Table 3).

The above Table shows that 106 (31.83 %) respondents are doctorate degree (Ph.D) followed by 96 (28.83 %) respondents are M.Sc.,65 (19.52%) respondents are B.Sc., 25 (7.51%) respondents are B. Tech., 15 (4.50%) respondents are M.V. Sc, 12(3.60%) are M. Tech, 11 (3.31 %) respondents are MBA and 3 (0.90 %) respondents are B.V. Sc. &A.H. It is observed that a majority of 106(31.83%) respondents are having Qualifications of PhD in agricultural sciences and the rest being UG / PG degrees.

Table 3: Educational and Professional Qualifications of Respondents

Sr. No.	Educational Qualifications	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	B.Sc.	65	19.52
2	M.Sc.	96	28.83
3	B.Tech.	25	7.51
4	M.Tech.	12	3.60
5	M.B.A.	11	3.31
6	B.V.Sc& A. H.	3	0.90
7	M.V.Sc.	15	4.50
Total		333	100.00

Table 4: Category-wise Classification of Respondents

Sr. No.	Respondents Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	UG / PG Students	193	57.96
2	Research Scholars	24	7.21
3	Faculty Members	78	23.42
4	Scientists	22	6.61
5	Extension Specialists	2	0.60
6	Agricultural Staff	6	1.80
7	Other (administrative staff)	8	2.40

This question was designed to understand the category of respondents. Their positions have been identified in the following categories: a) under graduate / post graduate students, b) research scholar c) faculty member d) scientist

Table 5: University-wise, Category-wise and Gender-wise Response of Respondents

Sr. No.	Name of the University	UG/PG Student (N = 193)		Research Scholar (N = 24)		Faculty Member (N = 78)		Scientist (N= 22)		Extension Specialist (N= 2)		Agricultural Staff (N= 6)		Other (N=8)	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1	AAU	26 (13.47)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.16)	1 (4.16)	3 (3.84)	1 (1.28)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (16.66)	0 (0.00)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.00)
2	BSKKV	12 (6.22)	17 (8.81)	1 (4.16)	0 (0.00)	6 (7.69)	0 (0.00)	2 (9.09)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
3	JAU	16 (8.29)	3 (1.55)	4 (16.66)	4 (16.66)	8 (10.25)	1 (1.28)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.00)
4	MKV	27 (13.99)	5 (2.59)	2 (8.33)	0 (0.00)	6 (7.69)	0 (0.00)	2 (9.09)	0 (0.00)	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (16.66)	0 (0.00)	3 (37.5)	0 (0.00)
5	MPKV	5 (2.59)	6 (3.11)	1 (4.17)	0 (0.00)	21 (26.92)	2 (2.56)	11 (50.00)	1 (4.55)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (25.00)	0 (0.00)
6	NAU	12 (6.22)	4 (2.07)	8 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	14 (17.94)	1 (1.28)	3 (13.63)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
7	PDKV	18 (9.33)	14 (7.26)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (5.12)	0 (0.00)	2 (9.09)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.00)
8	SDAU	17 (8.81)	11 (5.70)	2 (8.33)	0 (0.00)	10 (9.1)	1(4.54)	1 (1.28)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Total		133 (68.91)	60 (31.09)	19 (79.17)	5 (20.83)	72 (92.31)	6 (7.69)	21 95.45)	1 (4.55)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	6 (68.91)	133 (31.09)	60 (79.17)	19 (20.83)

e) extension specialist f) agricultural staff including agricultural supervisors, assistants, gardeners, etc. and g) others i.e. administrative staff. (Table 4).

The above Table indicates that 193 (57.96 %) respondents were 'under graduate as well as post graduate students' engaged in the teaching and research activities followed by 78 (23.42 %) from 'faculty members', 24 (7.21 %) from 'research scholars', 22 (6.61 %) from 'scientists', 6 (1.80 %) from 'agricultural staff', 2 (0.60 %) from 'extension specialists' and 8 (2.40 %) respondents were from 'others' category. It is possible to draw a table 5 of gender-wise categorization of the respondents as below.

SUGGESTIONS

i. Although the states in western India have agrarian economy and prominence for development, establishment of new agricultural university need consideration the ICAR, an apex body at national level to plan and support for agricultural education / research in these states ICAR and state Government may consider for establishing agriculture university.
ii. Qualified university librarian should appoint in the all the universities to caterthe needs of teaching and research.
iii. For electronic journals and online full-text databases and to make available totheir users for browsing and searching. The ICAR should provide more fundsfor subscribing these international databases.
iv. Networking with other agricultural universities in India is to be introduced.
v. Taking into account the existing status and infrastructure of libraries, sufficientgrants should be provided by the ICAR for development of libraries.
vi. Upgrading the skills and technology, training plan for each library professional through workshop, short-term courses, and long-term courses may be considered.
vii. For use of ICT application / Computer literacy, user education program is to be introduced, formulated and implemented in order to improve the proficiency, skills and knowledge.
viii. RFID security system should be procured and installed in all the universities toprotect and safeguard the library documents.

REFERENCES

1. Agrawal Anil and Singh DK. ICT Application in Academic Libraries: A Case Study of Banaras Hindu University System". edited by Swain, N. K. et al. In Paradigm Shift in Technological Advancement in Librarianship. Jodhpur: Scientific Publishers. 2011, p 507.
2. Ahmed B. Agricultural Libraries in Kashmir: A Survey". *Annals of Library Science and Documentation*, 1989; 36 (3): 75-84.
3. Ajegbomogun FO and Busayo IO. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Literacy among the staff of the libraries of Kenneth Dike and Nimbe Adedipe Universities, Nigeria: A Comparative Study, *Information Studies*, 2011; 17 (2): 89-97.
4. ANE's Encyclopedia Dictionary of Library and Information Science, Vol.2, edited by Ali, Amjad. New Delhi: Ane Books, 2006, p 84.
5. Angello C and Wema E. Availability and Usage of ICTs and E-resources by Livestock Researchers in Tanzania: Challenges and Ways Forward. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 2010, 6 (1): 53-65.
6. Ansari MA and Ansari IA. Adoption of Internet by the Faculty Members of Aligarh Muslim University: A comparison of Life Sciences and Agricultural Sciences. In Electronic Age Librarianship. edited by Swain, Dilip K. New Delhi: Ane Books. 2012, 163-174.
7. Aregu Raphale et al. An ICT Based Digital Content Information Access Framework in developing countries: The case of Agricultural Informatics Access and Management in Uganda". In IST- Africa

2008 Conference Proceeding Paul Cunningham and Miriam Cunningham (Ed.) IIMC International Information Management Corporation. 2008, 1-6. (www.IST-Africa.org/Conference 2008).

8. Balsubhramanian P and Baladhandayuthan A Research Methodology in Library Science. New Delhi: Deep and Deep, 2011.
9. Barua BP. National Policy on Library and Information System and Services for India. Bombay: Popular, 1992.
10. Bhatnagar Subhash and Schware Robert. ed. Information and Communication Technology in Development. New Delhi: Sage, 2002.