Discussion of Results

The result derived in the previous chapters is being discussed in the light of studies already conducted on the same aspects and observations made by the investigator.

Purpose of the Visit to Library- It is derived from the results of the present study that 163 respondents visit their library very frequently to get the books issued. According to table No. 4.18 156 respondents visit the library to use periodicals, 54 teachers visit the library to use Doctoral dissertations. 71 and 36 respondents visit the library to use News Paper files and Press cutting respectively. 154 respondents visit the library frequently to use reference books and 104 respondents use proceeding of conference and Seminars. The result of studies carried by Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000), found that 46.03% users mentioned that the major reason for visiting library was to get books issued while 44.44% users reported that they visit the library for using reference material frequently while 31.48% users visited the library for periodicals.

Frequency of Visit to the Library – The results of the present studies indicates that 16(9.41%) respondents visit their library daily, 38(22.36%) respondents visit their library more than
once a week, 31(18.23%) respondents visit their library once a week, 14(8.23%) visit fortnightly and 11(6.47%) visit library monthly.

Maximum number of respondents i.e. 60(35.29%) visit library when there is need, whereas the studies by Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) indicates that 101(32.06%) Social Scientist visits their library daily.

Sources of Information

Books and Reference Books – The present study shows that 163 (95.88) respondents consult reference books. Guha (1992) mentioned that 27.2% respondents preferred books. The results are supported by Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) that 93 respondents gave first priority to books, 149 respondents gave second priority to books, 48 respondents gave third priority to books and 15 respondents gave fourth priority to books. Total 305 respondents preferred books.

Journals: - In the present study, a majority of respondents 104 (61.17%) mentioned abstracting journals and 71(41.76%) mentioned other journals. Agarwal and Chakraborty (1995) reported that second important source was mentioned indexing & abstracting journals. Prasad and Tripathi (1998) found Journals as
the most frequently used source of information among the social scientist.

**Periodicals:** - In the present study, a majority of respondents 156 (91.76%) preferred Periodicals, the similar results were reported in some studies such as Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) found that 62.54% respondents preferred periodicals; Korah and Deverajan (1991) reported that current periodicals were the most important source of Information.

**Research Report:** - The present results indicate that 54 (31.76%) respondents pointed out research report. The result of studies carried by Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) found that 101 respondents printed out dissertation thesis as their fifth priority, 60 respondents pointed out dissertation/Thesis as their fourth Priority, only 6 (1.9%) respondents pointed out first Priority, Total 70.79% respondents preferred dissertation/thesis.

**News Paper Files:** - 71 (41.76%) respondents indicated their preference for the Newspaper files.
**Document and Official Documents**: - In the present study, 57 (33.52%) respondents preferred documents and 49 (28.82%) preferred official documents.

**Proceedings of Conference/Seminars**: - The present study shows that 104 (61.17%) respondents preferred proceedings of conference and Seminars. The results are supported by Parmar (2002) that 171 (59.1%) respondents preferred proceedings of conference and Seminars, whereas 57, 35, 19 and 9 respondents showed their fourth, third, second and first priority respectively. However, Guha (1992) revealed that 11.4% respondents showed their first preference for conference and Seminar proceedings.

**Usefulness of Library Service**: - Circulation service is considered useful by 91 (53.53%) respondents. 63 (37.05%) respondents considered circulation service as very useful, whereas only 26 respondents considered this service not useful at all. 104 (61.17%) respondents considered reference service to be very useful and 32 (18.82%) respondents considered this service to be little useful. Only 32 (18.82%) respondents considered indexing service to be very useful. In the case of abstracting service only 26 (15.29%) respondents considered it to be useful. 63 (37.05%) respondents ranked the photocopying service to be very useful.
whereas 19(11.17%) respondents ranked this service to be little useful. 54(31.17%) respondents mentioned the current awareness service to be very useful. Whereas 26(15.29%) respondents mentioned this service to be little useful. The results of the previous studies are also more or less of the same nature.

Krishna Reddy and Karisidappa (1997) found that indexing & abstracting services and the computer-aided services are less frequently used services. Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) found that circulation service is the most frequently used service.

**Purpose of Using Periodicals:** - The results of the present study reveals that a maximum number of teachers of Allahabad University use periodicals for the purpose of updating knowledge. 115(67.65%) respondents frequently used periodicals for updating knowledge. 88(51.76%) respondents used the periodicals for the purpose of research work, 74(43.53%) used for the purpose of teaching work and 69 (40.58%) respondents used the periodicals for general awareness purpose 42(24.71%) respondents used periodicals for some other purposes.

The Study by Parmar (2002) revealed that maximum number of respondents use periodicals for the purpose of updating knowledge, 64.01%(185) respondents frequently use periodicals
for updating knowledge, 51.21%(148) respondents use periodicals for the purpose of research work. Agarwal and Chakraborty (1995) revealed that 89.32% scholars consult primary periodicals for keeping abreast of current developments in their respective field of study.

**Helpfulness of Librarian and his Staff:** The result of the present study indicate that 51(30%) respondents mentioned that the librarian and his staff of University library of Allahabad, are always helpful. 48(28.24%) respondents mentioned that they are helpful sometimes, 34(20%) respondents said they are often helpful, 26(15.29%) respondents reported them to be rarely helpful, while 11(6.47%) respondents reported them to be never helpful. However, Sanjeev Kumar and Mishra (1992) revealed that library staff was found helpful by an overwhelming majority (66.66%) of respondents. Singh (1995) maintained that a majority of respondents found library staff as helpful. Adedien and Adio (1997) found that all the respondents agreed that the library staff is always willing to assist. Parmar (2002) revealed that a majority of 81 respondents found the librarian and his staff always helpful.

**Assessment of Arrangement of Library Opening**

**Hours:** In the present study 21 respondents informed that library
opening hours to be very convenient and 32 respondents mentioned fairly convenient, 78 respondents said library opening hours are convenient, 18 respondents said inconvenient while 21 respondents informed the library opening hours to be very inconvenient. Some earlier studies also reported the similar results. Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) found that arrangement of library opening hours was assessed as very convenient by 20% respondents, fairly convenient by 31.75% and convenient by 36.51% respondents. Singh (1995) reported that a majority of respondents assessed the library opening hours were convenient. Parmar (1995) also reported that a majority of respondents (136) assessed the library opening hours were convenient.

**Assessment of Library Collection:** It is revealed from the results of the present study that 33 and 44 respondents mentioned the use of library collection upto 90% and 75% respectively. None of respondents said that 100% of library collection is used. 58 respondents mentioned the use of library collection upto 50% and 22 respondents mentioned the use of library collection upto 25%. 13 respondents mentioned that less than 25% of library collection is used.

However, Singh (1995) found that a majority of respondents feel their library collection is well. Ashu Shokein and Sanjay Kumar (2000) found that a majority of 160 respondents
considered literature of their respective Universities to be adequate. Prasad and Tripathi (1998) reported that 100% Social Scientists were very much dissatisfied with information sources and services by the library and the whole library needs to be improved tremendously. Parmar (2002) reported that 41 and 34 respondents considered their respective library collection to be excellent & very adequate, while 98 respondents reported their respective library collection to be adequate and 74 respondents reported their respective library collection to be in adequate and 42 respondents reported it to be poor.

**Training Programmes for Users** – The result of the present study indicates that 46(27.06%) respondents mentioned that library should provide training programmes to users up to a very great extent. 29 and 66 respondents mentioned great extent and some extent respectively. 19 respondents reported that library should provide training programme to users up to a little extent and only 10 respondent mentioned that there is no need of any training programme for users at all. The results are supported by Guha (1992) that 47.2% respondents preferred training programmes for users.
**Time Spent in Library:** - In the present study, a majority of respondents 85(50%) mentioned that they spent more than a hour in library while 7, 31, 47 respondents spent 11-20 minutes, 21-30 minutes and 31-60 minutes respectively. The results are supported by the study of Parmar (2002) that 10(3.46%) respondents spent upto 10 minutes, 23(7.96%) spent 11-20 minutes, 77(26.64%) spent 20-30 minutes, 96(33.22%) respondents spent 30-60 minutes and 83(23.72%) respondents mentioned that they spent more than one hour.