# A case study on the use of internet resources by research scholars and students of Annamalai University

**V. Ramesh Babu***

**M. Nagarajan****

## ABSTRACT

This paper aims at analysing the use of internet resources by research scholar and student. The quality online content useful to academics in international studies teaching and research at the university and college level, including how and where to locate such materials through guides, directories, gateway sites, repositories, and various types of search engines; considerations about internet use in universities and college classes; and research scholars pg and ug graduate assignments that use sources of information from the internet. There is also consideration of characteristics and trends of university student use of the internet for research purposes, the ''invisible'' or deep web, electronic information literacy for academics, and maintaining current awareness on the fast-changing web.

## INTRODUCTION

The internet is a global network of computers and software that is interconnected by cables. It is appropriate to define the *world wide web* www or web as an interactive and collaborative information environment that is mainly composed of hypermedia and hypertext documents linked to one another, and distributed over the internet. What is more, the internet can be pictured as a dynamic process, because it transforms perpetually. That information network is evidently also becoming an integral part of peoples everyday life. It is not surprising, then, that internet research is often argued for by referring to the fast technological advancement and the changing mediascape.

Be that as it may, information science somehow tends to presume that *man* the originator of cultural progress is not inclined to really develop. This is betrayed by the bare fact that no major information theory or model accommodates human development. It also shows in how seldom longitudinal studies are conducted. Most directly, however, the bias is evidenced by the astonishing scarcity of published research analysing informational activities in conjunction with personal development.

We prefer pages by public institutions to those by private persons. One may detect a distinct polarity of actors here: development is mostly a private affair. In this study, an attempt is made to analyse the internet use and information such behaviour among the research scholars and students of annamalai university.

**Author's Affiliations: ***Librarian**, Dr. Pauls Engineering College, Pauls Nagar, Vanur, Villupuram Dist - 605 109, T.N. E-Mail: veerameshbabu@gmail.com; **Professor and Head, Department of Library and Information science Annamalai University Chidambaram (T.N.)

**Reprints Request: Dr. V. Ramesh Babu**, Librarian Dr. Pauls Engineering College, Pauls Nagar, Vanur, Villupuram Dist - 605 109, T.N. E-mail: veerameshbabu@gmail.com

## OBJECTIVES

i.  To analyse the respondent's duration and quantum of time utilization in search of information through internet

ii. To analyse the e-resources search behaviour of research scholars and students of annamalai university

iii. To analyse the respondents' rating on utility of internet resources

## HYPOTHESES

i. The respondents do differ significantly in their e-resources search behaviour.

ii. There is a significant faculty wise variation with respect to respondents' rating on utility of internet resources.

## METHODOLOGY

This study attempts to examine the internet use behaviour among the research scholars and students of annamalai university. It is primarily a fact-finding venture. The identified facts are cross tabulated with the faculty background, and occupational background of the respondents. Thus it gives an analytical orientation to this study and the design of this study is partly exploratory in nature and partly analytical in nature.

## SAMPLING

The researcher has selected six faculties in annamalai university, viz., arts, science, engineering, agriculture, education and medicine and from each faculty 50 respondents are selected

### Table 1: Faculty wise respondents' extent of using various internet resources

| Faculty | E-Journals | | | E-Books | | | Online data bases | | | E- Articles | | | E-publishing | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally |
| Art | 11 | 10 | 29 | 23 | 15 | 12 | 18 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 18 | 17 | 11 | 18 | 21 |
| | 22.00 | 20.00 | 58.00 | 46.00 | 30.00 | 24.00 | 36.00 | 32.00 | 32.00 | 30.00 | 36.00 | 34.00 | 22.00 | 36.00 | 42.00 |
| Science | 22 | 18 | 10 | 28 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 25 | 23 | 17 | 10 | 16 | 21 | 13 |
| | 44.00 | 36.00 | 20.00 | 56.00 | 22.00 | 22.00 | 20.00 | 30.00 | 50.00 | 46.00 | 34.00 | 20.00 | 32.00 | 42.00 | 26.00 |
| Engineering | 25 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 27 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 17 | 20 | 13 | 11 | 28 | 11 |
| | 50.00 | 28.00 | 22.00 | 26.00 | 20.00 | 54.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 20.00 | 34.00 | 40.00 | 26.00 | 22.00 | 56.00 | 22.00 |
| Agriculture | 10 | 12 | 28 | 14 | 10 | 26 | 16 | 12 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 23 |
| | 20.00 | 24.00 | 56.00 | 28.00 | 20.00 | 52.00 | 32.00 | 24.00 | 44.00 | 36.00 | 44.00 | 20.00 | 24.00 | 30.00 | 46.00 |
| Education | 15 | 22 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 14 | 27 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 25 |
| | 30.00 | 44.00 | 26.00 | 30.00 | 24.00 | 46.00 | 42.00 | 30.00 | 28.00 | 54.00 | 26.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 30.00 | 50.00 |
| Medicine | 20 | 12 | 18 | 20 | 8 | 22 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 14 | 22 |
| | 40.00 | 24.00 | 36.00 | 40.00 | 16.00 | 44.00 | 26.00 | 34.00 | 40.00 | 38.00 | 24.00 | 38.00 | 28.00 | 28.00 | 44.00 |
| Total | 103 | 88 | 109 | 113 | 66 | 121 | 80 | 79 | 91 | 119 | 102 | 79 | 74 | 111 | 115 |
| | 34.33 | 29.33 | 36.33 | 37.67 | 22.00 | 40.33 | 32.67 | 31.67 | 35.67 | 39.67 | 34.00 | 26.33 | 24.67 | 37.00 | 38.33 |

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Source of Variation* | *SS* | *df* | MS | F | *P-value* | *F crit* |
| Rows | 320.0926 | 5 | 64.01852 | 3.675314 | 0.007876 | 2.449468 |
| Columns | 264.1481 | 8 | 33.01852 | 1.895599 | 0.087748 | 2.180172 |
| Error | 696.7407 | 40 | 17.41852 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Total | 1280.981 | 53 | | | | |

## Table 2 : Category wise respondents' extent of using internet resources

| Category | E-Journals | | | E-Books | | | Online data bases | | | E- Articles | | | E-publishing | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally | Most Frequently | Frequently | Occasionally |
| Ph.D Scholar | 19 | 15 | 21 | 20 | 18 | 17 | 13 | 19 | 23 | 12 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 30 | 16 |
| | 34.55 | 27.27 | 38.18 | 36.36 | 32.73 | 30.91 | 23.64 | 34.55 | 41.82 | 21.82 | 50.91 | 27.27 | 16.36 | 54.55 | 29.09 |
| M.Phil Scholar | 22 | 15 | 29 | 22 | 12 | 32 | 22 | 16 | 28 | 32 | 16 | 18 | 22 | 16 | 28 |
| | 33.33 | 22.73 | 43.94 | 33.33 | 18.18 | 48.48 | 33.33 | 24.24 | 42.42 | 48.48 | 24.24 | 27.27 | 33.33 | 24.24 | 42.42 |
| PG Student | 30 | 24 | 21 | 39 | 14 | 22 | 36 | 18 | 21 | 33 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 33 | 24 |
| | 40.00 | 32.00 | 28.00 | 52.00 | 18.67 | 29.33 | 48.00 | 24.00 | 28.00 | 44.00 | 29.33 | 26.67 | 24.00 | 44.00 | 32.00 |
| Integrated Student | 32 | 34 | 38 | 32 | 22 | 50 | 27 | 42 | 35 | 42 | 36 | 26 | 25 | 32 | 47 |
| | 30.77 | 32.69 | 36.54 | 30.77 | 21.15 | 48.08 | 25.96 | 40.38 | 33.65 | 40.38 | 34.62 | 25.00 | 24.04 | 30.77 | 45.19 |
| Total | 103 | 88 | 109 | 113 | 66 | 121 | 98 | 95 | 107 | 119 | 102 | 79 | 74 | 111 | 115 |
| | 34.33 | 29.33 | 36.33 | 37.67 | 22.00 | 40.33 | 32.67 | 31.67 | 35.67 | 39.67 | 34.00 | 26.33 | 24.67 | 37.00 | 38.33 |

| Category n | Reference works dictionaries /Encyclopedias | | | Online book shop | | | Modal Exam Papers | | | Maps | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Most frequently | frequently | Occasionally | Most frequently | frequently | Occasionally | Most frequently | frequently | Occasionally | Most frequently | frequently | Occasionally | |
| Ph.D Scholar | 23 | 12 | 20 | 13 | 32 | 10 | 29 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 22 | 55 |
| | 41.82 | 21.82 | 36.36 | 23.64 | 58.18 | 18.18 | 52.73 | 20.00 | 27.27 | 27.27 | 32.73 | 40.00 | |
| M.Phil Scholar | 16 | 22 | 28 | 32 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 35 | 15 | 25 | 15 | 26 | 66 |
| | 24.24 | 33.33 | 42.42 | 48.48 | 24.24 | 27.27 | 24.24 | 53.03 | 22.73 | 37.88 | 22.73 | 39.39 | |
| M.Phil Scholar | 25 | 32 | 18 | 32 | 27 | 16 | 25 | 36 | 14 | 18 | 40 | 17 | 75 |
| | 33.33 | 42.67 | 24.00 | 42.67 | 36.00 | 21.33 | 33.33 | 48.00 | 18.67 | 24.00 | 53.33 | 22.67 | |
| Integrated Student | 39 | 35 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 34 | 30 | 28 | 46 | 32 | 45 | 27 | 104 |
| | 37.50 | 33.65 | 28.85 | 38.46 | 28.85 | 32.69 | 28.85 | 26.92 | 44.23 | 30.77 | 43.27 | 25.96 | |
| Total | 103 | 101 | 96 | 117 | 105 | 78 | 100 | 110 | 90 | 90 | 118 | 92 | 300 |
| | 34.33 | 33.67 | 32.00 | 39.00 | 35.00 | 26.00 | 33.33 | 36.67 | 30.00 | 30.00 | 39.33 | 30.67 | |

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Source of Variation* | *SS* | *df* | *MS* | *F* | *P-value* | *F crit* |
| Rows | 1311.639 | 3 | 437.213 | 11.4916 | 7.26E-05 | 3.008786 |
| Columns | 396.2222 | 8 | 49.52778 | 1.301777 | 0.289306 | 2.35508 |
| Error | 913.1111 | 24 | 38.0463 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Total | 2620.972 | 35 | | | | |

as samples. While selecting samples a stratification method is applied with a view to give relative weightage to the research scholars and students of different designations. Thus, the sampling of the study comes under stratified random sampling.

## DATA COLLECTION

The researcher has employed a well structured questionnaire for collecting the data from the respondents of the six faculties of annamalai university. The researcher has sent questionnaires to all the selected staff members who work at different faculties of annamalai university. The questionnaires have been designed to elicit background information of the staff members, duration and quantum of library use, nature and type of information required, information sharing behaviour and achievements, database use and so on.

## DATA ANALYSIS

The collected data are classified and tabulated according to the objectives and hypotheses stated. First, the data are recorded on data sheets and then fed to the computer personally.

A study of data in Table 1 indicates the faculty wise respondents' frequency of access to e-resources. It is noted that out of the total 300 respondents 34. 33 percent of them most frequently access to e-journals, 29.33 percent of them frequently access to e-journals and the rest 36.33 percent of them occasionally access to e-journals. It is observed that out of the total 300 respondents 37.67 percent of them most frequently access to e-books, 22.00 percent of them frequently access to e-books and the rest 40.33 percent of them occasionally access to e-books.

It is observed that out of the total 300 respondents 32.67 percent of them most frequently access to online data bases, 31.67 percent of them frequently access to online data bases and the rest 35.67 percent of them occasionally access to online data bases. It is significant that out of the total 300 respondents 39.67 percent of them most frequently access to e-articles, 34.00 percent of them frequently access to e-articles and the rest 26.33 percent of them occasionally access to e-articles.

It is noted that out of the total 300 respondents 24.67 percent of them most frequently access to e-publishing, 37.00 percent of them frequently access to e- publishing and the rest 38.33 percent of them occasionally access to e-publishing. It is observed that out of the total 300 respondents 34.33 percent of them most frequently access to reference works such as dictionaries and Encyclopedias, 33.67 percent of them frequently access to reference works and dictionaries/Encyclopedias and the rest 32.00 percent of them occasionally access reference works dictionaries/Encyclopedias. It is noted that out of the total 300 respondents 39.00 percent of them most frequently access to online book shop, 35.00 percent of them frequently access to online book shop and the rest 26.00 percent of them occasionally access online book shop.

It is significant that out of the total 300 respondents 33.33 percent of them most frequently access to model exam papers, 36.67 percent of them frequently access to model exam papers and the rest 30.00 percent of them occasionally access model exam papers. It is noted that out of the total 300 respondents 30.00 percent of them most frequently access to maps , 39.33 percent of them

frequently access to maps and the rest 30.67 percent of them occasionally access to maps.

The faculty wise analysis reveals the following facts. Majority of the respondent of science faculty most frequently access to e-books (56.00%), e-articles (46.00%), online book shop (44.00%) and model exam papers (44.00%). Majority of the respondents of faculty of agriculture occasional access to e-journals (56.00%), e-books(52.00%) and e-publications (46.00%).

Majority of the respondents of faculty of engineering frequently access to online data bases (40.00%), and e-publications (56.00%). A considerable number of respondents of faculty of medicine most frequently access to reference works dictionaries/Encyclopedias (44.00%), online books shop (44.00%) , model exam papers (44.00%) and maps (40.00%).

The anova to a model is applied for further discussion. At one point the computed ANOVA value 3.67 which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation with respect to most frequent access to various internet resources is statistically identified as significant. In another point the computed anova value 1.89 which is lesser than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation among chosen faculties of Annamalai University is statistically identified as insignificant with respect to respondents' most frequent access to various internet resources.

It is seen clearly from the above discussion that respondents mainly most frequently access to e-articles online book shop and e-books. They are occasional access to online data bases and e-publications.

A study of the data in Table 2 designation wise respondents' extent of using various internet resources. Majority of the M.Phil Scholar respondents most frequently use e-articles (48.48%), on-line book shop(48.48%) and maps (37.88%). A considerable number of M.Phil Scholar respondents most frequently use e-journals (40%), e-books (52%) and on-line data bases (48%). Majority of the Integrated Student respondents occasionally use e-journals (36.54%) ,

e-books (48.08%), e-publications (45.19%) and model exam papers(44.23%).

The anova to a model is applied for further discussion. At one point the computed ANOVA value 11.49 which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significants. Hence, variation with respect to most frequent access to various internet resources is statistically identified as significant. In another point the computed anova value 1.30 which is lesser than its tabulated value at 5 per cent level of significant. Hence, variation among chosen designation of respondents of Annamalai university is statistically identified as insignificant with respect to respondents' most frequent access to various internet resources.

It is clear from the above discussion that Ph.D Scholar respondents most frequently use reference works , dictionaries /Encyclopedias and model exam papers.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The findings of frequency of using library reveals the following facts. The Ph.D Scholar respondents considerably use the library daily.

It is found that knowledge about internet resources indicates the followings facts. Majority of the respondents have above average knowledge about internet. The Ph.D Scholar respondents have average knowledge about internet.

From the observations, it is perceived that the main problem in search of internet resources indicates the following facts. The respondents have problems of using internet in terms of lack of time to acquire computer skills to use internet resources, lack of high quality information available from internet resources and access to suitable software.

Rating of Internet Resources indicate the followings facts. A considerable number of respondents state that average level of performance of authority and availability of internet resources. The Ph.D Scholar respondents rate it as excellent performance of timeline internet resources.

## REFERENCES

1. Cohen, G. E. & Kerr, B. A. (1998). Computer mediated counseling: an empirical study of a new mental health treatment. Computers in Human Services, 15 (4), 13-26.

2. Finn, J. & Lavitt, M. (1995). A survey of information technology-related curriculum in undergraduate social work programs. The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 1 (1), 39-53.

3. Grishman, M.H. (1995). Development of a computer information management system. Social Work in Health Care, 22 (2), 73-86.

4. Hile, M. G. (1998). The history and function of the target cities management information systems: an introduction to the special issue. Computers in Human Services, 14 (3/4), 1-8.

5. Howard, M.D. (1995). From oral tradition to computerization: A case study of a social work department. Computers in Human Services, 12 (3-4), 203-219.

6. Linn, N. A., Schneider, S. J., McCreery, R. & Kasab, D. S. (1998). Expert system for utilization of alcohol and drug abuse cases. Computers in Human Services, 15 (4), 1-12.

7. Marlowe-Carr, L. C. (1997). Social workers on-line: a profile. Computers in Human Services, 14 (1), 59-70.

8. Pardeck, J.T. (1997). Computer technology in clinical practice: a critical analysis. Social Work & Social Sciences Review, 7 (2), 101-111.

9. Pardeck, J. (1998). Rationalizing decision-making through computer technology: a critical appraisal. Journal of Health and Social Policy, 9 (4), 19-29.