

User Satisfaction and Performance of Arts and Science College Libraries Situated in Cuddalore District : A Study

R. Sivagnanam

Librarian
Govt. Arts and Science College
Chidambaram.

Dr. S. Mohamed Esmail

Associate Professor
Dept. of Lib. and Inf. Science
Annamalai University
Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu.

ABSTRACTS

This paper evaluate the user satisfaction about library collection, services and facilities in arts and science colleges situated in Cuddalore district. Data were collected from 15 arts and science colleges in Cuddalore district which covers users satisfaction about library resources, library services and facilities among the academic community of students and teaching staff studying and working in the respective colleges. The present study highlights the differences exists among the academic community towards the various facilities and services offered by the libraries for the benefit of their users

Keywords: user satisfaction, performance, library collection, services, facilities, e-resources, and academic community.

Introduction

In recent years the operations of academic libraries have become increasingly complex as it involves mechanization, and computerization of library service. There has been a rapid growth in the size and scope of collections, in the variety of services offered, and also in the expectations of the users.

Performance evaluation concerns with a system evaluation which tends to determine whether a system has sufficient capacity to meet the demands that will be placed on it. System Performance is measured to understand how well the system is working and ideally how to improve the performance. With this aim of assessing the conditions of library services and recommending improvements that the present study is undertaken.

Evaluation is the assessment of goodness. It deals with the comparative study of the organizations current Performance against some standard or set of expectations. Evaluation has two parts: the collection of information or evidence, about the organization or library's performance; and the comparison of this information with some set criteria. Different points of view needs different criteria, for example, for the purpose of the present study, priority has been placed on direct services to students, hence a criteria that focuses on students' needs is given more importance.

Objectives of the study

- To find out the academic status wise respondents' level of satisfaction with library collection and level of performance of overall library collections.
- To determine academic status wise respondents' opinion on level of satisfaction with library services and level of performance of overall library services.
- To know academic status wise respondents' satisfaction of e-resources and Level of Performance of overall e-resources.
- To study academic status wise Respondents' Opinion on Library Physical Facilities and level of performance of overall Physical facilities of library.

Methodology

There are fifteen arts and sciences colleges functioning in Cuddalore district the researcher collected data from all the colleges. The researcher employed a well-structured questionnaire for collecting the data from the colleges. The questionnaire was prepared in such a way that the respondents could easily understand the items. At first, a pilot study was conducted to test the feelings of the respondents in answering questions. The data collection was done in person by the researcher and filling the questionnaire by the respondents in their college premises. 1950 questionnaire distributed to the respondents and 1700 filled in questionnaire received from the respondents and making the response rate 87 percentage.

Limitations of the study

The findings of this study are applicable to students and teaching staff members of arts and science colleges located in Cuddalore district, Tamilnadu. No other arts and science colleges in other districts of Tamilnadu are included in the present study. The study has not been covered the research scholars working in the study colleges.

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Academic status wise respondents' level of satisfaction with library collection

S. No	Library collection	Student						Teaching staff						Total					
		Level of users satisfaction						Level of users satisfaction						Level of users satisfaction					
		Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total	Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total	Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total
1	Newspaper and magazine	-	-	715 (47.6)	418 (27.8)	367 (24.5)	1500 (100)	-	-	31 (15.5)	69 (34.5)	100 (50)	200 (100)	-	-	746 (43.8)	487 (28.6)	467 (27.5)	1700 (100)
2	Text book	-	-	621 (41.4)	516 (34.4)	363 (24.2)	1500 (100)	-	-	11 (5.5)	84 (42)	105 (52.5)	200 (100)	-	-	632 (37.2)	600 (35.3)	468 (28.6)	1700 (100)
3	Fiction	324 (21.6)	408 (27.2)	561 (37.5)	207 (13.8)	-	1500 (100)	64 (32.0)	72 (36.0)	51 (25.6)	13 (6.5)	-	200 (100)	388 (22.8)	480 (28.3)	612 (36)	220 (12.9)	-	1700 (100)
4	Encyclopedia	200 (13.4)	398 (26.6)	532 (35.5)	347 (23.4)	23 (1.5)	1500 (100)	39 (1.5)	71 (35.6)	33 (16.5)	20 (10)	37 (18.6)	200 (100)	239 (14.2)	469 (27.6)	565 (33.3)	367 (21.6)	60 (3.6)	1700 (100)
5	Dictionary	20 (1.4)	46 (3.1)	823 (54.8)	395 (26.4)	216 (14.4)	1500 (100)	7 (3.5)	9 (4.5)	63 (31.5)	78 (39)	43 (21.5)	200 (100)	27 (1.5)	55 (3.3)	886 (52.2)	473 (27.8)	259 (15.3)	1700 (100)
6	Conference proceedings	-	-	-	-	-	1500 (100)	-	-	-	-	-	200 (100)	-	-	-	-	-	1700 (100)
7	Journals	622 (41.6)	374 (24.9)	200 (13.4)	294 (19.7)	10 (0.6)	1500 (100)	59 (29.5)	52 (26)	47 (23.5)	35 (17.5)	7 (3.5)	200 (100)	681 (40.1)	426 (25.2)	247 (14.6)	329 (19.4)	17 (1)	1700 (100)
8	Project report	598 (39.9)	400 (26.7)	238 (15.8)	184 (12.3)	80 (5.3)	1500 (100)	15 (7.5)	36 (18)	100 (50)	26 (13)	23 (11.5)	200 (100)	613 (36.8)	436 (25.6)	338 (19.8)	210 (12.4)	103 (6.2)	1700 (100)
9	Thesis and dissertations	500 (33.4)	260 (17.4)	427 (28.5)	300 (20)	13 (0.8)	1500 (100)	118 (59)	20 (10)	10 (5)	35 (17.5)	17 (8.5)	200 (100)	618 (36.4)	280 (16.5)	437 (2.6)	335 (19.7)	30 (1.8)	1700 (100)

10	Question papers	59 (3.9)	398 (26.6)	328 (21.9)	300 (20)	415 (27.7)	1500 (100)	25 (12.5)	26 (13)	100 (50)	28 (14)	21 (10.5)	200 (100)	84 (4.9)	424 (24.9)	428 (25.2)	328 (19.3)	436 (25.6)	1700 (100)
11	Year books	387 (25.8)	360 (24)	256 (17.1)	400 (26.7)	97 (6.5)	1500 (100)	14 (7)	85 (42.5)	19 (9.5)	16 (9.5)	66 (32)	200 (100)	401 (23.6)	445 (26.8)	275 (16.2)	416 (24.5)	163 (9.5)	1700 (100)
12	Biographical sources	823 (54.9)	184 (12.3)	398 (26.6)	95 (6.4)	-	1500 (100)	55 (27.5)	44 (22)	76 (38)	25 (12.5)	-	200 (100)	878 (51.7)	228 (13.5)	474 (27.8)	120 (7.6)	-	1700 (100)
13	Geographical sources (Atlas maps)	1161 (77.4)	263 (17.5)	30 (2)	46 (3.7)	-	1500 (100)	100 (50)	32 (16)	43 (21.5)	25 (12.5)	-	200 (100)	1261 (74.2)	295 (17.5)	73 (4.3)	71 (4.2)	-	1700 (100)
14	Directory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

The above table 1 shows that academic Status wise Respondents’ Satisfaction of Library Collection. Out of 1500 student respondents nearly one-fourth of the absolutely satisfied with newspaper/ magazine and text book collection. But it was 50 percent and more than 50 percent in teaching staff category respectively. Regarding to use of fiction and Encyclopedia more than 30 percent of the student respondents particularly satisfied but it was 25.6 percent and 16.5 percent in teaching staff category. The table shows that teaching staff are higher percent than student category regarding to fairly and absolutely satisfaction with the wage of dictionary. 50 percent of the teaching staff particularly satisfied with project report and question paper collection and it is higher percent when compare to students respondents.

Table – 2
Academic status wise respondents’ opinion on level of performance of overall library collections

S.No.	Level of performance	Academic status		Total
		Student	Staff	
1.	Excellent	162 (10.8)	28 (14.0)	190 (11.17)
2.	Adequate	513 (34.2)	55 (27.5)	568 (33.41)
3.	Fair	609 (40.6)	70 (35.0)	679 (39.94)
4.	Inadequate	155 (10.33)	23 (11.5)	178 (10.47)
5.	Poor	61 (4.06)	24 (12.0)	85 (5.00)
	Total	1500 (100.0)	200 (100.0)	1700 (100.0)

Source : Computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 2 shows that Academic Status wise Respondents opinion on level of performance of overall library collections. Out of 1500 student respondents 40 percent of them says as ‘Fair’ but it is only 35 percent among the staff respondents. 34.2 percent of the respondents belongs to the student category says ‘Adequate’ whereas it is 27.5 percent in staff category. It is bound that student percent is higher than the staff in the above mentioned performance level but staff are slightly higher than student in the level of excellent. It could be noted from the table that 12 percent of the staff respondents says as poor but it is 4 percent among student category.

Table – 3
Academic Status wise Respondents’ Opinion on Level of Satisfaction with Library Services.

S. No	Library collection	Student						Teaching staff						Total					
		Level of satisfaction						Level of satisfaction						Level of satisfaction					
		Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total	Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total	Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total
1	Book lending service	-	38 (2.5)	257 (17.2)	838 (55.8)	367 (24.5)	1500 (100)	-	40 (20)	98 (49)	35 (17.5)	27 (13.5)	200 (100)	-	78 (4.5)	355 (20.8)	873 (51.4)	394 (23.3)	1700 (100)
2	Current awareness service (CAS)	152 (10.2)	241 (16.1)	621 (41.4)	438 (29.1)	48 (3.2)	1500 (100)	39 (19.5)	44 (22)	63 (31.5)	24 (12)	30 (15)	200 (100)	191 (11.3)	285 (16.7)	684 (40.2)	462 (27.2)	78 (4.5)	1700 (100)
3	SDI service	225 (15)	367 (24.5)	612 (40.8)	286 (19.1)	10 (0.7)	1500 (100)	57 (28.5)	49 (24.5)	70 (35)	17 (8.5)	7 (3.5)	200 (100)	282 (16.6)	416 (24.5)	682 (40.1)	303 (17.8)	17 (1)	1700 (100)
4	Reference service	-	297 (19.8)	500 (33.3)	600 (40)	103 (6.8)	1500 (100)	-	30 (15)	73 (36.5)	31 (15.5)	66 (33)	200 (100)	-	327 (19.3)	573 (33.7)	631 (37.1)	169 (9.9)	1700 (100)
5	Periodical service	-	184 (12.3)	344 (22.9)	527 (35.2)	445 (29.7)	1500 (100)	-	37 (18.5)	69 (34.5)	30 (15)	64 (32)	200 (100)	-	221 (13)	413 (24.3)	557 (32.7)	509 (29.9)	1700 (100)
6	Reprographic service	-	99 (6.6)	913 (60.8)	314 (20.9)	174 (11.7)	1500 (100)	-	43 (21.5)	70 (35)	43 (21.5)	44 (22)	200 (100)	-	142 (8.4)	983 (57.8)	357 (21)	218 (12.8)	1700 (100)
7	Inter library loan service	1000 (66.6)	400 (26.6)	43 (2.9)	57 (3.9)	-	1500 (100)	70 (35)	41 (20.5)	54 (27)	35 (17.5)	-	200 (100)	1070 (62.9)	441 (25.9)	97 (5.7)	92 (5.4)	-	1700 (100)
8	Bibliographic service	980 (65.4)	302 (20.2)	132 (8.7)	-	86 (5.7)	1500 (100)	20 (10)	100 (50)	66 (33)	-	14 (7)	200 (100)	1000 (58.8)	402 (23.7)	198 (11.7)	-	100 (5.8)	1700 (100)

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 3 shows that Academic status wise respondents' Opinion on Level of Satisfaction with library services. Among the student category majority 54.8 percent of them fairly satisfied with 'book lending service' but it is only below 20 percent in teaching staff category. It is interesting to note that 40 percent of the students fairly satisfied with reference service but at the same time 33 percent of teaching staff absolutely satisfied with this service. More percent of respondents in the teaching staff category also absolutely satisfied with periodical as well as reprographic service than student respondents.

Table - 4
Academic Status wise Respondents' opinion on level of performance of overall library services

	Level of performance	Academic status		Total
		Student	Teaching Staff	
1.	Excellent	163 (10.86)	18 (9.0)	181 (10.65)
2.	Adequate	405 (27.0)	93 (46.5)	498 (29.29)
3.	Fair	700 (46.66)	15 (7.5)	715 (42.05)
4.	Inadequate	153 (10.2)	51 (25.5)	204 (12.0)
5.	Poor	79 (5.26)	23 (11.5)	102 (6.00)
	Total	1500 (100.0)	200 (100.0)	1700 (100.0)

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 4 shows that Academic Status wise Respondents' Opinion on level of performance of overall library Service. Out of 1500 student respondents 46.66 percent of them says as 'Fair' but it is only 7.5 percent among the staff respondents. 27 percent of the respondents belongs to the student category says 'Adequate' whereas it is 46.5 percent in staff category. It is found that more percent of student says 'Fair' and more percent of staff says 'Adequate'. It is also seen from the table that 25 percent of staff also says that the library services are 'Inadequate' but it is 10 percent in among student category.

Table - 5
Academic status wise respondents' satisfaction with e-resources

S. No	E-resources	Student						Teaching staff						Total					
		Level of users satisfaction						Level of users satisfaction						Level of users satisfaction					
		Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total	Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total	Not satisfied	Not much satisfied	Particularly satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Absolutely satisfied	Total
1	Internet	-	412 (27.4)	120 (8)	268 (17.9)	700 (46.7)	1500 (100)	-	42 (21)	82 (41)	50 (25)	26 (13)	200 (100)	-	454 (26.7)	202 (11.8)	318 (18.7)	726 (42.7)	1700
2	On line journal	-	415 (27.6)	712 (47.5)	350 (23.4)	23 (1.5)	1500 (100)	-	50 (25)	55 (27.5)	45 (22.5)	50 (25)	200 (100)	-	465 (27.3)	767 (45.1)	395 (23.4)	73 (4.2)	1700
3	On line database	15 (1)	720 (48)	50 (3.3)	5 (0.3)	710 (47.3)	1500 (100)	12 (6)	58 (29)	75 (37.5)	5 (2.5)	50 (25)	200 (100)	27 (1.5)	778 (45.7)	125 (7.4)	10 (0.5)	760 (44.9)	1700
4	CD ROM database	500 (33.3)	-	700 (46.6)	224 (14.9)	76 (5.2)	1500 (100)	70 (21.5)	-	57 (28.5)	51 (25.5)	22 (11)	200 (100)	570 (33.5)	-	757 (44.5)	275 (16.2)	98 (5.8)	1700
5	OPAC	280 (18.6)	109 (7.3)	188 (12.5)	215 (14.3)	708 (47.2)	1500 (100)	43 (21.5)	24 (12)	19 (9.5)	54 (27)	60 (30)	200 (100)	323 (19)	133 (7.8)	207 (12.2)	269 (15.8)	768 (45.2)	1700
6	College website	900 (60)	245 (16.3)	100 (6.6)	115 (7.6)	140 (9.3)	1500 (100)	78 (39)	23 (11.5)	25 (12.5)	15 (7.5)	59 (29.5)	200 (100)	978 (57.5)	268 (15.7)	125 (7.4)	130 (7.6)	199 (11.8)	1700

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 5 shows Academic status wise respondents' user's satisfaction with e-resources. Among the student respondents 40-50 percent of them absolutely satisfied with internet, online database and OPAC service but in case of teaching staff category majority of them particularly satisfied with internet, online journal, online database and CD-ROM database. It is also found from the table that 30 percent of the respondents in the category of teaching staff absolutely satisfied with OPAC and college website.

Table – 6: Academic Status wise Respondents' Opinion on Level of Performance of Overall E-Resources

S.No.	Level of performance	Academic status		Total
		Student	Staff	
1.	Excellent	105 (7.00)	16 (8.0)	121 (7.11)
2.	Adequate	302 (20.13)	41 (20.5)	343 (20.17)
3.	Fair	904 (60.26)	14 (7.0)	918 (54.0)
4.	Inadequate	102 (6.8)	66 (33.0)	168 (9.88)
5.	Poor	87 (5.80)	63 (31.5)	150 (8.82)
	Total	1500 (100.0)	200 (100.0)	1700 (100.0)

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 6 shows that Academic Status wise Respondents' Opinion on level of Performance of Overall E-Resources. Among the 1500 student respondents majority 60.26 percent of them says 'Fair' but in case of among staff category majority 33 percent of them says 'Inadequate'. It is also found that there is no variation among the academic status of the respondents regarding to 'Adequate'. It is also important to note that 31.5 percent of the staff respondents pointed out the performance of overall e-resources is 'Poor'.

Table - 7

Academic status wise Respondents' Opinion on Library Physical Facilities

S. No	Library physical facility	Academic Status					
		Teaching Staff		Students		Total	
		Satisfied	Not satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied
1	Ventilation	84 (42.0)	116 (58.0)	916 (61.07)	584 (38.93)	1000 (58.8)	700 (41.2)
2	Furniture	91 (45.5)	109 (54.5)	354 (23.6)	1146 (76.4)	445 (26.2)	1255 (73.8)
3	Lighting	118 (59.0)	82 (41.0)	520 (34.7)	980 (65.3)	638 (37.5)	1062 (62.5)
4	Study hall or cubicles	36 (18.0)	164 (82.0)	452 (30.1)	1048 (69.9)	488 (28.7)	1212 (71.3)
5	Drinking water	64 (32.0)	136 (68.0)	600 (40.0)	900 (60.0)	664 (39.1)	1036 (60.9)
6	Toilets	51 (25.5)	149 (74.5)	114 (7.6)	1386 (92.4)	165 (9.7)	1535 (90.3)

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 7 shows Academic status wise respondents' opinion on library physical facilities. Among the teaching staff nearly 60 percent of them satisfied with lighting facility but it is only 34 percent in student category. It is observed from the table that 61 percent of the

students satisfied with “Ventilation” facility but it is 42 percent among teaching staff category. It is also noted from the table that more than 90 percent of the student this satisfied with “Toilets” facility.

Table - 8
Academic Status wise Respondents’ opinion on level of performance of overall Physical facilities of library

S. No	Level of performance	Academic status		Total
		Student	Staff	
1.	Excellent	182 (12.13)	36 (18.0)	218 (12.82)
2.	Adequate	623 (41.53)	53 (26.5)	676 (39.76)
3.	Fair	622 (41.46)	70 (35.0)	692 (40.70)
4.	Inadequate	41 (2.73)	23 (11.5)	64 (3.76)
5.	Poor	32 (2.13)	18 (9.00)	50 (2.94)
	Total	1500 (100.0)	200 (100.0)	1700 (100.0)

Source : computed

Figure in the parenthesis denote percentage

Table 8 shows that Academic Status wise Respondents’ opinion on level of performance of overall Physical facilities of library. Among 1500 student respondents each 41 percent of them says ‘Adequate’ and ‘Fair’ but in case of among staff respondents it is 26.5 and 35 percent. It is also noted that 11 and 9 percent of staff respondents says ‘Inadequate’ and ‘Poor’ but it is below 3 percent among the students respondents.

Findings:

- Out of 1500 student respondents nearly 25 percent of them absolutely satisfied with newspaper/ magazine and text book collection. Whereas 50 percent and more than 50 percent of teaching staff absolutely satisfied with above said.
- Out of 1500 student respondents and 200 staff respondents 40 percent and 35 percent of them says as ‘Fair’ about the performance of overall library collections respectively.
- Out of 1500 student respondents majority 54.8 percent of them fairly satisfied with ‘book lending service’ but it is only below 20 percent in teaching staff category.
- Out of 1500 student respondents 46.66 percent of them and among 200 staff respondents 7.5 percent of them says as ‘Fair’ about performance of overall library Services.
- Out of 1500 student respondents 40-50 percent of them absolutely satisfied with internet, online database and OPAC service but in case of teaching staff category majority of them particularly satisfied with internet, online journal, online database and CD-ROM database.
- Out of 1500 student respondents majority 60.26 percent of them and among 200 teaching staff respondents 33 percent of them says ‘Fair’ and ‘Inadequate’ about the performance of overall e-resources.

- Out of 1500 student respondents majority 60 percent of them and among 200 teaching staff respondents 35 percent of them satisfied with lighting facility.
- Out of 1500 student respondents each 41 percent of them says 'Adequate' and 'Fair' but among 200 teaching staff respondents it is 26.5 and 35 percent respectively.

Conclusion:

The successful operation of any library depends upon the user satisfaction towards library collection, services and facilities. So it is important to meet the need and requirement of the user, periodically the librarian evaluate the library resources, services and facilities by the user of the library. As the result of the study, the library authority could be possible to take necessary action towards the development of its services.

References:

1. Lazinger, Susan S.; Bar-Ilan, Judit; and Peritz, Bluma C. (1998), "Internet Use by Faculty Members in Various Disciplines: A Comparative Case Study", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, Vol. 48, No. 6, PP. 508-518.
2. Mallaiah, T.Y.; and Gowda, M. Purushothama (2009) "Collection Development in Mangalore University Library: A User Study", *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 46, No. 1, PP. 73-80.
3. Oyesiku, F.A.; Amusa, O.I.; and Odunew, A.O. (2006), "Resources, Services and Management of Academic Law Libraries and Law Firm Libraries", *International Library Movement*, Vol. 28, No. 4, PP. 181-205.

