Evaluation of University Library Homepages: with Special Reference to South India

Manjunath Lamani
Research Scholar
Department of Library & Information Science, Karnatak University,
Pavate Nagar Dharwad -580003 (Karnatak-India)
e-mail: leosigman@gmail.com

Dr. Keshava
Associate Professor
Department of Studies and Research in Library & Information Science,
Tumkur University
B H Road, Tumakuru-572103 (Karnatak-India)
e-mail: keshtut@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The objective of the paper is to evaluate the homepages of university libraries based on the criteria such as Authority, Purpose, Coverage, Currency, Objectivity, Accuracy, Superstructure, Graphics, Use of colour, Content, Readability, Page layout, Hyperlinks, Promotions, Searching and FAQ which were proposed by Benjamin Keevil. The study covers the libraries of the universities of the south Indian states viz. Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala. The result of the study shows that majority of the libraries' homepages have the compatibility with all the browsers. There is the link among the web resources, but no direct link of the libraries' homepages among the universities. It was surprised that there was no regular updates of them. Further, they contain their missions and visions. Majority of them don't have Web OPAC's, information on the current news, notice, administrative structures and Ask Librarian's link including the committee of the libraries whereas they have links to e-resources under consortia.

Keywords: Website analysis, University Libraries, South India, evaluation criteria, Library homepage.

Introduction

In the digital world, the most of the activities take place with the help of Information & Communication Technology. Advancement of technology has made things so easy, provided one has to adopt oneself into the virtual world. ICT has almost entered into all fields. Research goes on now and then to modify and update the necessary applications to every field of activities by ICT. Sir Tim Berners-Lee, the British computer scientist had invented the 'www' in 1989. Gradually, the development of internet took place and has become a part of everyone's life too. Website plays the dominant role of exchanging the information and ideas via mails, audios, videos and graphics etc., whereas it is the medium of communication which is easily affordable and accessible to all.

With the help of UGC/ AICTE, the national agencies are here to support the development of the libraries of universities for sharing the resources among themselves. The motto of the Library is to disseminate the offline or online resources as per the present requirement of the

users because of the advanced technologies in handling the information by various modes. Most of the libraries of universities have all types of resources for learning, teaching and research activities. But the availability of the existing resources in them would serve the purpose of the users if they are available in their libraries' homepages with the link.

Objectives:

The major objectives of the study are:
1. To reveal the authority of website designer and developer;
2. To know the contents;
3. To investigate the coverage;
4. To know the organisation of library homepage;
5. To identify and improve the search efficiency;
6. To study the layout of the homepage;
7. To analyse the supporting tasks and feedbacks;

Methodology:

Questionnaire method is widely used for collecting the data in social science research where it is a reasonable tool for gathering of data from huge, different, mixed and scattered social group (Kothari, C. R. -2007). In the present study, questionnaire method has been adopted for collecting the data from the respondents.

A structured questionnaire was designed for the pilot study and it was redesigned and finalized based on the responses and suggestions which are driven from the pilot study. Based on UGC/ NAAC accredited list of universities from the UGC website and institutes which are considered for the national importance, only twenty seven universities have been selected for the research out of ninety six universities in the states of South India.

Scope and Limitations:

The study is confined to the evaluation of libraries' homepages of twenty seven universities have been selected, out of ninety six universities in the entire south India. Universities with the potential for excellence, agricultural, women's university, technological, the national law School of India University, Language and Heritage University and institutes of the national importance from the states like Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Kerala have been considered for the present study. The target population for the study includes faculty members, research scholars, students and others (For example, lab technicians, lab assistants, web-masters etc.).

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

The data has been collected through the questionnaires by visiting personally and conducting **interviews.** There are various formulas for calculating the required sample size based on the data collected is to be of categorical or quantitative in nature. For the present study, the sample techniques proposed by Robert V Krejecie and Daryle W Morgan (1970) were adopted.

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

Where,

S - The required sample size

X^2 - The table value of X^2 for 1 degree of freedom at the desired

confidence level (3.841)

N - The population size

P - The population proportion

(Assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

d - the degree of accuracy expressed as P (i.e. margin of error=5.0 percent).

About 977 questionnaires were distributed with 99.0% confidence level at the degree of 0.03 of accuracy. A total of 815 questionnaires were received with 83.42% response.

Category of respondents

Table-1 Category & number of respondents

Sl No.	Category	No. of respondents	Percentage
1	Students	150	18.4
2	Research Scholars	405	49.7
3	Faculty members	223	27.4
4	Others	37	4.5
	Total	815	100

Table-1, shows the category of respondents. Nearly fifty percent 405 (49.7%) of them are research scholars, it is followed by faculty members are 223 (27.4%), and 150 (18.4%) are students and only 37 (4.5%) are others. Others included are technical assistants, webmasters, and Computer lab in charge of respective universities.

Information Dissemination

Table-2 Ratings of information dissemination

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	**Research Scholars**	**Faculty Members**	**Others**	
Compatibility with IE, Netscape, Opera, Chrome and Mozilla	Poor	4 (17.4)	17 (73.9)	2 (8.7)	0 (0)	23
	Average	39 (19.7)	92 (46.5)	55 (27.8)	12 (6.1)	198
	Good	84 (20.6)	193 (47.4)	112 (27.5)	18 (4.4)	407
	Very Good	23 (13.8)	94 (56.3)	46 (27.5)	4 (2.4)	167
	Excellent	0 (0)	9 (45.0)	8 (40.0)	3 (15.0)	20
	Mean =2.95		**CV=27.45**		**p=0.01**	
Links to others Libraries	Poor	118 (21.7)	247 (45.4)	158 (29.0)	21 (3.9)	544
	Average	13 ((10.7)	79 (65.3)	25 (20.7)	4 (3.3)	121
	Good	15 (16.0)	44 (46.8)	29 (30.9)	6 (6.4)	94

	Very Good	3 (7.0)	27 (62.8)	8 (18.6)	5 (11.6)	43
	Excellent	1 (7.7)	8 (61.5)	3 (23.1)	1 (7.7)	13
	Mean =1.6		**CV=61.81**		***p*=0.00**	
Links to web resources	Poor	30 (17.6)	86 (50.6)	45 (26.5)	9 (5.3)	170
	Average	17 (19.5)	35 (40.2)	31 (35.6)	4 (4.6)	87
	Good	57 (25.2)	102 (45.1)	56 (24.8)	11 (4.9)	226
	Very Good	37 (14.1)	147 (55.9)	71 (27.0)	8 (3.0)	263
	Excellent	9 (13.0)	35 (50.7)	20 (29.0)	5 (7.2)	69
	Mean =2.96		**CV=42.66**		***p*=0.073**	

In Table-2, A question was asked to rate whether *homepage is compatible* with different browsers like Internet explorer, Netscape Navigator, Opera, Google Chrome and Mozilla Firefox or not. Out of 815 respondents, 407 have rated as ***very good*** who are research scholars (47.4%), faculty members (27.5%), students (20.6%) and others (4.4%). Majority of them have agreed with the existing library homepage where it has the compatibility with all the browsers. 198 respondents have rated as *average* who are research scholars (46.5%), faculty members (27.8%), students (19.7%) and others (6.1%). It is depicted from the above table that compatibility of websites is very good. It is also supported by chi-square test value *p*=0.016; Mean value =2.95, Coefficient of Variation = 27.45 holds good.

With regard to *'links to other libraries'* in the library homepage, majority of the respondents (544) rated as ***poor*** who are research scholars (45.5%), faculty members (29.0%), students (21.7%) and others (4.9%). It is understood from the data that there are no links to other libraries on the websites. The support of Chi-square test (p=0.00) indicates significant. There is an association between the attribute and the rating scale. The Mean (1.6) and CV (61.81) indicate negative.

Regarding the *'links to web resources'* on the library homepage, 263 respondents rated as ***good*** who are research scholars (55.9%), faculty members (27.0%), students (14.1%) and others (3.0%). It is clear from the above table that web resource links are provided in the library homepage across the universities. The support of Chi-square test (*p*=0.07) indicate insignificant. The Mean value (2.96) and CV (42.66) are also holds good. Therefore, it is inferred that majority of the libraries' homepages have 'links to web resources.

Information Searching

Table 3: Ratings of information Searching

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Date of last update	Poor	94 (20.0)	212 (45.1)	140 (29.8)	24 (5.1)	470
	Average	14 (14.1)	58 (58.6)	24 (24.2)	3 (3.0)	99
	Good	20 (15.3)	71 (54.2)	36 (27.5)	4 (3.1)	131
	Very Good	16 (17.0)	57 (60.6)	17 (18.1)	4 (4.3)	94
	Excellent	6 (28.6)	7 (33.3)	6 (28.6)	2 (9.5)	21
	Mean =1.89		**CV=63**		***p*=0.11**	
Latest News, and flash	Poor	15 (15.3)	47 (48.0)	25 (25.5)	11 (11.2)	98
	Average	61 (17.9)	165 (48.5)	98 (28.8)	16 (4.7)	340
	Good	58 (20.3)	143 (50.0)	77 (26.9)	8 (2.8)	286
	Very Good	15 (19.2)	44 (56.4)	17 (21.8)	2 (2.6)	78
	Excellent	1 (7.7)	6 (46.2)	6 (46.2)	0 (0)	
	Mean =2.46		**CV=35.7**		***p*=0.09**	

With the reference of *'date of last updates'* of the libraries' homepages, most of the research scholars rated as *poor* followed by faculty members (29.8%), students (20%) and others (5.1%). It is clear from the table-3, that the university authority had not updated library's homepage. It is also supported by Chi-square test (p=0.11) which indicates highly insignificant. There is an association between attribute and rating scale. Therefore it is inferred that there is no regular updates of the library homepage across universities in South India.

In the matter of *'latest news and flash'* the data depicted reveals that majority (45.8%) of the research scholars rated as an *average* followed by faculty members (28.8%), students (17.9%) and others (4.7%). It is clear that the 'latest news and flash' in the library's homepage is not updated regularly. The verification of Chi-square test (p=0.09) indicates highly insignificant. The Mean (2.46) and CV (35.7) hold slight negative. Therefore, it is inferred that the *'latest news and flash'* in the library homepage is not updated.

Table 4: Ratings of authority of information

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Copyright	Poor	94 (20.0)	212 (45.1)	140 (29.8)	24 (5.1)	470
	Average	14 (14.1)	58 (58.6)	24 (24.2)	3 (3.0)	99
	Good	20 (15.3)	71 (54.2)	36 (27.5)	4 (3.1)	131
	Very Good	16 (17.0)	57 (60.6)	17 (18.1)	4 (4.3)	94
	Excellent	6 (28.6)	7 (33.3)	6 (28.6)	2 (9.5)	21
	Mean =2.86		**CV=36.86**		*p*=**0.51**	
Design and content	Poor	5 (41.7)	6 (50.0)	1 (8.3)	0 (0)	12
	Average	20 (17.2)	67 (57.8)	22 (19.0)	7 (6.0)	116
	Good	77 (22.6)	152 (44.7)	95 (27.9)	16 (4.7)	340
	Very Good	40 (13.5)	156 (52.7)	88 (29.7)	12 (4.1)	296
	Excellent	8 (15.7)	24 (47.1)	17 (33.3)	2 (3.9)	51
	Mean =2.95		**CV=25.5**		*p*=**0.03**	
Independent Domain	Poor	102 (24.3)	187 (44.6)	112 (26.7)	18 (4.3)	419
	Average	24 (14.0)	89 (52.0)	50 (29.2)	8 (4.7)	171
	Good	11 (13.6)	41 (50.6)	24 (29.6)	5 (6.2)	81
	Very Good	7 (9.1)	49 (63.6)	16 (20.8)	5 (6.5)	77
	Excellent	6 (9.0)	39 (58.2)	21 (31.3)	1 (1.5)	67
	Mean =2.02		**CV=65.14**		*p*=**0.00**	

The table-4 depicts the 'ratings of information'. In response to links related to 'copyright', the majority are research scholars and rated as good followed by faculty members (29.8%), students (20%) and others (5.1%). It is also verified statistically and same is depicted in the table.

With reference *to the* design and contents of the libraries' homepages, it reveals that the majority of the research scholars rated as ***good*** followed by faculty members (27.9%), students (22.6%) and others (4.7%). It is clear that the design and contents of libraries' homepages are updated. It is supported by statistical analysis as shown in the table.

While observing the 'independent domains' for library website, it reveals that majority of the research scholars (44.6%) opined that there is no separate domain for library website, followed by faculty members (26.7%), students (24.3%) and others (4.3%). It is clear that there is no separate domain for library website. It is statistically verified and same is given in the table. Therefore, it is inferred that the library websites are not there in most of the universities of the South India.

Table 5: Ratings of website Index

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Indexed in Google, Yahoo and AltaVista etc	Poor	12 (23.1)	25 (48.1)	11 (21.2)	4 (7.7)	52
	Average	77 (21.5)	162 (45.3)	102 (28.5)	17 (4.7)	358
	Good	53 (17.6)	150 (49.8)	87 (28.9)	11 (3.7)	301
	Very Good	7 (7.7)	61 (67.0)	19 (20.9)	4 (4.4)	91
	Excellent	1 (7.7)	7 (53.8)	4 (30.8)	1 (7.7)	13
	Mean =2.57		CV=32.27		*p*=0.05	

Table-5 reveals that majority of the research scholars (45.3%) opined that the library homepage is indexed for some extent followed by faculty members (28.5%), students (21.5%) and others (4.7%). It is clear from the data that the library homepage is indexed for some extent. It is also supported by Chi-square test (p=0.05), Mean (2.57) and CV (32.27) which show negative trend.

Table-6: Ratings of Information Contents

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Library vision and mission	Poor	26 (26.8)	32 (33.0)	35 (36.1)	4 (4.1)	97
	Average	51 (21.0)	122 (50.2)	62 (25.5)	8 (3.3)	243
	Good	54 (16.6)	172 (52.8)	84 (25.8)	16 (4.9)	326
	Very Good	18 (13.7)	72 (55.0)	36 (27.5)	5 (3.8)	131
	Excellent	1 (5.6)	7 (38.9)	6 (33.3)	4 (22.2)	18
	Mean =2.66		CV=35.84		*p*=0.00	
Web OPAC	Poor	59 (17.3)	163 (47.8)	104 (30.5)	15 (4.4)	341
	Average	9 (19.1)	18 (38.3)	16 (34.0)	4 (8.5)	47
	Good	35 (20.6)	89 (52.4)	42 (24.7)	4 (2.4)	170
	Very Good	42 (18.8)	117 (52.2)	54 (24.1)	11 (4.9)	224
	Excellent	5 (15.2)	18 (54.5)	7 (21.2)	3 (9.1)	33
	Mean =2.46		CV=55.71		*p*=0.46	
E- Resources under consortia	Poor	10 (12.7)	47 (59.5)	18 (22.8)	4 (5.1)	79
	Average	20 (18.9)	43 (40.6)	36 (34.0)	7 (6.6)	106
	Good	58 (22.5)	126 (48.8)	64 (24.8)	10 (3.9)	258
	Very Good	54 (16.5)	169 (51.5)	93 (28.4)	12 (3.7)	328
	Excellent	8 (18.2)	20 (45.5)	12 (27.3)	4 (9.1)	44
	Mean =3.18		CV=32.96		*p*=0.23	
Staff Details	Poor	41 (17.0)	112 (46.7)	78 (32.3)	10 (4.1)	241
	Average	28 (26.4)	46 (43.4)	26 (24.5)	6 (5.7)	106
	Good	34 (15.3)	121 (54.7)	60 (27.1)	6 (2.7)	221

	Very Good	42 ((20.0)	111 (52.9)	47 (22.4)	10 (4.8)	210
	Excellent	5 (13.5)	15 (40.5)	12 (32.4)	5 (13.5)	37
	Mean =2.65		**CV=47.46**		**p=0.03**	
Librarian Profile	Poor	115 (23.7)	215 (44.2)	138 (28.4)	18 (3.7)	486
	Average	20 (17.2)	56 (48.3)	33 (28.4)	(6.0)	116
	Good	12 (9.0)	80 (60.2)	34 (25.6)	7 (5.3)	133
	Very Good	2 (3.6)	33 (60.0)	16 (29.1)	4 (7.3)	55
	Excellent	1 (4.0)	21 (84.0)	2 (8.0)	1 (4.0)	25
	Mean =1.79		**CV=62.69**		**p=0.00**	
Current news and notices	Poor	25 (35.2)	27 (38.0)	18 (25.4)	1 (1.4)	71
	Average	62 (17.5)	174 (49.2)	98 (27.7)	20 (5.6)	354
	Good	52 (17.9)	141 (48.5)	86 (29.6)	12 (4.1)	291
	Very Good	11 (11.3)	62 (63.9)	21 (21.6)	3 (3.1)	97
	Excellent	0 (0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0)	1 (50.0)	2
	Mean =2.51		**CV=32.71**		**p=0.00**	
ICT Facility	Poor	10 (23.8)	22 (52.4)	9 (21.4)	1 (2.4)	42
	Average	33 (19.3)	80 (46.8)	47 (27.5)	11 (6.4)	171
	Good	74 (18.8)	202 (51.4)	104 (26.5)	13 (3.3)	393
	Very Good	29 (15.0)	98 (50.8)	56 (29.0)	10 (5.2)	193
	Excellent	4 (26.7)	3 ((20.0)	6 (40.0)	3 (13.3)	15
	Mean =2.96		**CV=28.96**		**p=0.38**	
Library Achievements	Poor	100 (30.1)	133 (40.1)	84 (25.3)	15 (4.5)	332
	Average	33 (11.0)	170 (56.5)	90 (29.9)	8 (2.7)	301
	Good	9 (9.9)	50 (54.9)	27 (29.7)	6 (5.5)	92
	Very Good	7 (10.1)	39 (56.5)	16 (23.2)	7 (10.1)	69
	Excellent	1 (4.8)	12 (57.1)	6 (28.6)	)	21
	Mean =1.95		**CV=53.84**		**p=0.00**	
Useful links	Poor	0 (.0)	4 (36.4)	6 (54.5)	1 (9.1)	11
	Average	24 (22.9)	48 (45.7)	28 (26.7)	5 (4.8)	105
	Good	71 (19.8)	168 (46.9)	105 (29.3)	14 (3.9)	358
	Very Good	47 (16.0)	162 (55.3)	73 (24.9)	11 (3.8)	293
	Excellent	8 (16.7)	23 (47.9)	11 (22.9)	6 (12.5)	48
	Mean =3.32		**CV=24.74**		**p=0.06**	
Contact information	Poor	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	0 (0)	9
	Average	6 (9.2)	32 (49.2)	21 (32.3)	6 (9.2)	65
	Good	66 (21.3)	144 (46.5)	85 (27.4)	15 (4.8)	310
	Very Good	61 (17.6)	184 (53.0)	93 (26.8)	9 (2.6)	347
	Excellent	16 (19.0)	38 (45.2)	23 (27.4)	7 (8.3)	84
	Mean =2.83		**CV=41.8**		**p=0.09**	

Table-6 indicates 'the ratings of information contents' viz. library vision and mission, Web OPAC, e-resources under consortia, Librarian profile, the current news and notices, administrative structure, ICT facility, library achievement, useful links for users and contact information on the library homepages.

With respect to *Library vision and mission* on the homepage, 405 respondents have rated **good**, the majority of them are research scholars (52.8%) followed by faculty (25.8%), students (16.6%) and others (4.9%). It is clear that the homepage contains library vision and mission. It is supported by Chi-square test value p=0.00 which shows highly significant. There is an association between the respondents and the attributes. The mean value 2.66 and co-efficient of variation 35.84 holds good. It is seen from the table that library homepage proves the vision and mission statements.

Concerned with *Web OPAC of library* on the homepage, 341 respondents have rated **poor,** in which, 47.8% of them are research scholars followed by faculty members (30.5%), students (17.3%) and others (4.4%) whereas 224 have rated **very good**, in which 52.2% of them are research scholars followed by faculty members (24.1%), students (18.8%) and others (4.9%). It is clear that the majority of the library homepages don't have Web OPAC. It is supported by Chi-square test (p=0.46) which indicates highly insignificant. There is an association between attribute and rating scale. It is supported by the mean value 2.46 and co-efficient of variation 55.71. It is inferred that majority of the library homepages don't have link to Web OPAC across the universities.

With reference to *e- resources under consortia,* the data given in the table shows that the library homepage contains links to e-resources under consortia. It is verified statistically and results are depicted. Therefore, it is inferred that majority of the library homepages have links to e-resources under consortia.

Concerned with the staff details and librarian's profile, the data depicted in the table clearly indicates that the library homepage doesn't contain them. The data is statistically tested and found the same. Therefore, it is inferred that the majority of the universities' library homepages don't contain library staff details and librarian's profile.

With regard to *current news and notices* and *administrative structure of the library,* it is revealed that majority of the research scholars rated as **poor** followed by faculty members, students and others. It is clear from the analysed data which is shown in the respective attribute. The result of the analysis is also tested statistically and found that the library homepages don't contain information on *current news and notices* and *administrative structure of the library.* Therefore, it is inferred that the majority of the library homepages do not contain information on the current *news, notices* and *administrative structure of the library*.

With reference to the availability of *ICT facility* on the university library homepage, 393 respondents rated *good*, in which research scholars are 51.4% followed by faculty members (26.5%), students (18.8%) and others (3.3%). It is clear that the ICT facility availability on the homepage is good. It is supported by Chi-square test p=0.38 which shows insignificant. There is an association between the rating scale and attribute. The value of Co-efficient of variation 28.96 and Mean value 2.96 proves good. Therefore, it is inferred that the majority of the universities' library homepages have ICT facility.

As far as library achievement concerned, the data depicted in the table reveals that the library homepage doesn't contain information on library achievement. The data is also supported by Chi-square test (p=0.05) which indicates significant. There is a consistency in the responses which are obtained. The value of mean (1.95) and CV (53.84) also shows negative trend. Therefore, it is inferred that majority of the library homepages on the websites of universities have no information on library achievement.

In the matter of the useful links of library homepage, the data shown in the table reveals the opinion of the respondents like research scholars that the homepages have the useful links followed by faculty members (29.3%); students (19.8%) and others (3.9%). It is clear that the homepages have useful links. It is also tested and verified by x^2 analysis (p=0.06) which indicates insignificant. There is a consistency in the obtained responses. The value of Mean value (3.32) and CV (24.74) holds good. Therefore, it is inferred that majority of the library homepages contain the useful links across the universities of the South India.

With regard to contact information, 347 respondents have rated as **very good**, in which there are research scholars more than fifty percent (53.0%), followed by faculty members (26.8%), students (17.6%) and others (2.6%). While 310 respondents have rated as **good**, in which 46.5% of them are research scholars followed by faculty members (27.4%), students (21.3%) and others (4.8%).

It is found that there is a contact information on library homepage. It is statistically proved by Chi-square test value p=0.09 which shows insignificant. There is an association between the attribute and rating scale. The value of mean 2.83 and co-efficient of variation 41.8 holds good. Therefore, it is inferred that majority of the library homepages contain contact information.

Table 7: Ratings of Search efficiency

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Search option linked to any search engines	Poor	48 (18.3)	129 (49.2)	69 (26.3)	16 (6.1)	262
	Average	40 (20.4)	92 (46.9)	56 (28.6)	8 (4.1)	196
	Good	39 (20.3)	108 (56.2)	42 (21.9)	3 (1.6)	192
	Very Good	20 (14.0)	74 (51.7)	42 (29.4)	7 (4.9)	143
	Excellent	3 (13.6)	2 (9.1)	14 (63.6)	3 (13.6)	22
	Mean =2.34		**CV=50.14**		**p=0.00**	

Table-7 describes the *ratings of search efficiency*. With reference to the *'search option linked to search engines',* the data depicts that the library homepages do not have search option links to other search engines. It is also tested statistically and the results are given in the table.

Therefore, it is inferred that the library homepages do not have search option links to other search engines in the university website.

Information Know How

Table No.8: Ratings of the organisation of website

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Library rules and regulations	Poor	40 (23.8)	90 (53.6)	35 (20.8)	3 (1.8)	168
	Average	25 (20.5)	58 (47.5)	32 (26.2)	7 (5.7)	122
	Good	55 (18.4)	136 (45.5)	95 (31.8)	13 (4.3)	299
	Very Good	25 (13.4)	114 (61.3)	39 (21.0)	8 (4.3)	186
	Excellent	5 (12.5)	7 (17.5)	22 (55.0)	6 (15.0)	40
	Mean =2.76		**CV=41.95**		***p*=0.00**	
Library Committee	Poor	72 (16.3)	225 (50.9)	127 (28.7)	18 (4.1)	442
	Average	23 (23.2)	51 (51.5)	21 (21.2)	4 (4.0)	99
	Good	38 (27.5)	58 (42.0)	36 (26.1)	6 (4.3)	138
	Very Good	11 (9.9)	65 (58.6)	28 (25.2)	7 (6.3)	111
	Excellent	6 (24.0)	6 (24.0)	11 (44.0)	2 (8.0)	25
	Mean =1.99		**CV=62.2**		***p*=0.00**	

Table-8 reveals the attribute *library rules and regulations*, working hours, terminology and consistency, clarity and conciseness of the text and background colour of the homepages, the majority of the research scholars rated as ***good*** followed by faculty members, students and others. The data is clearly depicted in the table. It is also tested statistically and found correct. Therefore, it is inferred that the library homepages contain them in the university website.

With regard to *library committee*, the majority (50.9%) of the research scholars opined that the information about library committee is not available on the library homepages followed by faculty members (28.7%) students (16.3%) and others (4.1%). It is clear that the library homepages do not contain information about library committee. It is verified statistically by Chi-square test (p=0.00) which indicates highly significant.

There is an association between the attribute and the rating scale. The value of Mean (1.99) and CV (62.2) also indicates negative trend. Therefore, it is inferred that majority of library homepages of university websites do not contain information about library committee.

Supporting tasks:

Table 9: Ratings of Supporting Tasks

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	Research Scholars	Faculty Members	Others	
Availability of FAQ	Poor	117 (20.4)	280 (48.8)	148 (25.8)	29 (5.1)	574
	Average	2 (4.9)	25 (61.0)	11 (26.8)	3 (7.3)	41
	Good	14 (13.6)	49 (47.6)	39 (37.9)	1 (1.0)	103
	Very Good	16 (17.6)	50 (54.9)	22 (24.2)	3 (3.3)	91
	Excellent	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7)	3 (50.0)	1 (16.7)	6
	Mean =1.66		**CV=66.63**		***p*=0.03**	

Feedback Mechanism	Poor	61 (18.8)	151 (46.5)	97 (29.8)	16 (4.9)	325
	Average	25 (19.4)	66 (51.2)	31 (24.0)	7 (5.4)	129
	Good	49 (20.7)	115 (48.5)	64 (27.0)	9 (3.8)	237
	Very Good	13 (10.9)	73 (61.3)	28 (23.5)	5 (4.2)	119
	Excellent	2 (40.0)	0 (0)	3 (60.0)	0 (0)	5
	Mean =2.2		**CV=51.56**		***p*=0.15**	
Question Point to Seek opinion	Poor	62 (17.4)	169 (47.5)	108 (30.3)	17 (4.8)	356
	Average	18 (18.9)	44 (46.3)	24 (25.3)	9 (9.5)	95
	Good	52 (23.9)	103 (47.2)	58 (26.6)	5 (2.3)	218
	Very Good	17 (12.8)	82 (61.7)	28 (21.1)	6 (4.5)	133
	Excellent	1 (7.7)	7 (53.8)	5 (38.5)	0 (0)	13
	Mean =2.2		**CV=54.81**		***p*=0.02**	
Ask Librarian	Poor	73 (21.6)	134 (39.6)	112 (33.1)	19 (5.6)	338
	Average	22 (15.1)	89 (61.0)	29 (19.9)	6 (4.1)	146
	Good	33 (19.3)	82 (48.0)	49 (28.7)	7 (4.1)	171
	Very Good	21 (13.8)	97 (63.8)	31 (20.4)	3 (2.0)	152
	Excellent	1 (12.5)	3 (37.5)	2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)	8
	Mean =2.19		**CV=54.26**		***p*=0.00**	

Table-9 shows the rating of supporting tasks through different attributes. It reveals availability of FAQ, the majority of the research scholars (48.8%) rated as *poor* followed by faculty members (25.8%), students (20.4%) and others (5.1%) whereas 103 respondents rated as *good*. It is clear from the table that FAQ is not available in library links on the website. It is also tested statistically by x^2 analysis (p=0.03) which indicate significant. There is a consistency in the obtained responses. The value Mean (1.66) and CV (66.63) holds poor. Therefore, it is inferred that FAQ is not available in the library links on the website.

Concerned with the feedback mechanism, it is found from the data depicted in the table that the feedback mechanism is also not available in the library links on the website of universities in the south India. It is also verified by Chi-square test value (p=0.15), Mean (2.2) and CV (51.56) which indicate poor.

With regard to the question point to seek answer, we can see from the table that the library links on the website don't have question point to seek answer or clarification. It is supported by Chi-square test value (p=0.02), Mean (2.2) and CV (54.81). Therefore, it is inferred that the library links on the website don't have point to seek answers to certain questions.

With regard to 'Ask Librarian' tasks, the majority (338) of the respondents rated as *poor*. It is clear that the 'Ask Librarian' option is not available on the website. It is statistically proved by x^2 analysis (p=0.00) which indicates significant. There is a consistency in the obtained responses. The Mean value (2.19) and CV (54.26) indicate negative response. It is inferred that the majority of the library homepages do not contain 'Ask Librarian' option.

Table 10. Ratings of print option

Attributes	Rating scale	Respondents				Total
		Students	**Research Scholars**	**Faculty Members**	**Others**	
Print option	Poor	99 (16.9)	305 (52.0)	155 (26.5)	27 (4.6)	586
	Average	8 (16.3)	28 (57.1)	13 (26.5)	0 (0)	49
	Good	17 (22.1)	38 (49.4)	20 (26.0)	2 (2.6)	77
	Very Good	19 (23.8)	29 (36.2)	25 (31.2)	7 (8.8)	80
	Excellent	7 (30.4)	5 (21.7)	10 (43.5)	1 (4.3)	23
	Mean =1.65		**CV=69.98**		***p*=0.05**	

Table-10 shows the ratings of the print option. The majority (52%) of the research scholars opined that the print option is not available followed by faculty members (26.5%), students (26.9%) and others (4.6%) who rated as *poor*. It is clear that there is no links of the print option on the university website. This is also supported by Chi-square value (p=0.05 significant), Mean (1.65) and CV (69.98). Therefore it is inferred that the print option on the library homepage is not available across the websites of the universities in South India.

Findings:

The findings of the study are as follows:
- Compatibility of the library homepage is very good.
- There are no links to other libraries.
- The web resource links are provided in the library homepage.
- University authority is not updating library homepage regularly.
- The design and contents of library homepage is updated.
- A few library homepages are indexed in popular search engines.
- Library homepage holds vision and mission statements.
- Majority of library homepages do not have Web OPAC.
- Majority of the library homepages have link to e-resources under consortia.
- Majority of the university library homepages do not contain library staff details and librarian profile.
- Majority of the library homepages don't have the information about library achievement.
- Majority of the library homepages contain contact information.
- The library homepages do not have search option link.
- Majority of the library homepages do not contain information about library committee.
- FAQ is not available in the library homepage.
- Feedback mechanism is not available in the library homepage.
- 'Ask Librarian' option is not available.

Conclusion:

Since the universities are considered to be major platform for the research activities in academic environment. Authority should certainly think about the scope of procurement and dissemination of available resources to the needy. Resource sharing is possible only when the

memorandum of mutual understanding is there among the universities. The objectives of the study show that there are very few universities which have the standard websites of their libraries where as the majority of the universities do not have the separate library website rather a link has been provided. The study strongly recommends to all the universities to have the separate website for the libraries. It will facilitate the research scholars and faculties who are working mainly on the activities of research and development. The universities should have the common platform to share the resources among them to avoid duplication of procurement cost.

References:

1. Amanda & Morgan (2014). *Evaluation of websites: Criteria for evaluating website* retrieved from
   http://www.slideshare.net/mandaawakes/evaluating-a-website-using-the-craap-test
2. Brief history of websites (2015, Sept 30th) retrieved from
   http://www.mnwebco.com/resources/websites-101/brief-history-websites
3. Christenson, P. (2015, Aug 1st). *Home Page Definition.* retrieved from
   http://techterms.com
4. Data analysis and interpretation (2014, Nov 28th) retrieved from
   (https://docs.google.com/presentation
5. Data analysis from power point presentation slides (2014, Nov 27th) retrieved from
   http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/bceo/index.html
6. History of Books (2015, Sept 30th), retrieved from
   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_books
7. History of websites (2015, Sept 30th), http://webfoundation.org/about/vision/history-of-the-web
8. Home page definition (2015, Sept 16th), retrieved from
   http://searchsoa.techtarget.com/definition/home-page
9. Keshava & Lamani, M G (2015). Understanding university websites by academic fraternity in India: A survey *E-Library Science Research Journal.* 3(3), Jan 2015; pp1-7.
10. Lamani, M G & Keshava (2013). Evaluation of university library websites: A literature review, *Indian Journal of Library & Information Science.* 7(3), Sept- Dec 2013, pp245-247.
11. Lamani, M G & Keshava (2015). Study of university websites based on selected evaluation criteria's. *Indian Journal of Library and Information Science* Sept- Dec 2015.
12. Likert scale (2015, Mar 3rd). retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Likert_scale
13. Margam, Madhusudhan & Shashi Prakash (2013). Websites of Indian Institutes of Technology: A webometric study. *International Journal of Information Studies*, 3(4), Oct-Dec 2013**,** pp.93-107.
14. Promotion of website (2014, Dec 4th). *Website evaluation criteria* retrieved from http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Promotion.aspx
15. R, Jeyshankar & I, Maria Sujitha (2014). Link analysis of websites of universities in Kerala: A webometric study. *Indian Journal of Library & Information Science.*4 (2), Apr-Jun**,** pp.62-71. Retrieved from http://www.ijlis.org.
16. Website evaluation checklists: page layout (2014, Dec 3rd) retrieved from http://desktoppub.about.com/cs/basic/g/pagelayout.htm