

# Information and Communications Technology (ICT) on Information's Use Pattern of Faculty Members in Pharmacy Colleges in Karnataka (South India)

<sup>1</sup>Dr. B. Mahadevan, <sup>2</sup>Dr. K. Vijaya Kumar

<sup>1</sup>UGC Post Doctoral Fellow, <sup>2</sup>Associate Professor

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Library Information science, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamil Nadu, India

Email - <sup>1</sup>dmaha32@gmail.com , <sup>2</sup>aulisvijayakumar@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *ICT on facts use sample research are one of the crucial regions in user research. The motives and features of customers deliver a perception into information needs and necessities. To fulfill such dreams and requirements, customers adopt numerous technique for accession to resources of information, and in the act of accession to information, the customers is based or calls upon the resources predetermined which result in delight or dissatisfaction. The examine is specifically based totally at the number one statistics gathered from the teaching community through a properly designed questionnaire. The secondary statistics have been amassed from resources like textual content books, reference books and so forth. The have a examine attempts to have a study the records needs and records use pattern of school member through way of making an experiments of Karnataka. Institutions and it lines out the data use sample and facts needs of schools in phrases of descriptive technique. This have a look at elaborates information use pattern of college participants in Karnataka. Their qualifications and achievements on academic and professional fronts and extensive evaluation of their assets of records for applications in improving their knowledge.*

**Key Words:** *Library statistics', Evaluation and records, Distribution.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Information use sample studies are one of the important areas in person studies. The reasons and functions of customers deliver a modern-day insight into records needs and requirements. To satisfy such wishes and requirements, clients adopt several method for accession to belongings of statistics. The concept of information is cautiously associated with notions of constraint, communication, manage, statistics, shape steering, expertise, which means, mental stimulus, sample, belief and illustration.

## 2. Significance of the study:

This take a look at examines information and communication technology (ICT) on information use sample school individual's pharmacy colleges in Karnataka establishments and encompasses research personnel of 30 pharmacy faculties. The data wishes can be assessed at the simple of period and quantum of time utilization looking for information in pharmacy libraries in their very own institutions and also in other institution. The evaluation of nature and kind of information required of college is the second one critical issue of reading records searching for pattern, stages in their motivation determine the statistics use sample. The get right of entry to library services and a facility determines the utility of library. The observe of respondents expert activities and achievements gives a clue to their get right of entry to information and communication generation and facts needs. The analysis of respondents' quantity of satisfaction over various sources of library statistics paperwork any other essential constant and fifth thing of have a look at.

## 3. Objectives of the study:

- To examine the respondents' period and quantum of time utilization searching for information in the libraries of decided on institutions.
- To look at the character and sort of records required by, school participants in Karnataka Institutions.
- To determine the extent to utilization of library facility and services made through pharmacy libraries of Karnataka institutions.
- To realize the extent of expert sports and achievements a number of the faculty of Karnataka establishments.
- To recognise the respondents delight concerning information resources available of their non-public institutional libraries for specific functions.

### 3.1 Hypotheses:

- There is no significant inter institutional difference among the faculty members with respect to duration and quantum of time utilization in search of information in pharmacy libraries of the selected institutions.

- There is no significant difference among the faculty members of various institutions with regard to their involvement of professional activities and achievements.

#### 4. METHODOLOGY:

The study is mainly based on the primacy data collected from the teaching community through a designed questionnaire. The secondary data have been collected from sources like text books, reference books etc. This study attempts to examine the information needs and information use pattern of faculty members by making and experiment of Karnataka institutions, and it traces out of information use pattern and information needs of faculties in terms of descriptive approach. The identified facts are tabulated with the institutional background, educational and six backgrounds of the respondents. Thus it gives analytical orientation to this study and the design of this study and the design of this study is partly exploratory and partly analytical in nature. Because of finite population (population size is 400), simple random sampling (Lottery Method) have been used for collecting the required sample. Sample size of this study is 350 for analytical purpose, the researcher has been used the statistical tools such as percentage analysis, chi-square analysis, Analysis of variances.

#### 5. Data collection:

The collected data were classified and tabulated according to the objectives and hypotheses stated. First, the data are recorded on the data sheets and then fed to the computer personally. In order to test the hypotheses, the chi-square statistical ANOVA two way model were applied. The chi-square and ANOVA values were worked out with the help of SPSS package. The general data interpretation was made with the help of percentages and averages. In order to measure the respondent's level of satisfaction on library services and facilities, the responses are rated as highly satisfied response denotes 5 points, satisfied 4 points, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3, dissatisfied 2, and highly dissatisfied 1. On the basic of obtained score for each variable, the overall educations wise and six wise mean score values are obtained for general interpretation.

#### 6. Limitations:

The findings of this study are mainly applicable to pharmacy college libraries of Karnataka institutions, which are under pharmacy colleges in Karnataka and not to the other professional colleges. Only 30 institutions were selected for this study since studying of all institutions would not be possible to an individual researcher, owing to constraints of money, time, energy and efforts. During the analysis, fraction value may be rounded off.

#### 7. Analysis and interpretations:

Table -1. Distribution of respondents, quantum of time utilization:

Respondents	16-20 hours per week	11-15 hours per week	7-10 hours per week	Less than 4hours	Total
Professor	40 (40.00%)	31 (31.00%)	20 (20.00%)	9 (9.00%)	100 (28.57%)
Associate professor	32 (39.50%)	21 (25.92%)	22 (27.16%)	6 (7.40%)	81 (21.14%)
Assistant Professor	85 (50.29%)	40 (23.66)	25 (14.79%)	19 (11.24%)	169 (48.29%)
Total	157 (44.85%)	92 (26.28%)	67 (19.14%)	34 (9.71%)	350 (100.00%)

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	204.16	1	204.16	6.25	0.12	18.51
Columns	329.33	2	164.66	5.04	0.16	19
Error	65.33	2	32.66			
Total	598.83	5				

**Interpretation:**

Data presented in table -1 indicate the distribution of respondents according to their quantum of time utilization. It could be noted that, out of 350 respondents, 157 (44.85%) of them are 16-20 hours per week, 92 (26.28%) of them are 11-15 hours per week, 67 (19.14%) of them are 7-10 hrs per week, 34 (9.71%) of them are less than 4 hours. It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that, the majority of the respondents spent 16-20 hrs per week at the library. The ANOVA two-way model is applied for further discussion. At one point, the computed Anova value is 6.25, which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, there is significant variation among the distribution of respondents, quantum of time utilization. At another point, the computed Anova value is 5.04, which is less than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, variation among the distribution of respondents, quantum of time utilization is statistically identified as significant.

**Table -2. Showing distribution of respondents purpose of library visit**

Responsibility	General reading	Recreation reading	Academic reading	Professional reading	Total
Professor	23 (23.00%)	22 (22.00%)	35 (35.00%)	20 (20.00%)	100 (28.57%)
Associate professor	15 (18.51%)	22 (27.16%)	30 (37.03%)	14 (17.28%)	81 (21.14%)
Assistant Professor	20 (11.83%)	17 (10.05%)	102 (60.35)	30 (17.75%)	169 (48.29%)
Total	58 (16.57%)	61 (17.42%)	167 (47.71%)	64 (18.28%)	350(100.00%)

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	1148.16	1	1148.16	1.44	0.35	18.51
Columns	2736.33	2	1368.16	1.72	0.36	19
Error	1584.33	2	792.16			
Total	5468.83	5				

**Interpretation**

Data present in table -2 indicate the distribution of respondents according the faculty members purpose of library visit. It could be noted that, out of 350 respondents, 58 (16.57%) of them are general reading 61 (17.42%) of them are recreation reading, 167 (47.71%) of them are Academic reading, 64 (18.28%) of them are professional reading. It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that, the majority of the respondent purpose of library visits in Academic reading. The ANOVA two-way model is applied for further discussion. At one point, the computed Anova value is 1.44, which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, there is significant variation among the showing distribution of respondent’s purpose of library visit. At another point, the computed Anova value is 1.72, which is less than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, variation among the showing distribution of respondent’s purpose of library visit is statistically identified as significant.

**Table-3. Showing distribution of respondents methods of obtaining relevant bibliographic references**

Respondents	Library catalogues	Abstracting and indexing journal	Citation	Internet	Consulting library staff	Total
Professor	20 (20.00%)	27 (27.00%)	12 (12.00%)	31 (31.00%)	10 (10.00%)	100 (28.57%)
Associate professor	14 (17.28%)	13 (16.04%)	9 (11.11%)	35 (43.20%)	10 (12.34%)	81 (21.14%)
Assistant Professor	24 (14.20%)	26 (15.38%)	30 (17.75%)	67 (39.64%)	20 (11.83%)	169 (48.29%)
Total	58 (16.57%)	66 (18.85%)	51 (14.57%)	133 (38.40%)	42 (12.00%)	350 (100.00)

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	722	1	722	14.93	0.03	10.12
Columns	1660.5	3	553.5	11.45	0.03	9.27
Error	145	3	48.33			
Total	2527.5	7				

### Interpretation

Data presented in table 3 indicate the distribution of respondents according to their method of obtaining relevant bibliographic reference. It could be noted that, out of 350 respondents, 58(16.57%) of them are library catalogues, 66 (18.85%) of them one abstracting and indexing journal, 51(14.57%) of them are citation, 133 (38.40%) of them are internet, 32 (9.14%) of them are consulting library staff members. It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that, the majority of respondents are internet. The ANOVA two-way model is applied for further discussion. At one point, the computed Anova value is 14.93, which is less than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, there is no significant variation among the showing distribution of respondent's methods of obtaining relevant bibliographic references. At another point, the computed Anova value is 11.45, which is less than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, variation among the showing distribution of respondent's methods of obtaining relevant bibliographic references is statistically identified as significant.

**Table -4. Distribution of Respondents Professional activities and Achievements**

Respondents	National Journals	International Journal	Bok Published	Conference Seminars	Total
Professor	23 (23.00%)	25 (25.00%)	14 (14.00%)	38 (38.00%)	100 (28.57%)
Associate professor	21 (25.92%)	30 (37.63%)	5 (6.17%)	25 (30.86%)	81 (21.14%)
Assistant Professor	35 (20.71%)	52 (30.76%)	17 (10.05%)	65 (38.46%)	169 (48.29%)
Total	79 (22.57)	107 (30.57)	36 (10.28)	128 (36.57)	350 (100.00)

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	Df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	912.66	1	912.66	9.06	0.09	18.51
Columns	1381.33	2	690.66	6.86	0.12	19
Error	201.33	2	100.66			
Total	2495.33	5				

### Interpretation:

Data presented in table 4 indicate the distribution of respondents according to their professional activities and achievements. It could be noted that, out of 350 respondents 128 (36.57%) of them are conference /seminar, 107 (30.57%) of them are international journals, 79 (22.57%) of them are national journals, 36 (10.28%) of them are books published. It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that, the majority of respondents are participated in conference and seminar. The ANOVA two-way model is applied for further discussion. At one point, the computed Anova value is 9.06, which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, there is significant variation among the Distribution of Respondents Professional activities and Achievements. At another point, the computed Anova value is 6.86, which is greater than its tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance. Hence, variation among the Distribution of Respondents Professional activities and Achievements is statistically identified as significant.

**Table 5. Showing distribution of respondents' Extent of Information Sharing Behavior**

Sharing behavior	No information shared	Not much information shared	Certain type information shared	Most of the information shared
Subordinate and Junior	70 (20.0)	40 (11.43)	105 (30.00)	135 (38.58)
Peers and colleges	60 (17.14)	45 (12.85)	107 (30.57)	138 (39.42)
Superiors	45 (12.85)	57 (16.28)	120 (34.28)	128 (36.57)

### Interpretation:

Data presented in table -5 indicate the distribution of respondents according the extent of information sharing behavior in Karnataka pharmacy colleges in institution. It could be noted that out of 350 respondents about subordinate and junior, 135 (38.58%) of them are most of the information is shared, 70 (20.00%) of them no information is shared, 40 (11.43%) of them are not much information is shared. Out of 350 respondents about peer and colleges 60 (17.14%) of them are no information shared, 45 (12.85%) of them are not much information is shared, 107 (30.57%) of them are certainty type information is shared, 138 (39.42%) of them are most of the information is shared. Out of 350 Respondents about superiors 45 (12.85 %) them me no information is shared, 57 (16.28 %) of them are not much information is shared, 120 (34.28 %) of them are certain type information is shared, 128 (36.57 %) of them are most of the information is shared. It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that, the majority of respondents are most of the information is shared with superiors, power and colleges, and subordinate and juniors at Pharmacy College Karnataka State Institute.

**Table 6.** Showing distribution of respondent's mode of information sources

Information sources	No dependence	Rarely dependence	Occasionally dependence	Frequently dependence	Highly dependence
Books	18 (5.14)	32 (9.14)	90 (25.71)	105 (30.00)	115 (32.85)
Articles in Journals	25 (7.14)	38 (10.85)	55 (15.71)	107 (30.57)	125 (35.71)
News paper	23 (6.57)	27 (7.71)	60 (17.14)	115 (32.85)	135 (38.57)
Govt. Documents	27 (7.71)	21 (6.00)	54 (15.42)	105 (30.00)	143 (40.85)
Dissertation	22 (6.28)	24 (6.85)	86 (24.42)	83 (23.71)	135 (38.57)
Index and abstracting solutions	18 (5.14)	16 (4.57)	82 (23.42)	109 (31.14)	125 (35.71)
Audio/Visual (including CD – Rom)	13 (3.71)	21 (6.00)	73 (20.85)	115 (32.85)	128 (36.57)
Internet services	12 (3.42)	24 (6.85)	54 (15.42)	100 (28.57)	158 (45.14)

**Interpretation:**

Data presented in table – 6 indicate the distribution of respondents according to their library information sources. It could be noted that, out of 350 respondents about books 5.14% of them are no dependence, 9.14 % of them are rarely dependence, 25.71 % of them are occasionally dependent 30 % of them are frequently dependence, 32.85 % of this are Highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about articles in Journals 7.14 % of them are no dependence, 10.85 % of them are rarely difference, 15.71 % of them are occasionally dependence, 30.57 % of them are Frequently dependence, 32.85 % of them are Highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about Newspaper 6.57 % of them are no dependence, 7.41 % of them are Rarely dependence, 17.14 % of them are occasionally dependence, 32.85% of them are Frequently dependence, 38.57% of them are Highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about Govt. documents 7.71% of them are no dependence, 6.10% of them are rarely dependence, 15.42 % of them are occasionally dependence, 30.00% of them are frequently dependence, 40.85% of them are highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about dissertation 6.28% of them are no dependence, 6.85% of them Rarely dependence, 24.42% of them are occasionally dependence, 23.71% of them are 23.71% of them are frequently dependence, 38.57% of them are Highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about Index and Abstracting solution 5.14% of them are no dependence, 4.57% of them are rarely dependence, 23.42% of them are occasionally dependence, 31.14% of them are frequently dependence, 35.71% of them are highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about Audio/Visual (including CO-ROM) 3.17% of them are no dependence, 6.10% of them are rarely dependence, 20.85% of them are occasionally dependence, 32.57% of them are frequently dependence, 36.57% of them are highly dependence. Out of 350 Respondents about Internet Services 3.42% of them are no dependence, 6.85% of them are Rarely dependence, 15.42% of them are occasionally dependence, 28.57% of them are Frequently dependence, 45.15% of them are Highly dependence. It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that, the majority of Respondents are in high dependents of information sources at Karnataka Pharmacy College Institute.

**8. CONCLUSION:**

The users of pharmacy libraries of this institution and its constituent colleges, seek a need based approach to library & information services. They prefer to access the latest to keep abreast of developments in their respective fields, and information thus obtained is shared with their superiors, peers and colleagues. The respondents interact with librarian and the library resources which are on offer and the facilities provided by the pharmacy colleges are utilized to their maximum potential and they are than satisfied to utilize the library resources. This access to library resources has enhanced and enriched their work experience which is comparable with any other pharmacy college institution throughout the world.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Alakpodia O.N Assessment of information literacy skills among librarians in Delta State University, Abraka. An International Journal of Information and Communication Technology. 2010, 7(1). 55-63.
2. Haruna, I and Oyelekan, G. O. Provision and Utilisation of Information Resources and Services in Nigerian Defence Academy (NDA) Library, Kaduna. An International Journal of Information and Communication Technology. 2010, 7(1). 11-18.
3. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES-0794-2003.pdf>
4. Islam S and Islam N. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in Libraries: A New Dimension in Librarianship. Asian Journal of Information Technology. 2006,5(8).809-817.
5. Mohamed H.K Use of ICT based resources and services in special libraries in kerala. Annals of Library and Information Studies. 2007,Vol 54, 23-31.



6. Ozoemelem, O. A Use of electronic resources by postgraduate students of the department of Library and Information of Delta State University, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available: <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/obuh-alex.htm>
7. Satpathy S.K, Maharana R.K and Panda S.K.. Use of Information Communication Technology (ICT) Based Services by Faculty members and Students of One Premier Engineering College of Odisha. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*. 2012,2(3). 76-91.
8. Shakeel Ahmad Khan, Rubina Bhatti., Aqeel Ahmad Khan. Use of ICT by Students: A Survey of Faculty of Education at IUB, <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/Library Philosophy and Practice 2011>
9. Shuva N.Z, Banerjee T, Naningrum A, Madrid M, Agabirwe P and Kulisooma E ICTs in national libraries of Bangladesh Indonesia, Philippines and Uganda: comparative study. *INFOtheca - Journal of Informatics & Librarianship*. 2011, 12(1). 33-44.
10. A.K, Munshi M.N, Sayeed M.A The adoption of information and communication technology (ICT) in the university libraries of Bangladesh: An exploratory study. *International Seminar "Vision 2021: the role of libraries for building digital Bangladesh"*. 2011, 154
11. Swain, D.K. Students keenness on use of e-resources. *Electronic Library* 2010, 28(4), 580-591.
12. Togia, A. & Tsigilis, N. Awareness and use of electronic information resources by education graduate students: preliminary results from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Retrieved October, 2011.