CHAPTER – V

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Introduction

The analysis has been done based on the data collected through questionnaire method with a view to ascertain the demographic characteristics of the respondents, the extent of use of library facilities, the purpose for which they seek and collect information, the major source of information, the usefulness of various sources of information, users satisfaction of library services, the availability of e-resources, awareness of e-resources available in library, utilization of e-resources, and usefulness of e-resources in job related tasks among the users of Corporation of Chennai Library (hereafter CCL). The responses were coded and data have been presented in the form of tables and graphs/charts along with interpretations. To accomplish the major objectives of the study, the data were subjected to statistical techniques i.e. Mean, Standard Deviation, Coefficient of Variance, Chi-square Test, and Percentage Test.

A) DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

5.2 Category-wise distribution of questionnaire and response among users
As stated in chapter 4, a total of 425 questionnaires, which is 50% of total population, were distributed among the users of eight different departments to find out the effectiveness of information seeking behaviour of the engineers of CCL. Of these, a total of 300 questionnaires duly filled by the respondents were received back. There are four categories of users such as Level-I, Level-II, Level-III, and Level-IV. An account of category wise status of distribution of questionnaire has been stated in Table 5.1.

The Table shows that out of a total of 425 questionnaires distributed, all the respondents divided into four categories viz. Level-I, Level-II, Level-III, and Level-IV were given 41, 266, 61, and 57 respectively. However, a total of 300 responses out of 425 questionnaires distributed from all the categories together were received back. The overall response rate comes to 70.59 percent.

5.3 Distribution of department wise status of responses

A sample of 300 respondents was studied to analyze the information seeking behavior of the users of CCL. The results of the analysis (Table 5.1) showed that out of eight departments which were commonly identified from both the organizations, the response rate of Electrical Engineering comes first recording the highest response rate of 77.59 percent followed by Mechanical Engineering (75%), Parks and Play Fields (73.08%), Building Engineering (72.73%), Works Department (70.73%), Bridges (68.25%), Solid Waste Management (65.22%) and Storm Water Drain (58.14%).
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## Table 5.1: Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Level - I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Level - II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Level - III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Level - IV</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Drain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Play Fields</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.1: Distribution of department wise response status

[Diagram showing the distribution of department wise response status with bars for different departments such as Works Dept, Mech, Electric, Solid Waste, Buildings, Storm Water, Bridges, Parks and Play, showing the number of respondents at different response levels (Level-I, Level-II, Level-III, Level-IV).]
On the other hand, the highest response rate (73.31%) was recorded by the Level–II employees of CCL. It is quite interesting that out of 266 questionnaires distributed duly filled in were received back. The response rate of the remaining levels as per the ranking is as follows: Level-III (68.85%); Level-IV (68.42%); and Level-I (58.54%).

On the whole, it was observed that response rate of all the departments was quite encouraging. However the highest response rate among eight departments was achieved by Electrical Engineering sharing 77.59 percent while the lowest was recorded by Storm Drain (58.14%).

It could be deduced from the above discussion that out of four categories of employees of CCL, the response rate of Level-II employees that amounts to 73.31% was found to be the highest. It is quite interesting that out of 266 questionnaires distributed duly filled in were received back. The response rate of the remaining levels as per the ranking was fund to be 68.85%, 68.42%, and 58.54% by the employees of Level-III, Level-IV and Level-I respectively.

5.4 Distribution of respondents by Gender

Table 5.2 presents the gender wise distribution of respondents. The result revealed that out of 300 respondents, 199 are males and 101 are
females. Among 199 males 137 that accounts for 68.84 percent belongs to Level-II category ranks first followed by Level-III (13.07%), and 9.05% each by Level-I and Level-IV employees. Out of 101 females 58 that accounts for 57.43 percent belongs to Level-II category ranks first followed by Level-IV (13.07%), Level-II (13.07%) and Level-I (5.94%).

The overall response revealed that 199 respondents which constitute 66.33 percent are males and 101 (33.67%) are females. The gender wise response by category revealed that Level-II employees record first sharing 65% followed by Level-III (14%), Level-IV (13%) and Level-I (8%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>68.84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.43</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199 (66.33%)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>101 (33.67%)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300 (100%)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Department wise distribution of respondents by Gender

As the result of gender wise distribution indicated in Table 5.2 was quite impressive, an attempt was made to analyse the department wise strength of male and female respondents of CCL. The result of the gender wise analysis of eight departments as reported in Table 5.3 shows that out of 300 total respondents, 199 are males and 101 are females.

Out of 199 males, it was found that 58 respondents from Parks and Play Fields department occupied the first position sharing 29.15% of the total respondents followed by Bridges (22.11%), Electrical Engineering (18.59%), Mechanical Engineering (7.04%), Solid Waste Management (7.04%), Storm Water Drain (6.53%), Buildings Department (5.53%), and Works Department (4.02%).

As far as the female respondents are concerned, Parks and Play Fields department occupies the first position sharing 26.73 percent of the total respondents followed by Electrical Engineering (17.82%), Bridges (15.84%), Buildings Department (8.91%), Storm Water Drain (8.91%), Mechanical Engineering (7.92%), Solid Waste Management (7.92%), and Works Department (5.94%).

Therefore, it could be concluded from the above discussion that the majority of the respondents irrespective of the gender were from Parks and
Play Fields, Bridges, and Electrical Engineering. Their percentage share comes to 28.33 percent, 20 percent and 18.33 percent respectively. The response of the other departments namely Mechanical Engineering, Solid Waste Management, and Storm Water Drain was quite encouraging with a percentage share of 7.33 each. And the response of the remaining two departments namely Building Department (6.67%), and Works Department (4.67%) which is quite low as compared to the other departments. However the highest number of respondents was observed from Parks and Play Fields department (28.33%) while the lowest was recorded by Works Department (4.67%).

5.6 Distribution of respondents by Age

Table 5.4 presents the age wise distribution of the respondents from CCL. The result shows that out of 24 respondents from Level-I employees of Chennai Corporation, 7 (29.17%) are between the age group of 31 – 35; another 7 (29.17%) are between the age group of 36-40; 6 (25%) are between the age group of 41 – 50; 2 (8.33%) are between the age group of 26-30; and another 2 (8.33%) are between the age group of above 50.

On the other hand, out of 195 respondents from Level-II employees of Chennai Corporation, 64 (32.82%) are between the age group of 36 – 40; 61 (31.28%) are between the age group of 31-35; 45 (23.08%) are between the age group of 41 – 50; 15 (7.69%) are between the age group of 26-30; and 10 (5.13%) are between the age group of above 50.
### Table 5.3: Department Wise Distribution of respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Play Fields</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Drain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Department</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Department</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.2: Department wise distribution of respondents by Gender

- Works Dept: 6 Female, 14 Male
- Mech: 8 Female, 8 Male
- Electri: 18 Female, 37 Male
- Solid Waste: 9 Female, 11 Male
- Buildings: 9 Female, 13 Male
- Storm Water: 16 Female, 44 Male
- Bridges: 27 Female, 58 Male

Legend:
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As far as the respondents from Level-III employees of Chennai Corporation are concerned, the age wise analysis revealed that out of 42 respondents, 15 (35.71%) are between the age group of 36 – 40; 13 (30.95%) are between the age group of 31-35; 6 (14.29%) are between the age group of 41-50; another 6 (14.29%) are between the age group of 26-30; and 2 (4.76%) are between the age group of above 50.

With regard to Level-IV employees, out of 39, 13 (33.33%) fall under the age group of 31-35; 12 (30.77%) are between 36-40; 6 (15.38%) are between 41-50; 5 (12.82%) are between 26-30; and 3 (7.69%) are between the age group of Above 50.

The overall result expresses that out of 300 total respondents, 98 (32.67%) are between the age group of 36-40; 94 (31.33%) are between the age group of 31-35; 63 (21%) are between the age group of 41-50; 28 (9.33%) are between the age group of 26-30; and 17 (5.67%) are between the age group of above 50.

As a result, it was found that majority of the respondents are between the age group of 36-40 and 31-35. The percentage share comes to more than 60 percent which is quite high out of the total population. It is significant that 63 respondents that constitute 21 percent fall under the age group of 41-50. However the lower percentage share is recorded by the age group of 26-30 and Above 50 sharing 9.33 percent and 5.67 percent respectively.
Table 5.4: Category wise distribution of respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.3: Category wise distribution of respondents by Age
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B) LIBRARY USE

5.7 Distribution of opinion on the visit to library

Table 5.5 presents the analysis of the opinion of the respondents on the visit to library. The result indicates that out of 300 total respondents, 221 respondents are of the opinion that they visited library while the remaining 79 respondents were not.

Out of 221 respondents who were of the opinion of visiting the library, 159 (71.95%) were from Level-II employees, 27 (12.22%) were from Level-III employees, 19 (8.6%) were from Level-I employees and 16 (7.24%) were from Level-IV employees. On the other hand, 79 respondents were not of the opinion of visiting library. Out of 79 respondents, 36 (45.57%) were from Level-II employees, 23 (29.11%) were from Level-IV employees, 15 (18.99%) were from Level-III employees, and 5 (6.33%) were from Level-I employees.

Therefore, it could be deduced from the above discussion that the majority of the respondents were interested in visiting the library. It is evident from the result that out of 300 total respondents, 221 (73.66%) were of the opinion of visiting library while the remaining 79 (26.34%) were not. Therefore, it is obvious that the effective usage of library depends on the age, maturity, information need as well as information seeking skills, etc. which were found in the engineers of Chennai Corporation.
Table 5.5: Distribution of opinion on the visit to library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>71.95</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.57</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.4: Distribution of opinion on the visit to library
5.8 Distribution of frequency of visit to library

Table 5.6 presents the results of frequency of visit to library by the respondents from CCL. The result shows that out of 24 respondents from Level-I employees of Chennai Corporation, 8 (33.33%) visited the library once in fortnight; 5 (20.83%) visited the library once in a week; 4 (16.67%) visited the library once in a month; 3 (12.5%) visited the library daily; another 3 (12.5%) visited the library occasionally; and 1 (4.17%) never visited the library.

On the other hand, out of 195 respondents from Level-II employees of Chennai Corporation, 94 (48.21%) visited the library daily; 46 (23.59%) visited the library once in a week; 24 (12.31%) visited the library once in fortnight; 12 (6.15%) never visited the library; 10 (5.13%) visited the library once in a month; and 9 (4.62%) visited the library occasionally.

As far as the respondents from Level-III employees of Chennai Corporation are concerned, 17 (40.48%) visited the library daily; 12 (28.57%) visited the library once in a week; 5 (11.9%) visited the library once in fortnight; 3 (7.14%) never visited the library; another 3 (7.14%) visited the library once in a month; and 2 (4.76%) visited the library occasionally.
With regard to Level-IV employees, 13 (33.33%) visited the library daily; 10 (25.64%) visited the library once in a week; 7 (17.95%) visited the library once in fortnight; 3 (7.69%) visited the library once in a month; 3 (7.69%) never visited the library; and another 3 (7.69%) visited the library occasionally.

The overall result expresses that out of 300 total respondents, 127 (42.33%) visited the library daily; 73 (24.33%) visited the library once in a week; 44 (14.67%) visited the library once in fortnight; 20 (6.67%) visited the library once in a month; 19 (6.33%) never visited the library; and 17 (5.67%) visited the library occasionally.

An attempt was made to ascertain the consistency of the respondents in visiting library. It was found that the better consistency was found in the case of Level-I employees as compared to the other categories. It is supported by the lowest C.V. (59.16%) followed by Level-IV employees (65.81%), Level-III employees (87.13%), and Level-II employees (102.19%).

From the above discussion, it is clear that majority of the respondents visited the library frequently while only 6.33 percent of the respondents never visited the library.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>42.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.V.</strong></td>
<td>59.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>102.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.9 Distribution of opinion on the timings of the library

Table 5.7 presents the analysis of the opinion of the respondents on the timings of the library. The result indicates that out of 300 total respondents, 208 respondents were of the opinion that the timings of the library were convenient while the remaining 92 responded that the timings of the library were not convenient.

Out of 208 respondents who were of the opinion that the timings of the library were convenient, 141 (67.79%) were from Level-II employees, 31 (14.9%) were from Level-III employees, 19 (9.13%) were from Level-IV employees and 17 (8.17%) were from Level-I employees.

On the other hand, 92 respondents were not of the opinion that the timings of the library were convenient. Out of 92 respondents, 54 (58.7%) were from Level-II employees, 20 (21.74%) were from Level-IV employees, 11 (11.96%) were from Level-III employees and 7 (7.61%) were from Level-I employees.

Therefore, it could be deduced from the above discussion that the majority of the respondents were satisfied with the working hours of the library. It is evident from the result that out of 300 total respondents, 208 respondents, which account for 69.33 percent, were satisfied with the
working hours of the library while the remaining 92 (30.67%) were not. However, it was noticed that quite a number (34.11%) of respondents were not satisfied with the working hours of the library. This is an indication for the libraries to modify the timings of the libraries in order to satisfy the needs of their users. The constant efforts toward this direction should be made to fill the gap by CCL, Chennai.

Table 5.7: Distribution of opinion on the timings of the library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>67.79</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10 Distribution of opinion on the level of satisfaction with the library resources

Table 5.8 indicates the distribution of opinion on the level of satisfaction with the library resources in CCL, Chennai. The result showed
that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 35 (12.41%) were Very satisfied; 5 (20.83%) were Satisfied; 6 (25%) were Somewhat satisfied; another 6 (25%) were Less satisfied; 3 (12.5%) were Least satisfied; and 2 (8.33%) were Not at all satisfied. Out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 68 (34.87%) were Very satisfied; 54 (27.69%) were Satisfied; 29 (14.87%) were Somewhat satisfied; 18 (9.23%) were Less satisfied; 15 (7.69%) were Least satisfied; and 11 (5.64%) were Not at all satisfied. The overall result shows that out of 300 total respondents, 88 (29.33%) were Very satisfied; 79 (26.33%) were Satisfied; 50 (16.67%) were Somewhat satisfied; 37 (12.33%) were Less satisfied; 27 (9%) were Least satisfied; and 19 (6.33%) were Not at all satisfied.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 12 (28.57%) were Very satisfied; 11 (26.19%) were Satisfied; 8 (19.05%) were Somewhat satisfied; 5 (11.9%) were Less satisfied; 4 (9.52%) were Least satisfied; and 2 (4.76%) were Not at all satisfied. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 6 (15.38%) were Very satisfied; 9 (23.08%) were Satisfied; 7 (17.95%) were Somewhat satisfied; 8 (20.51%) were Less satisfied; 5 (12.82%) were Least satisfied; and 4 (10.26%) were Not at all satisfied. The overall result shows that out of 300 total respondents, 88 (29.33%) were Very satisfied; 79 (26.33%) were Satisfied; 50 (16.67%) were Somewhat satisfied; 37 (12.33%) were Less satisfied; 27 (9%) were Least satisfied; and 19 (6.33%) were Not at all satisfied.

It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents were satisfied with the resources available in the library of Chennai Corporation. It is evident from the result that 84.67 percent of the
respondents combining all the categories together were satisfied while the remaining 15.33 percent of the respondents were either least satisfied or not at all satisfied. Though the percentage of respondents, who were not satisfied with the resources, is a bit low a proper care needs to be taken for effective and efficient utilization of resources available in CCL, Chennai.

5.11 Distribution of preference of sources used for required Information

Table 5.9 presents the distribution of sources preferred by the respondents for required information. The data were analysed based on the 21 parameters. The result indicates that out of 21 listed items, Consultation with experts in the field (91.67%) was the highest preference of the Level-I employees followed by Internet search engines (87.5%), Conversation with colleagues (87.5%), Electronic databases (87.5%), Browsing the collections in libraries (79.17%), Attending conferences, seminars, and workshops (79.17%), Library catalogues (70.83%), Review articles (70.83%), Listserv / e-mail alerts/ newsgroups (66.67%), Media: TV, radio, and newspapers (66.67%), Publisher catalogues (62.5%), and so on.
Table 5.8: Distribution of opinion on the level of satisfaction about the library resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.5: Distribution of opinion on the level of satisfaction about the library resources
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In the case of Level-II employees, the result showed that Consultation with experts in the field (78.97%) was the highest preference followed by Listserv / e-mail alerts/ newsgroups (75.9%), Internet search engines (74.36%), Conversation with colleagues (70.26%), Websites of bookstores (66.15%), Attending conferences, seminars, and workshops (64.62%), Media: TV, radio, and newspapers (63.08%), Library catalogues (61.54%), Browsing the collections in libraries (60.51%), Current awareness services of libraries (60%), Indexing journals (59.49%), Review articles (57.44%), Book reviews (56.41%), and so on.

In respect of Level-III employees, the result showed that Consultation with experts in the field (76.19%) was the highest preference followed by Internet search engines (69.05%), Current awareness services of libraries (59.52%), Conversation with colleagues (57.14%), Indexing journals (54.76%), Browsing the collections in libraries (50%), Listserv / e-mail alerts/ newsgroups (47.62%), Library catalogues (47.62%), Review articles (47.62%), and so on.

With regard to Level-IV employees, the result showed that Consultation with experts in the field (79.49%) was the highest preference followed by Listserv / e-mail alerts/ newsgroups (76.92%), Internet search engines (74.36%), Conversation with colleagues (71.79%), Websites of bookstores (64.1%), Attending conferences, seminars, and workshops
(64.1%), Media: TV, radio, and newspapers (64.1%), Current awareness services of libraries (61.54%), Browsing the collections in libraries (61.54%), Library catalogues (61.54%), Indexing journals (58.97%), Review articles (58.97%), Book reviews (56.41%), Publisher catalogues (56.41%), Electronic databases (56.41%), and so on.

According to overall response, it was found that Consultation with experts in the field (59.75%) was the highest priority given for getting required information by the respondents. The other preferred choices were Internet search engines (56%), Listserv / e-mail alerts/ newsgroups (53.5%), Conversation with colleagues (52.5%), Attending conferences, seminars, and workshops (47%), Websites of bookstores (46.75%), Media: TV, radio, and newspapers (45.5%), Browsing the collections in libraries (45.5%), Library catalogues (45.25%), Current awareness services of libraries (45%), Indexing journals (43.75%), Review articles (43%), Electronic databases (42.25%), Publisher catalogues (41%), Book reviews (40.5%), Conversation with library staff (39.25%), and so on.

5.12 Distribution of importance of the information resources used in work related activities

Table 5.10 presents the distribution of importance of the information resources used in work related activities of Chennai Corporation Building. The data were analysed based on the 20 items listed in the questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with experts in the field</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>78.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet search engines</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current awareness services of libraries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation with colleagues</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>70.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexing journals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>59.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing the collections in libraries</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library catalogues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listserv / e-mail alerts/ newsgroups</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>75.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review articles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites of bookstores e.g., Amazon.com</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book reviews</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending conferences, seminars, and</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher catalogues</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media: TV, radio, and newspapers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic databases</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation with library staff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52.31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting book stores</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52.31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations (References in material used)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private or personal correspondence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprints received from authors/publishers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result indicates that out of 20 listed items, Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field, Discussion with colleagues, and Internet news groups and discussion forums sharing 83.33% each was the highest preference of the Level-I employees followed by Journals (79.17%), Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars (75%), Theses and dissertations (75%), Reference books (75%), Research reports (70.83%), Indexes and abstracts (70.83%), Electronic databases (66.67%), Bibliographies, Textbooks, Audiovisuals, General books/Monographs, Pamphlets and brochures (each 54.17%), and so on.

In the case of Level-II employees, the result showed that Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field sharing 85.13% was the highest preference of the Level-II employees followed by Discussion with colleagues (83.59%), Internet news groups and discussion forums (77.44%), Journals (70.77%), Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars (65.13%), Electronic databases (63.8%), Textbooks (61.96%), Audiovisuals (61.96%), Research reports (60.74%), Theses and dissertations (60.51%), Reference books (60.51%), Indexes and abstracts (53.37%), General books/Monographs (53.37%), Bibliographies (52.15%), Pamphlets and brochures (51.53%), and so on.

In respect of Level-III employees, the result showed that Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field,
Discussion with colleagues, and Internet news groups and discussion forums sharing 85.71% each was the highest preference of the Level-III employees followed by Journals (83.33%), Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars (80.95%), Theses and dissertations (76.19%), Reference books (73.81%), Research reports (73.81%), Indexes and abstracts (69.05%), Electronic databases (69.05%), Bibliographies, Textbooks, Audiovisuals, General books/Monographs, Pamphlets and brochures (each 57.14%), Pamphlets and brochures (54.76%), TV and radio (52.38%), and so on.

With regard to Level-IV employees, the result showed that Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field, and Discussion with colleagues sharing 84.62% each was the highest preference of the Level-IV employees followed by Internet news groups and discussion forums (76.92%), Journals (69.23%), Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars (66.67%), Electronic databases (64.1%), Theses and dissertations, Reference books, Research reports, Textbooks, Audiovisuals (each 61.54%), Indexes and abstracts and General books/Monographs (53.85%), Bibliographies and Pamphlets and brochures (each 51.28%) and so on.

According to overall response, it was noticed that Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field sharing 63.75 percent was
the highest preference followed by Discussion with colleagues (63%), Internet news groups and discussion forums (59.25%), Journals (54.75%), Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars (51.25%), Theses and dissertations (48%), Reference books (47.75%), Research reports (47.61%), and so on. However, it was observed that the response of first eight choices was found to be similar among all the categories of employees. Therefore, it is obvious that consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field was the prominent source used by the employees of Chennai Corporation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>85.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with colleagues</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>83.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet newsgroups and discussion forums</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>77.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>65.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses and dissertations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference books</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexes and abstracts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic databases (CD-ROM)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM and online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>61.96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisuals (videos, slides, sound recordings)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>61.96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General books/Monographs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlets and brochures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.87</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and radio</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps, atlases, guidebooks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts and archives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.13 Distribution of options required for the respondents to use library resources

An attempt was made to analyse the options required for the respondents to use library resources and presented the results in Table 5.11. The Table indicates that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 10 (41.67%) were in favour of Library Orientation followed by Printed instructions (20.83%), Individual assistance at the reference desk (16.67%), Study related instructions from the library staff (12.5%), Individual appointment with the librarian (4.17%), and Help from friends and colleagues (4.17%). Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 75 (38.46%) were in favour of Library Orientation followed by Printed instructions (22.05%), Study related instructions from the library staff (17.95%), Individual assistance at the reference desk (10.77%), Help from friends and colleagues (6.67%), and Individual appointment with the librarian (4.1%).

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 14 (33.33%) were in favour of Library Orientation followed by Printed instructions (26.19%), Individual assistance at the reference desk (11.9%), Study related instructions from the library staff, Individual appointment with the librarian, and Help from friends and colleagues (each 9.52%) whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 14 (35.9%) were in
favour of Library Orientation followed by Printed instructions (28.21%), Individual assistance at the reference desk (17.95%), Help from friends and colleagues (7.69%), Study related instructions from the library staff (5.13%), and Individual appointment with the librarian (5.13%).

The overall result showed that out of 300, 113 (37.67%) were in favour of Library Orientation followed by Printed instructions (23.33%), Study related instructions from the library staff (14.67%), Individual assistance at the reference desk (12.33%), Help from friends and colleagues (7%), and Individual appointment with the librarian (5%).

It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents were in favour of Library Orientation and Printed instructions. It is evident from the result that more than 50 percent of the respondents combining all the categories preferred Library Orientation and Printed instructions while the remaining 50 percent of the respondents were in favour of the other options viz. Individual assistance at the reference desk, Study related instructions from the library staff, Help from friends and colleagues, and Individual appointment with the librarian.
Table 5.11: Distribution of options required for the respondents to use library resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Option</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study related instructions from the library staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual assistance at the reference desk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed instructions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual appointment with the librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from friends and colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) INFORMATION SEEKING PATTERN

5.14 Distribution of the preference of the respondents in using information resources for their job related works

Table 5.12 represents the distribution of the preference of respondents in using information resources for their job related works. The result showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 11 (45.83%) preferred electronic medium while 10 (41.67%) preferred print medium; 2 (8.33%) preferred audio-visual formats; and 1 (4.17%) preferred audio format. Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 78 (40%) preferred electronic medium while 63 (32.31%) preferred print medium; 32 (16.41%) preferred audio-visual formats; and 22 (11.28%) preferred audio format.

On the other hand, out of 42 employees of Level-III category, 17 (40.48%) preferred electronic medium while 14 (33.33%) preferred print medium; 6 (14.29%) preferred audio-visual formats; and 5 (11.9%) preferred audio format. Whereas out of 39 employees of Level-IV category, 16 (41.03%) preferred electronic medium while 12 (30.77%) preferred print medium; 6 (15.38%) preferred audio-visual formats; and 5 (12.82%) preferred audio format.
The overall result shows that out of 300 employees of all category, 122 (40.67%) preferred electronic medium while 99 (33%) preferred print medium; 46 (15.33%) preferred audio-visual formats; and 33 (11%) preferred audio format.

It could be observed from the above discussion that majority of the respondents preferred electronic format of information available in the library of Chennai Corporation. It is evident from the result that 84.67 percent of the respondents combining all the categories together preferred non-print sources such as electronic (40.67%), audio format (11%), and audio-visual format (15.33%) while the remaining 15.33 percent of the respondents preferred print medium. Therefore, it is clear that the non-print media are getting momentum among the employees of Chennai Corporation.

5.15 Distribution of the mode of acquiring required information resources

An analysis was carried out to study the mode of acquiring the required information by the respondents of CCL. The result, as shown in Table 5.13, revealed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 14 (58.33%) get the required information from their library while 4 (16.67%) acquire through personal collections; another 4 (16.67%) from their colleagues; 2 (8.33%) by purchase. Whereas out of 195 respondents of
Table 5.12: Distribution of the preference of the respondents in using information resources for their job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level-II category, 87 (44.62%) get the required information from their library while 51 (26.15%) from their colleagues; 26 (13.33%) by purchase; 23 (11.79%) acquire through personal collections; and 8 (4.1%) got through Free of cost/Donations.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 20 (47.62%) get the required information from their library while 12 (28.57%) from their colleagues; 5 (11.9%) acquire through personal collections; 4 (9.52%) by purchase; and 1 (2.38%) got through Free of cost/Donations. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 20 (51.28%) get the required information from their library while 10 (25.64%) from their colleagues; 5 (12.82%) acquire through personal collections; and 4 (10.26%) by purchase.

The overall result showed that out of 300 respondents of all the categories, 141 (47%) get the required information from their library while 77 (25.67%) managed from their colleagues; 37 (12.33%) acquired through personal collections; 36 (12%) by purchase; and 9 (3%) got through Free of cost/Donations.

It is clear from the above discussion that majority of the respondents got their required information sources from their library. It is evident from the result that 141 respondents, who constitute 47 percent, got their
information from Chennai Corporation Library. The remaining respondents acquired their required information from other sources such as through personal collection, by purchase, from colleagues, and on free of cost/donations. It is very interesting that majority of the respondents depend on their own library (CCL) in getting required information for their job related activities.

5.16 Distribution of the place of conducting information-seeking activities

Table 5.14 presents the distribution of the place of conducting information-seeking activities by the respondents. The result revealed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 12 (50%) conducted information seeking activities at their library while 6 (25%) did at home; 5 (20.83%) did at workplace; and the remaining 1 (4.17%) did at other places like internet café, etc. Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 75 (38.46%) conducted information seeking activities at their library while 61 (31.28%) did at workplace; 37 (18.97%) did at home; and the remaining 22 (11.28%) did at other places like internet café, etc.
Table 5.13: Distribution of the source of acquiring required information by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Acquiring Required Information</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental library</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free of cost/Donations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 17 (40.48%) conducted information seeking activities at their library while 14 (33.33%) did at workplace; 7 (16.67%) did at home; and the remaining 4 (9.52%) did at other places like internet café, etc. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 15 (38.46%) conducted information seeking activities at their library while 11 (28.21%) did at workplace; 7 (17.95%) did at other places like internet café, etc; and the remaining 6 (15.38%) did at home.

The overall result shows that out of 300 total respondents, 119 (39.67%) conducted information seeking activities at their library while 91 (30.33%) did at workplace; 56 (18.67%) did at home; and the remaining 34 (11.33%) did at other places like internet café, etc. It is obvious from the above discussion that majority of the respondents conducted information seeking activities at their library. It is evident from the result that 119 respondents, who constitute 39.67 percent, conducted information seeking activities at their library. The remaining respondents conducted information seeking activities at their work place and home. It is very interesting that majority of the respondents depend on their own library (CCL) in conducting information seeking activities for getting required information for their job related activities.
5.17 Distribution of communication channels used for information-seeking

Table 5.15 presents the results of distribution of communication channels used for information-seeking activities by the respondents. The result revealed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 11 (45.83%) used email as a channel for information-seeking activities while 7 (29.17%) used personal meeting; 4 (16.67%) used telephone; 1 (4.17%) used postal mail; and the remaining 1 (4.17%) used Fax. Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 78 (40%) used personal meeting as a channel for information-seeking activities while 59 (30.26%) used email; 29 (14.87%) used Fax; 15 (7.69%) used telephone; and the remaining 14 (7.18%) used postal mail.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 17 (40.48%) used email as a channel for information-seeking activities while 13 (30.95%) used personal meeting; 8 (19.05%) used Fax; 2 (4.76%) used telephone; and the remaining 2 (4.76%) used postal mail. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 16 (41.03%) used email as a channel for information-seeking activities while 8 (20.51%) used personal meeting; another 8 (20.51%) used Fax; 5 (12.82%) used telephone; and the remaining 2 (5.13%) used postal mail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Access</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>39.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall result showed that out of 300 total respondents, 106 (35.33%) used personal meeting as a channel for information-seeking activities while 103 (34.33%) used email; 46 (15.33%) used Fax; 26 (8.67%) used telephone; and the remaining 19 (6.33%) used postal mail.

It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents used email and personal meetings/interaction as channels for conducting information seeking activities. It is evident from the result that 106 respondents, who constitute 35.33 percent, used personal meetings/interaction as a channel for conducting information seeking activities and 103 respondents (34.33%) used email as a channel for conducting information seeking activities. The remaining respondents used the other channels for information seeking activities such as Fax, Telephone, and Postal mail. It is quite surprising that email was used as an important channel for conducting information seeking activities by majority of the respondents.

5.18 Distribution of use of methods and sources for current awareness

Nowadays, it is important for every researcher to be aware of the current literature through various methods and sources. In this regard, an attempt was made to analyse the methods and sources used by the employees of CCL for making themselves aware of the current literature in their respective fields. Table 5.16 presents the distribution of use of
Table 5.15: Distribution of communication channels used for information-seeking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting personally / Face to face discussions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal mail (Writing letter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
methods and sources for current awareness. The data were analysed based on the thirteen parameters. The result indicates that out of 13 listed items, Through email alerts as a method opted by 5 respondents of Level-I category which accounts for 20.83 percent was the highest preference followed by Consulting experts in subject field (12.5%), Browsing publishers’ catalogues (12.5%), Discussions with colleagues (8.33%), Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals (8.33%), Reading newsletters (8.33%), Through current awareness services of libraries like CAS, SDI & Content Page Service (8.33%), and so on. Whereas Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals as a method opted by 26 respondents of Level-II category which accounts for 13.33 percent was the highest preference followed by Attending professional conferences, seminars, and workshops (12.31%), Browsing publishers' catalogues (11.79%), Through email alerts (10.77%), Through current awareness services of libraries like CAS, SDI & Content Page Service (9.74%), Discussions with colleagues (7.69%), Consulting experts in subject field (6.67%), Reading latest books (5.64%), Media: TV and radio (5.64%), and so on.

In the case of Level-III category of respondents, the result showed that Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals as a method of current awareness opted by 7 respondents which accounts for 16.67 percent was the highest preference followed by Attending professional
conferences, seminars, and workshops (14.29%), Browsing publishers' catalogues (9.52%), Reading newsletters (9.52%), Through current awareness services of libraries like CAS, SDI & Content Page Service (9.52%), Through email alerts (9.52%), Consulting experts in subject field (4.76%), and so on. Whereas Browsing publishers' catalogues as a method opted by 5 respondents of Level-IV category which accounts for 12.82 percent was the highest preference followed by Consulting experts in subject field (10.26%), Attending professional conferences, seminars, and workshops (10.26%), Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals (10.26%), through current awareness services of libraries like CAS, SDI & Content Page Service (10.26%), Reading latest books (7.69%), and so on.

According to overall response, it was noticed that the top priority of the respondents from CCL in terms of methods and sources used for current awareness was Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals (13%). The other preferred choices were Attending professional conferences, seminars, and workshops (11.67%), Browsing publishers' catalogues (11.67%), Through email alerts (11%), Through current awareness services of libraries like CAS, SDI & Content Page Service (9.67%), and so on.
However, it is obvious that email alerts (Listserv), Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals, Browsing publishers' catalogues, Reading newsletters, Attending professional conferences, seminars, and workshops, and current awareness services of libraries were the prominent sources used by the employees of Chennai Corporation for current awareness with the latest information sources. As far as the consistency in using the methods and sources for current awareness by the respondents is concerned, it is very surprising that all the categories of respondents were equally consistent in using the methods and sources for current awareness. It is supported by low values of C.V. ranging between 43 and 70.

5.19 Distribution of the purpose of information-seeking

Table 5.17 gives a detailed picture of distribution of the purpose of information-seeking. The data were analysed based on the 10 parameters. The result indicates that out of 10 listed items, to support research which accounts for 79.17 percent was the main purpose of information seeking by Level-I category of employees followed by Writing a book or article (75%), Workshop and seminar presentations (70.83%), Service or job requirement (66.67%), Develop competence (54.17%), Keep up with current developments (45.83%), and so on. With regard to Level-II category of employees, to support research which accounts for 91.79 percent was the main purpose of information seeking followed by Workshop and seminar presentations (83.59%), Writing a book or article
(75.9%), Service or job requirement (68.72%), Keep up with current developments (59.49%), Improve General knowledge (56.92%), Develop competence (55.9%), Preparation for lecturing (47.69%), and so on.

In the case of Level-III category of employees, the result showed that to support research which accounts for 80.95 percent was the main purpose of information seeking followed by Writing a book or article (80.95%), Workshop and seminar presentations (71.43%), Service or job requirement (61.9%), Develop competence (57.14%), Keep up with current developments (57.14%), Improve General knowledge (52.38%), Preparation for lecturing (52.38%), Preparation for audio-video programmes (47.62%), and so on. With regard to Level-IV category of employees, reading purpose only which accounts for 79.49 percent was the main purpose of information seeking followed by Develop competence (71.79%), Keep up with current developments (64.1%), Improve General knowledge (61.54%), Service or job requirement (56.41%), Workshop and seminar presentations (53.85%), Writing a book or article (46.15%), Preparation for lecturing (46.15%), and so on.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting experts in subject field</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading latest books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading newspapers (print and online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional conferences, seminars, and workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing shelves in bookstores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing publishers’ catalogues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media: TV and radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning current issues of print and electronic journals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading newsletters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through current awareness services of libraries like CAS, SDI &amp; Content Page Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning recent issues of abstracting and indexing tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through email alerts (Listserv)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>C.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>69.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>46.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>55.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>43.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>44.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.85, S.D.: 1.28, C.V.: 69.39; Total: 300; 100.00%
According to overall response, it was noticed that the top most purpose of the respondents of CCL in terms of purpose of information seeking was to support their research (61.25%) except for Level-IV category who opined that the information seeking was for reading purpose only. The other purposes were the preparation for Workshop and seminar presentations (57.75%), Writing a book or article (54.5%), for Service or job requirement (49.5%), to keep up with current developments (44%), to develop competence (43.5%), to improve general knowledge (41.25%), and so on. However, it was observed that the main purpose of information seeking by the respondents was to support their research.

5.20 Distribution of the problems faced by the respondents in information-seeking

Due to information explosion, majority of the information seekers need to face a lot of problems in getting right information from relevant sources. In this regard, an attempt was made to analyse the problems faced by the respondents in information seeking for their job-oriented activities. The results of the analysis have been presented in Table 5.18. The data were analysed based on the fifteen parameters that pertain to information seeking related problems. The result indicates that out of 15 listed problems, Lack of information about available sources, and Information is scattered in too
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level – II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support research</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>91.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing a book or article</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>75.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop and seminar presentations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>83.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service or job requirement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>68.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop competence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up with current developments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>59.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve General knowledge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>56.92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for lecturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for audio-video programmes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading purposes only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
many sources which accounts for 83.33 percent each was the top most problem faced by the respondents of Level-I category in information seeking followed by the other problems like Required material is not available (79.17%), Latest information sources are not available (75%), Information explosion or too much of information (70.83%), Lack of time for searching (62.5%), Lack of training in electronic resources/products (62.5%), Lack of knowledge in using the library (62.5%), Information sources are located far away (62.5%), and so on. In the case of Level-II category respondents, the result indicates that out of 15 listed problems, Required material is not available which accounts for 86.67 percent was the top most problem faced by the respondents in information seeking followed by the other problems like Information is scattered in too many sources (83.59%), Latest information sources are not available (76.41%), Information explosion or too much of information (74.87%), Lack of information about available sources (63.08%), Lack of training in electronic resources/products (58.46%), Non availability of electronic resources (53.85%), Lack of computer hardware or software (51.79%), Lack of technical support (47.69%), and so on.

In the case of Level-III category respondents, the result indicates that out of 15 listed problems, Required material is not available which accounts for 90.48 percent was the top most problem faced by the respondents in information seeking followed by the other problems like
Information is scattered in too many sources (80.95%), Latest information sources are not available (76.19%), Information explosion or too much of information (73.81%), Lack of information about available sources (71.43%), Lack of training in electronic resources/products (66.67%), Non availability of electronic resources (61.9%), Lack of time for searching (57.14%), Lack of knowledge in using the library (52.38%), Information sources are located far away (47.62%), and so on. With regard to Level-IV category respondents, the result indicates that out of 15 listed problems, Required material is not available which accounts for 87.18 percent was the top most problem faced by the respondents in information seeking followed by the other problems like Information is scattered in too many sources (82.05%), Latest information sources are not available (79.49%), Lack of information about available sources (74.36%), Information explosion or too much of information (74.36%), Lack of training in electronic resources/products (66.67%), Non availability of electronic resources (64.1%), Lack of computer hardware or software (61.54%), Lack of technical support (58.97%), Lack of time for searching (51.28%), Lack of knowledge in using the library (46.15%), and so on.

According to overall response, it was noticed that the top most problem faced the respondents in information seeking was that the Required material is not available which accounts for 65 percent. The other problems were like Information is scattered in too many sources (62.25%),
Latest information sources are not available (57.5%), Information explosion or too much of information (55.75%), Lack of information about available sources (50.5%), Lack of training in electronic resources/products (45.75%), Non availability of electronic resources (42.25%), and so on.

However, it was observed that the major problems faced by the employees of CCL in information seeking were like Information is scattered in too many sources (62.25%), Latest information sources are not available (57.5%), Information explosion or too much of information (55.75%), Lack of information about available sources (50.5%), Lack of training in electronic resources/products (45.75%), Non availability of electronic resources (42.25%), etc. It is to be noted from the result that an effort should be made by the library to make the respondents get right information from right source at right time. These problems can be overcome by the services like abstracting and indexing, TOC alerts, user orientation, etc.
Table 5.18: Distribution of the problems faced by the respondents in information-seeking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level - II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about available sources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is scattered in too many sources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>83.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required material is not available</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest information sources are not available</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>76.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information explosion or too much of information</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>74.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time for searching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training in electronic resources/products</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge in using the library</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sources are</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level - II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>located far away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non availability of electronic resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff is incompetent or not well-trained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of computer hardware or software</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from library staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D) USE OF E-RESOURCES

5.21 Distribution of the extent of use of e-resources by the respondents

Table 5.19 depicts the results of the distribution of extent of use of e-resources by the users of Chennai Corporation Library. The data were analysed based on the eight kinds of e-resources such as E-Journals, E-Books, E-Theses, E-Databases, E-Newspaper, E-Magazines, E-Maps, and E-Manuscripts. The result indicates that out of eight kinds of e-resources, e-journals which account for 91.67 percent was the top most category of e-resources used by Level-I category respondents followed by the other kinds viz. E-Books (87.5%), E-Theses (83.33%), E-Databases (79.17%), E-Newspaper (79.17%), E-Magazines (75%), E-Maps (33.33%), and E-Manuscripts (29.17%). In the case of Level-II respondents, e-journals which account for 94.36 percent was the top most category of e-resources used by the respondents followed by the other kinds viz. E-Books (89.74%), E-Theses (82.05%), E-Databases (81.54%), E-Newspaper (69.74%), E-Magazines (54.36%), E-Maps (45.64%), and E-Manuscripts (20%).

In the case of Level-III category of users, the result showed that e-journals which account for 94.3 percent was the top most category of e-resources followed by the other kinds such as E-Books (88.1%), E-Databases (88.1%), E-Magazines (78.57%), E-Maps (71.43%), E-
Manuscripts (66.67%), E-Theses (59.52%), and E-Newspaper (54.76%).

With respect to Level-IV category of users, the result showed that e-journals which account for 79.49 percent was the top most category of e-resources followed by the other kinds such as E-Manuscripts (76.92%), E-Books (74.36%), E-Databases (69.23%), E-Magazines (61.54%), E-Maps (61.54%), E-Theses (58.97%), and E-Newspaper (58.97%).

According to overall response, it was noticed that the top most category of e-resources used by the users of CCL was e-journals which account for 69 percent. The other kinds of e-resources were E-Books (65.5%), E-Databases (60.5%), E-Theses (57%), E-Newspaper (50.25%), E-Magazines (45.25%), E-Maps (37.75%), and E-Manuscripts (26%).

It could be deduced from the above discussion that e-journals were the predominant source as compared to other kinds of e-resources used by the users of CCL, Chennai. However, it is surprising that priority of using e-resources by all the categories of users is almost similar.
Table 5.19: Distribution of the extent of use of e-resources by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-resources</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level - II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Journals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>94.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Books</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>89.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Theses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>82.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Databases</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Newspaper</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>69.74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Magazines</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Maps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Manuscripts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.6: Distribution of the extent of use of e-resources by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of e-resources</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Manuscripts</td>
<td>Anna University: 62, IIT Madras: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Maps</td>
<td>Anna University: 125, IIT Madras: 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Magazines</td>
<td>Anna University: 262, IIT Madras: 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Newspaper</td>
<td>Anna University: 282, IIT Madras: 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Databases</td>
<td>Anna University: 284, IIT Madras: 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Theses</td>
<td>Anna University: 298, IIT Madras: 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Books</td>
<td>Anna University: 305, IIT Madras: 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Journals</td>
<td>Anna University: 323, IIT Madras: 149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.22 Distribution of purpose of using e-resources

Table 5.20 presents the results of distribution of purpose of using e-resources by the respondents. The result revealed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 14 (58.33%) were of the opinion that the e-resources were used for job related purpose while 7 (29.17%) used for General Reading; and 3 (12.5%) used for research purpose. Whereas out of 195 users of Level-II category, 96 (49.23%) were of the opinion that the e-resources were used for research purpose while 77 (39.49%) used for job related purpose; and 22 (11.28%) used for General Reading.

On the other hand, out of 42 users of Level-III category, 22 (52.38%) were of the opinion that the e-resources were used for research purpose while 17 (40.48%) used for job related purpose; and 3 (7.14%) used for General Reading. Whereas out of 39 users of Level-IV category, 23 (58.97%) were of the opinion that the e-resources were used for research purpose while 14 (35.9%) used for job related purpose; and 2 (5.13%) used for General Reading.

The overall result showed that out of 300 users of the entire category, 144 (48%) were of the opinion that the e-resources were used for research purpose while 122 (40.48%) used for job related purpose; and the remaining 34 (11.33%) used for General Reading.
It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents used e-resources for their research purpose. It is evident from the result that 144 respondents, who constitute 48 percent, used e-resources for their research purpose; 122 (40.48%) used for job related purpose; and the remaining 34 (11.33%) used for General Reading. Therefore, it is obvious that e-resources available in the CCL are widely used for research and job related purposes.

5.23 Distribution of the opinion on conducting orientation to the users

Table 5.21 presents the analysis of the opinion of the respondents on conducting orientation to the users. The result indicates that out of 300 total respondents, 250 respondents are of the opinion that user orientation programme needs to be conducted in the library while the remaining 50 respondents did not.

Out of 250 respondents, who were of the opinion on user orientation programme needs to be conducted in the library, 19 (9.13%) were from Level-I category, 163 (78.37%) were from Level-II category, 35 (16.83%) were from Level-III category, and 33 (15.87%) were from Level-IV category. Whereas out of 50 respondents who were not on the opinion of user orientation programme needs to be conducted in the library that 5 (5.43%) were from Level-I category, 32 (34.78%) were from Level-II category, 7 (7.61%) were from Level-III category, and 6 (6.52%) were from Level-IV category.
### Table 5.20: Distribution of purpose of using e-resources by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job related</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, it could be deduced from the above discussion that the majority of the respondents were positive in conducting user orientation programme in the library. It is evident from the result that out of 300 total respondents, 250 (83.33%) were of the opinion that user orientation programme needs to be conducted in the library while the remaining 50 (16.67%) were not. Therefore, it is obvious that the Chennai Corporation Library should conduct orientation programme periodically in order to make the users aware of the resources and to increase the usage of library resources.

Table 5.25: Distribution of the opinion on conducting orientation to the users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.24 Distribution of the opinion on the confidence level of ability to access e-resources

Table 5.22 represents the distribution of opinion on the confidence level of ability to access e-resources in CCL, Chennai. The result showed that out of 24 users of Level-I category, 2 (8.33%) were Extremely Confident; 9 (37.5%) were Confident; 7 (29.17%) were Somewhat Confident; 4 (16.67%) were Not Confident; and 2 (8.33%) Never Do This. Whereas out of 195 users of Level-II category, 24 (12.31%) were Extremely Confident; 56 (28.72%) were Confident; 67 (34.36%) were Somewhat Confident; 29 (14.87%) were Not Confident; and 19 (9.74%) Never Do This.

On the other hand, out of 42 users of Level-III category, 5 (11.9%) were Extremely Confident; 15 (35.71%) were Confident; 12 (28.57%) were Somewhat Confident; 7 (16.67%) were Not Confident; and 3 (7.14%) Never Do This. Whereas out of 39 users of Level-IV category, 4 (10.26%) were Extremely Confident; 13 (33.33%) were Confident; 11 (28.21%) were Somewhat Confident; 8 (20.51%) were Not Confident; and 3 (7.69%) Never Do This.

The overall result showed that out of 300 users of entire category, 35 (11.67%) were Extremely Confident; 93 (31%) were Confident; 97 (32.33%) were Somewhat Confident; 48 (16%) were Not Confident; and the remaining 27 (9%) Never Do This.
It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents were confident enough to access e-resources in Chennai Corporation Library. It is evident from the result that 75 percent of the respondents combining all the categories together were confident while the remaining 25 percent of the respondents were either not confident or never do this. Though the percentage of respondents, who were not confident, is a bit low a proper care needs to be taken to extend the level of confidence of the users in accessing to e-resources available in CCL.

5.25 Distribution of the mode of approaches for getting awareness of e-resources

Table 5.23 depicts the results of the distribution of the mode of approaches for getting awareness of e-resources by the users of CCL. The result showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 7 (29.17%) opined that Library website was the source of making them aware of e-resources while 5 (20.83%) said Information Brochure of library; 4 (16.67%) said through their colleagues; 3 (12.5%) said through Staff and other sources; and 5 (20.83%) said by User Orientation. Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 56 (28.72%) opined that Library website was the source of making them aware of e-resources while 38 (19.49%) said Information Brochure of library; 37 (18.97%) said through their colleagues; 19 (9.74%) said through Staff and other sources; and 45 (23.08%) said by User Orientation.
Table 5.22: Distribution of the opinion on the confidence level of ability to access e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Confident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Confident</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Confident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Do This</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 14 (33.33%) opined that Library website was the source of making them aware of e-resources while 8 (19.05%) said Information Brochure of library; 6 (14.29%) said through their colleagues; 5 (11.9%) said through Staff and other sources; and 9 (21.43%) said by User Orientation. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 11 (23.08%) opined that Library website was the source of making them aware of e-resources while 9 (23.08%) said Information Brochure of library; 5 (12.82%) said through their colleagues; another 5 (12.82%) said through Staff and other sources; and 9 (23.08%) said by User Orientation.

The overall result showed that out of 300 total respondents, 88 (29.33%) opined that Library website was the source of making them aware of e-resources while 60 (20%) said Information Brochure of library; 52 (17.33%) said through their colleagues; 32 (10.67%) said through Staff and other sources; and 68 (22.67%) said by User Orientation.

It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents were of the opinion that the role of library is a prime source for making them aware of e-resources available in Chennai Corporation Library. It is evident from the result that 72 percent of the respondents combining all the categories together were aware of e-resources through libraries while the remaining 28 percent of the respondents were aware of e-
resources through their colleagues and staff & other sources. The sources used by the libraries of these organizations to make aware of e-resources were Library websites, Information Brochure of library, and User Orientation. The percentage share of these sources was 29.33 percent, 20 percent, and 22.67 percent respectively. However, it is interesting that the CCL plays an important role in promoting the use of e-resources by the Engineers of Chennai Corporation through various means effectively.

5.26 Distribution of the place of access to e-resources by respondents

The advent of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) has overcome the distance barrier in information access. It has made clientele to have access to e-resources from anywhere, anytime, and in any format. Keeping this fact in mind, an attempt was made to analyse the place where the users of CCL prefer to have access to e-resources.

The result, as depicted in Table 5.24, showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 3 (12.5%) revealed that they have access to e-resources in their personal desktop itself while 8 (33.33%) were from Library Computer Centre; and 13 (54.17%) were through Campus LAN. Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 43 (22.05%) revealed that they have access to e-resources in their personal desktop itself while 56 (28.72%) were from Library Computer Centre; and 96 (49.23%) were through Campus LAN.
Table 5.23: Distribution of the mode of approaches for getting awareness of e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library websites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Brochure of library</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your colleagues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and other sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 7 (16.67%) revealed that they have access to e-resources in their personal desktop itself while 14 (33.33%) were from Library Computer Centre; and 21 (50%) were through Campus LAN. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 6 (15.38%) revealed that they have access to e-resources in their personal desktop itself while 12 (30.77%) were from Library Computer Centre; and 21 (53.85%) were through Campus LAN.

The overall result showed that out of 300 respondents of all the categories, 59 (19.67%) revealed that they have access to e-resources in their personal desktop itself while 90 (30%) were from Library Computer Centre; and 151 (50.33%) were through Campus LAN.

It is obvious from the above discussion that majority of the respondents were of the opinion that the campus LAN is a prime place where the respondents of CCL prefer to have access to e-resources. It is evident from the result that 50.33 percent of the respondents combining all the categories together accessed e-resources through Campus LAN. The other sources were Library Computer Centre (30%) and Personal Desktop (16.67%).
Table 5.24: Distribution of the source of access to e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Access</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Desk Top</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Computer Centre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus LAN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>50.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.27 Distribution of the frequency of using e-resources

Table 5.25 represents the distribution of opinion on the frequency of using e-resources in Chennai Corporation Library. The result showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 5 (20.83%) used Always; 10 (41.67%) used Frequently; 5 (20.83%) used Sometimes; 3 (12.5%) used Rarely; and 1 (2.13%) used Never whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 35 (17.95%) used Always; 79 (40.51%) used Frequently; 27 (13.85%) used Sometimes; 43 (22.05%) used Rarely; and 11 (5.64%) used Never.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 8 (19.05%) used Always; 15 (35.71%) used Frequently; 8 (19.05%) used Sometimes; 6 (14.29%) used Rarely; and 5 (11.9%) used Never whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 9 (23.08%) used Always; 14 (35.9%) used Frequently; 7 (17.95%) used Sometimes; 5 (12.82%) used Rarely; and 4 (10.26%) used Never.

The overall result showed that out of 300 respondents of entire category, 57 (19%) used Always; 118 (39.33%) used Frequently; 47 (15.67%) used Sometimes; 57 (19%) used Rarely; and 21 (7%) used Never.
Table 5.25: Distribution of the frequency of using e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>39.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents accessed to e-resources in Chennai Corporation Library. It is evident from the result that 93 percent of the respondents combining all the categories together accessed e-resources while the remaining 7 percent of the respondents never accessed e-resources.

5.28 Distribution of the time spent per visit for searching / accessing e-resources

An attempt was made to analyse the time spent per visit for accessing to e-resources. The results have been reported in Table 5.26 which represents the time spent per visit for searching / accessing e-resources in CCL. The result showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 2 (8.33%) spent more than two hours; 4 (16.67%) spent Two hours; 7 (29.17%) spent More than one hour; 10 (41.67%) spent one hour; and 1 (4.17%) spent Less than one hour whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 20 (10.26%) spent more than two hours; 25 (12.82%) spent Two hours; 45 (23.08%) spent More than one hour; 93 (47.69%) spent one hour; and 12 (6.15%) spent Less than one hour.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 5 (11.9%) spent more than two hours; 7 (16.67%) spent Two hours; 9 (21.43%) spent More than one hour; 15 (35.71%) spent one hour; and 6 (14.29%) spent Less than one hour whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-
IV category, 4 (10.26%) spent more than two hours; 7 (17.95%) spent Two hours; 10 (25.64%) spent More than one hour; 15 (38.46%) spent one hour; and 3 (7.69%) spent Less than one hour.

The overall result showed that out of 300 respondents of entire category, 31 (10.33%) spent more than two hours; 43 (14.33%) spent Two hours; 71 (23.67%) spent More than one hour; 133 (44.33%) spent one hour; and 22 (7.33%) spent Less than one hour.

It could be deduced from the above discussion that majority of the respondents spent at least one hour for accessing to e-resources in Chennai Corporation Library. It is evident from the result that 92.67 percent of the respondents combining all the categories together spent one hour or more for accessing to e-resources while the remaining 7.33 percent of the respondents spent less than one hour. Therefore, it is obvious that the usage of e-resources is getting momentum among the engineers of Chennai Corporation.

5.29 Distribution of the reasons for not using e-resources frequently

The study on the frequency of using e-resources by the Engineers of Chennai Corporation revealed that some of the respondents used the e-resources sometimes and rarely. A few of them never used these resources. The result represented in Table 5.27 was an attempt to ascertain the reasons for not using the e-resources frequently by the users of CCL.
Table 5.26: Distribution of the time spent per visit for searching / accessing e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Spent</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than two hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one hour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>44.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one hour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result indicates that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 10 (41.67%) users were of the opinion that they did not use frequently due to Slow Downloading while 5 (20.83%) were due to Non-availability of full text; 4 (16.67%) were due to Lack of subject coverage; 2 (8.33%) were due to Lack of training; another 2 (8.33%) were due to Unfamiliarity with e-resources; and 1 (4.17%) were due to Lack of confidence. Whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 49 (25.13%) users were of the opinion that they did not use frequently due to Slow Downloading while 39 (20%) were due to Non-availability of full text; 38 (19.49%) were due to Lack of subject coverage; 39 (20%) were due to Lack of training; 20 (10.26%) were due to Unfamiliarity with e-resources; and 10 (5.13%) were due to Lack of confidence.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 12 (28.57%) users were of the opinion that they did not use frequently due to Slow Downloading while 10 (23.81%) were due to Non-availability of full text; 7 (16.67%) were due to Lack of subject coverage; 6 (14.29%) were due to Lack of training; 5 (11.9%) were due to Unfamiliarity with e-resources; and 2 (4.76%) were due to Lack of confidence. Whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 13 (33.33%) users were of the opinion that they did not use frequently due to Slow Downloading while 10 (25.64%) were due to Non-availability of full text; 8 (20.51%) were due to Lack of subject coverage; 6 (15.38%) were due to Lack of training; and the remaining 2 (5.13%) were due to Unfamiliarity with e-resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slow downloading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-availability of full text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of subject coverage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar with e-resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 4.00 32.50 7.00 6.50 50.00
S.D. 3.29 14.49 3.58 4.89 25.38
C.V. 82.16 44.58 51.11 75.21 50.75
The overall result indicates that out of 300 respondents of entire category, 84 (28%) users were of the opinion that they did not use frequently due to Slow Downloading while 64 (21.33%) were due to Non-availability of full text; 57 (19%) were due to Lack of subject coverage; 53 (17.67%) were due to Lack of training; 29 (9.67%) were due to Unfamiliarity with e-resources; and 13 (4.76%) were due to Lack of confidence.

An attempt was made to ascertain the consistency of the respondents in facing the problems in frequent access to e-resources in CCL, Chennai. It was observed that the low consistency was found in the case of Level-II category respondents as compared to other categories. It is supported by the lowest C.V. (44.58%) followed by Level-III (51.11%), Level-IV (75.21%), and Level-I (82.16%). Therefore, it is clear that all the categories of employees of Chennai Corporation faced problems consistently in using e-resources frequently CCL.

### 5.30 Distribution of the opinion on the satisfaction with the relevance of e-resources

Table 5.28 indicates the distribution of opinion on the level of satisfaction with the relevance of e-resources in Chennai Corporation Library. The result showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 2
(8.33%) were Very satisfied; 8 (33.33%) were Satisfied; 6 (25%) were Somewhat satisfied; 5 (20.83%) were dissatisfied; and 3 (12.5%) were Very dissatisfied whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 24 (12.31%) were Very satisfied; 61 (31.28%) were Satisfied; 51 (26.15%) were Somewhat satisfied; 35 (17.95%) were dissatisfied; and 24 (12.31%) were Very dissatisfied.

On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 4 (9.52%) were Very satisfied; 14 (33.33%) were Satisfied; 12 (28.57%) were Somewhat satisfied; 8 (19.05%) were dissatisfied; and 4 (9.52%) were Very dissatisfied whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 4 (10.26%) were Very satisfied; 12 (30.77%) were Satisfied; 8 (20.51%) were Somewhat satisfied; 9 (23.08%) were dissatisfied; and 6 (15.38%) were Very dissatisfied.

The overall result showed that out of 300 respondents of entire category, 34 (11.33%) were Very satisfied; 95 (31.67%) were Satisfied; 77 (25.67%) were Somewhat satisfied; 57 (19%) were dissatisfied; and 37 (12.33%) were Very dissatisfied.

It could be deduced from the above discussion that almost an equal percentage of respondents was dissatisfied with the relevance of e-resources available in Chennai Corporation Library. It is evident from the result that
Table 5.28: Distribution of the opinion on the satisfaction with the relevance of e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31.33 percent of the respondents combining all the categories were dissatisfied and very dissatisfied while 25.67 percent of the respondents were somewhat satisfied and the remaining 31.67 percent of the respondents were satisfied. Therefore, it is to be noted that a proper care needs to be taken towards acquiring relevant resources in consultation with the users for effective and efficient utilization of e-resources in Chennai Corporation Library.

5.31 Distribution of the opinion on whether e-resources help in meeting job related requirements

Table 5.29 presents the results of the opinion of the respondents on whether e-resources help in meeting job related information requirements. The result indicates that out of 300 total respondents, 152 respondents were of the opinion that the e-resources in CCL helped in meeting job related information requirements while the remaining 148 respondents were not.

Out of 152 respondents, who were of the opinion that the e-resources in CCL helped in meeting job related information requirements, 13 (8.55%) were from Level-I category, 96 (63.16%) were from Level-II category, 24 (15.79%) were from Level-III category, and 19 (12.5%) were from Level-IV category whereas 148 respondents were not on the opinion that the e-resources in CCL did not help them in meeting job related information
requirements. Out of 148 respondents, 11 (7.43%) were from Level-I category, 99 (66.89%) were from Level-II category, 18 (12.16%) were from Level-III category, and 20 (13.51%) were from Level-IV category.

With regard to overall result, it was quite surprising that 152 respondents, which account for 50.67 percent, were of the opinion that the e-resources in CCL helped in meeting job related information requirements while the remaining 148 (49.33%) were not.

**Table 5.29: Distribution of the opinion on whether e-resources help in meeting job related information requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66.89</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-III</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It could be observed from the above discussion that the majority of the respondents were interested in visiting the library. It is evident from the result that out of 300 total respondents, 152 (50.67%) were of the opinion of visiting library while the remaining 148 (18.13%) were not. Therefore, it is obvious that the e-resources available in the CCL are helpful to the employees of Chennai Corporation in meeting job related information requirements. Contrastingly, almost an equal percentage of employees was not in favour of this parameter. The reason could be infrequent visit to the library, lack of awareness about e-resources, lack of confidence in handling e-resources, etc. However, 50 percent is not a small portion of percentage. The CCL needs to be cautious enough to make efforts to promote the awareness and utilization of e-resources in the library.

5.32 Distribution of the overall opinion on the satisfaction of e-resources

Table 5.30 indicates the distribution of the overall opinion on the satisfaction of e-resources available in CCL. The result showed that out of 24 respondents of Level-I category, 2 (8.33%) were Very satisfied; 9 (37.5%) were Satisfied; 6 (25%) were Somewhat satisfied; 4 (16.67%) were dissatisfied; and 3 (12.5%) were Very dissatisfied whereas out of 195 respondents of Level-II category, 22 (11.28%) were Very satisfied; 51 (26.15%) were Satisfied; 45 (23.08%) were Somewhat satisfied; 48 (24.62%) were dissatisfied; and 29 (14.87%) were Very dissatisfied.
Table 5.30: Distribution of the overall opinion on the satisfaction of e-resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Level-I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-II</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-III</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level-IV</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, out of 42 respondents of Level-III category, 5 (11.9%) were Very satisfied; 12 (28.57%) were Satisfied; 9 (21.43%) were Somewhat satisfied; 10 (23.81%) were dissatisfied; and 6 (14.29%) were Very dissatisfied whereas out of 39 respondents of Level-IV category, 4 (10.26%) were Very satisfied; 11 (28.21%) were Satisfied; 9 (23.08%) were Somewhat satisfied; 10 (25.64%) were dissatisfied; and 5 (12.82%) were Very dissatisfied.

The overall result showed that out of 300 respondents, 33 (11%) were Very satisfied; 83 (27.67%) were Satisfied; 69 (23%) were Somewhat satisfied; 72 (24%) were dissatisfied; and 43 (14.33%) were Very dissatisfied.

It could be deduced from the above discussion that almost an equal percentage of respondents was dissatisfied with the relevance of e-resources available in CCL. It is evident from the result that 38.33 percent of the respondents combining both the categories were dissatisfied and very dissatisfied while 23 percent of the respondents were somewhat satisfied and the remaining 38.67 percent of the respondents were satisfied. Therefore, it is to be noted that a proper care needs to be taken towards acquiring relevant e-resources in consultation with the engineers of Chennai Corporation in order to make them satisfied to a large extent.
TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

This section deals with the testing of hypotheses. Based on the objectives of the study, the formulated three null hypotheses have been tested in order to ascertain the significant relationship between the different categories of employees in Chennai Corporation. Chi-Square test has been used with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software package to validate the null hypotheses. The results of analyses and hypotheses testing are indicated as follows:

**Null Hypothesis – 1**: There is no significant difference in the frequency of visiting the library among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation.

In order to find out the significant difference in the frequency of visit to Chennai Corporation Library by different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation, Kruskal Wallis test was applied. The result was extracted based on the data presented in Table 5.6. The results of Kruskal Wallis test have been highlighted in Table 5.31.

It is depicted from the result that there is no significant difference in the frequency of visit to CCL among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation. The type of information that they seek is exactly similar except for some other sources. It is evident from the Chi-
Square Value and Level of Significance for Daily Visit (Chi-Square=0.1352, Level of Significance=0.9346 at 5 percent), Every Week (Chi-Square=1.3835, Level of Significance=0.5007 at 5 percent), Fortnightly (Chi-Square=2.0426, Level of Significance=0.6004 at 5 percent), Monthly (Chi-Square=2.0456, Level of Significance=0.3596 at 5 percent), and so on. However, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in the frequency of visiting the library among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation” is validated based on the results.

Table 5.31: Calculation of significant difference in the frequency of visit to CCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>Level-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>170.61</td>
<td>179.4</td>
<td>165.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>154.79</td>
<td>162.44</td>
<td>168.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>181.81</td>
<td>161.65</td>
<td>171.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>158.92</td>
<td>176.42</td>
<td>177.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>169.91</td>
<td>175.46</td>
<td>172.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 5 per cent level.
Source: Computed data
Null Hypothesis – 2: There is no significant difference in the sources used for job related assignments among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation.

It is depicted from the result that there is no significant difference among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation in terms of sources used for their job related assignments. The type of sources that they used for their work is almost similar except for Audio Visual Material (Chi-Square=19.7704, Level of Significance=0.0001 at 5 percent) and Manuscripts and archives (Chi-Square=15.0623, Level of Significance=0.0005 at 5 percent). It is evident from the Chi-Square Value and Level of Significance for Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field (Chi-Square=2.0623, Level of Significance=0.3025 at 5 percent), Discussion with colleagues (Chi-Square=4.6733, Level of Significance=0.0967 at 5 percent), Internet news groups and discussion forums (Chi-Square=1.6649, Level of Significance=0.435 at 5 percent), Journals (Chi-Square=1.2509, Level of Significance=0.5350 at 5 percent), Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars (Chi-Square=0.9457, Level of Significance=0.6232 at 5 percent), and so on (Table 5.32). Therefore, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in the sources used for job related assignments among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation” is validated based on the results.
Table 5.32: Calculation of significant difference in the sources used for job related assignments among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Sources Used</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chisquare Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>Level-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Consultation with knowledgeable persons or experts in the field</td>
<td>160.42</td>
<td>167.63</td>
<td>156.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Discussion with colleagues</td>
<td>186.58</td>
<td>155.37</td>
<td>179.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Internet news groups and discussion forums</td>
<td>170.53</td>
<td>177.06</td>
<td>167.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>174.37</td>
<td>169.7</td>
<td>175.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Proceedings of conferences, workshops, and seminars</td>
<td>173.17</td>
<td>173.8</td>
<td>173.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Theses and dissertations</td>
<td>193.23</td>
<td>179.92</td>
<td>189.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Reference books</td>
<td>168.79</td>
<td>159.5</td>
<td>165.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td>171.17</td>
<td>164.04</td>
<td>174.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Indexes and abstracts</td>
<td>185.06</td>
<td>166.58</td>
<td>179.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Electronic databases</td>
<td>168.59</td>
<td>160.28</td>
<td>164.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>171.23</td>
<td>189.83</td>
<td>177.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>174.11</td>
<td>197.14</td>
<td>173.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Audio-visuals</td>
<td>163.65</td>
<td>151.59</td>
<td>158.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>General books/Monographs</td>
<td>167.15</td>
<td>199.08</td>
<td>181.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Pamphlets and brochures</td>
<td>186.58</td>
<td>155.37</td>
<td>194.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>TV and radio</td>
<td>173.17</td>
<td>173.8</td>
<td>175.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>171.17</td>
<td>164.04</td>
<td>173.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>171.23</td>
<td>189.83</td>
<td>178.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Maps, atlases, guidebooks</td>
<td>167.15</td>
<td>199.08</td>
<td>169.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Manuscripts and archives</td>
<td>160.42</td>
<td>167.63</td>
<td>163.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 5 per cent level.
Source: Computed data
Null Hypothesis – 3: There is no significant difference in the problems faced in information search pattern among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation.

It is depicted from the result that there is no significant difference among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation in terms of problems faced in information seeking. The problems faced by various categories of respondents in information seeking is almost similar except for the problems such as Lack of computer hardware or software (Chi-Square=19.7704, Level of Significance=0.0001 at 5 percent) and Language barrier (Chi-Square=8.9639, Level of Significance=0.0113 at 5 percent). It is evident from the Chi-Square Value and Level of Significance for the problems in information seeking like Lack of information about available sources (Chi-Square=0.1352, Level of Significance=0.9346 at 5 percent), Information is scattered in too many sources (Chi-Square=2.0426, Level of Significance=0.6004 at 5 percent), Required material is not available (Chi-Square=2.2487, Level of Significance=0.3249 at 5 percent), Latest information sources are not available (Chi-Square=2.2014, Level of Significance=0.2186 at 5 percent), Information explosion or too much of information (Chi-Square=2.2311, Level of Significance=0.3277 at 5 percent), and so on (Table 5.38). Therefore, the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference in the problems faced in information search pattern among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation” is validated based on the results.
Table 5.33: Calculation of significant difference in the problems faced in information search pattern among different categories of engineers working in Chennai Corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Nature of Problems Faced</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level-I</td>
<td>Level-II</td>
<td>Level-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lack of information about available sources</td>
<td>175.43</td>
<td>180.74</td>
<td>171.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Information is scattered in too many sources</td>
<td>154.79</td>
<td>162.44</td>
<td>158.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Required material is not available</td>
<td>169.91</td>
<td>175.46</td>
<td>174.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Latest information sources are not available</td>
<td>165.51</td>
<td>149.63</td>
<td>154.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Information explosion or too much of information</td>
<td>168.92</td>
<td>179.87</td>
<td>170.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lack of time for searching</td>
<td>177.72</td>
<td>173.55</td>
<td>176.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lack of training in electronic resources/products</td>
<td>179.24</td>
<td>165.23</td>
<td>164.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge in using the library</td>
<td>167.01</td>
<td>172.11</td>
<td>163.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Information sources are located far away</td>
<td>171.82</td>
<td>178.65</td>
<td>174.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Non availability of electronic resources</td>
<td>177.81</td>
<td>164.58</td>
<td>168.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Library staff is incompetent or not well-trained</td>
<td>174.89</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>167.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Lack of technical support</td>
<td>186.01</td>
<td>155.65</td>
<td>177.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Lack of computer hardware or software</td>
<td>163.65</td>
<td>151.59</td>
<td>158.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lack of support from library staff</td>
<td>177.95</td>
<td>163.98</td>
<td>166.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td>168.79</td>
<td>159.5</td>
<td>161.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 5 per cent level.
Source: Computed data