INTRODUCTION

Information is considered as basic resource for today’s humankind as it affects both personal and professional career. In case of academicians and researchers, it is even more important because they need accurate and update information for their research. Recent trends show that people are more enthusiastic to empower themselves with latest information to augment their competency. The Advent of latest technologies paved access towards abundant resources for information seekers. Learning is continuous process which needs assistance of latest information available either in the Print form like Reference books, Newsletters, Journals etc. or in Electronic form like Internet websites, e-journals, e-learning resources, Institutional repository etc.

The impact of information technology is enormous and global in magnitude. Information seeking is a term describing the ways individuals seek, evaluate, select, and use information. In the course of seeking new information, the individuals may interact with different people, analog tools and computer based information systems. Information seeking behaviour of any individual is based upon various factors like awareness regarding availability, ease of access, availability to utilize the resources, the innate mentality of the information seekers etc.

Through information cascade, information requirement of every person is of growing variety and range of level, frequency, quantity, and simplicity. This intricate condition appears to be confusing and heterogeneous as the information need of meticulous collection of users and information stream from specific situations in an organization are complicated to determine. This circumstance has given rise to the augmented perception of information searching and this prototype of
information exploration is assumed to be information seeking behaviour.

College of Veterinary Science, Proddatur was started in the year 2008 as a constituent college under Sri Venkateswara Veterinary University, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh. At present, the college is equipped with 85 member teaching faculty educating nearly 160 professional students in under-graduate and post-graduate curriculum. The information seeking behavior of teaching faculty is assorted. Hence, the present survey was conducted to assess the Information Seeking Behaviour of faculty members.

**Literature Review**

This study was undertaken to determine the information seeking behavior and library use by research scholars at the Banasthali University. The overall purpose of the study was to determine what their information requirements and determine their awareness of library services available to them. The study collected data on the information requirements of researchers. Data were gathered from 100 researchers out of 150 through open and closed questionnaire. Findings indicate that guidance in the use of library resources and services is necessary to help researchers meet some of their information requirements.

The article presents a user study done at Lala Lajpatrai College in Mahalakshmi, Mumbai, India and the Department of Studies in Library and Information Science at Karnataka University in Dharwad, India of the behavior of people who are seeking information at libraries. It focuses on the differences in print media and electronic media, and discusses research findings which show that only a small percentage of the general public prefer to learn by reading. It also states that a survey was used by the authors to gather data and conduct research.

The information needs and information seeking behaviour of users are vital for developing library collections, services and facilities to meet their information needs effectively. The purpose of this study is to identify the information channels used by the Central Law College, Salem faculty members, information sources preferred by them, methods employed for getting the needed information and their library use pattern. A questionnaire was distributed to 64 law faculty members and 56 filled in questionnaires were returned, giving an overall response rate of 87.5 percent. It was found that respondents used various sources for acquiring the needed information. Books were ranked as the most important source for teaching and research purposes, followed by law reports and statutes. Respondents preferred to first consult their personal collection before resorting to other information resources and agencies. On the whole, respondents perceived the Central Law College library collections, services and facilities as adequate to meet their information needs effectively.

The article discusses research on the information needs and information-seeking behaviour of the faculty at the Islamia University of Bahawalpur in Pakistan using literature review, questionnaires, and interviews. The topics discussed in the research include the kind of information that is needed for teaching and research, the sources that are used, the kinds of informal methods of acquiring information, the difficulties and issues involved in information seeking, the preferred study places by faculty members, and if the library’s physical setting facilitates active learning. The findings indicate that information seeking could be motivated by several different needs.

**Objectives**

- To Study and assess the Information Seeking Behaviour of faculty members of College of Veterinary Science, Proddatur, Andhra Pradesh.
- To study the awareness regarding the available Information Resources consulted by the users.

**Scope**

This study has been limited to the teaching faculties of College of Veterinary Science, Proddatur Library only. Sixty teaching faculty respondents were randomly involved in the present study. The adapted questionnaires administered to the teaching faculty members of the veterinary college, Proddatur, Andhra Pradesh. Out of Sixty respondents Forty Five responded with a response rate of 75%.

**Methodology**

Information seeking behaviour of the teaching faculty members of veterinary college proddatur assessed using a well-structured questionnaire with ten critical questions. Cross tabulation, comparison with related parameters and chi-square were made to share the independent variables to the findings and ascertain possible reports.

Chi-square, which is a statistical test used to compare expected data with the collected data. A chi-square denotes if there is a large difference between collected numbers and expected numbers. If the difference is large, it indicates that there may be something causing a significant change. A significantly large difference will allow rejecting the null hypothesis, which is defined as the prediction that there is no interaction between variables. If there is a big enough difference between the scores, then we can say something significant happened. If the scores are too close, then we have to conclude that they are the same. Studies conducted on information seeking behavior and analyzed using chi-square test worldwide.

**Data Analysis**

- Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations</th>
<th>Questionnaire Distributed(%)</th>
<th>Questionnaire Received(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>10(16.67)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>10(16.67)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>40(66.67)</td>
<td>29(64.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60(100)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Preferences of Information Resources

Printed form of information is the most preferred (35.56%) type of information resource preferred by the teaching faculty of C.V. Sc. Proddatur (Table 2). The study was intended to examine whether there is any relationship between the type of information preferred and the cadre of faculty. The computed chi-square value between Professor & Associate professor is less than the table value. Therefore, there is no significant difference between Professor & Associate professor with respect to type of
information resource preferred. However there is a significant
difference between Associate Professor & Assistant Professor as
well as Professor & Assistant Professor with regard to the type of
information resource preferred, which is evident from the higher
chi-square calculated values than table values.

Table 2: Information Resource Preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Professors (%age)</th>
<th>Associate Professors (%age)</th>
<th>Assistant Professors (%age)</th>
<th>Total (%age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed form</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>12(26.67)</td>
<td>16(35.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Resource</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>7(15.56)</td>
<td>15(33.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>10(22.22)</td>
<td>14(31.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>29(64.44)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square test
Professor - Associate Professor:
\[ x^2 = 0.043 \text{ df:}2 \quad \text{TV:}1.386 \text{ N Sig at}0.05 \text{ level} \]
Associate Professor-Assistant Professor:
\[ x^2 = 2.029 \text{ df:}2 \quad \text{TV:}1.386 \text{ Sig at} 0.05 \text{ level} \]
Professor-Assistant Professor:
\[ x^2 = 2.029 \text{ df:}2 \quad \text{TV:}1.386 \text{ Sig at} 0.05 \text{ level} \]

The present findings corroborate the observations of Sathe et al.
who observed that most of the faculty preferred printed form of
information resources whereas students and research fellows
preferred electronic form of information resources\(^{11}\). Similar
analogous findings were reported by Aggarwal & Bhalla that,
teacher educators in India favored print resources than electronic
resources for the ease of use, authenticity and accessibility\(^{11}\).

- **Purpose of Using Information**

Majority of the faculty (46.67%) opted updating the subject
knowledge as the main purpose of seeking information (Table3). There is no significant difference between Associate Professor & Assistant Professor with regard to the opinion about the purpose of seeking information (chi-square computed value is less than table value). But, among the Professor & Assistant Professor as well as Professor and Assistant Professor there exists a significant difference [chi-square computed value is higher than table value] regarding the opinion about the purpose of seeking information.

The results were similar to the findings of Sharma & Singh where-in, the maximum number of Natural Sciences faculty members in University of Delhi, had updation of subject knowledge to meet their professional obligations of teaching and research, as their main purpose of seeking information\(^{17}\). Similarly, the life scientists of Defense Research and Development Organization, India utilize specific information for keeping up-to-date and acquiring background information\(^{17}\).

- **Location for Accessing Resources**

Most of the teaching faculty (28.89%) had access to information resources, both at their home and College Library (Table 5). Some of the faculty (22.22%) had access only at department library, few others had access only at college library (20%). While, computer centres are least (4.44%) utilized as an accessing location by the teaching faculty. There is a significant difference (chi-square calculated values higher than chi-square table values) between Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors with regard to the location for accessing information.

The results are congruent with the finding of Mostufa who reported that the faculty members of Darul IhsanUniversity in Bangladesh prefer home, predominantly, as a places of accessing information, followed by college Library and department library as their places of study\(^{20}\).
Information Sources

Seeking information from the internet is the prime method of choice (46.67%) of the teaching faculty with regard to different methods of seeking information (Table 6). There is a significant difference among the Professor & Associate Professor as well as Associate Professor & Assistant Professor with regard to methods of seeking information as corroborated from higher chi-square calculated values than chi-square table values. However, there is no significant difference between Professor & Assistant Professor in the methods of seeking information as reflected in lesser chi-square calculated values than chi-square table values.

Table 6: Sources of Information Seeking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Professors (%)</th>
<th>Associate Professors (%)</th>
<th>Assistant Professors (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Guide/ Subject Expert</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>9(17.78)</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>4(8.89)</td>
<td>9(17.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/ Colleagues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given 2 options</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>13(28.89)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given 3 options</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>29(64.44)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>29(64.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Satisfaction with Print

The levels of satisfaction for both printed form and electronic form of information among majority of teaching faculty is satisfied level. 64.44% of teaching faculty were satisfied with printed form (Table 7), whereas 51.11% of teaching faculty were satisfied with electronic form (Table 8). The chi-square calculated values are more than chi-square table values for the levels of satisfaction for print form and therefore it can be conclude that there is a significant difference among the Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors pertaining to the levels of satisfaction with print form of information (Table 7).

Table 7: Level of Satisfaction with Print Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Professors (%)</th>
<th>Associate Professors (%)</th>
<th>Assistant Professors (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Satisfied</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>5(11.11)</td>
<td>9(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>6(13.33)</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>20(44.44)</td>
<td>29(64.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>1(2.22)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>2(4.44)</td>
<td>5(11.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>8(17.78)</td>
<td>29(64.44)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints of Information Seeking

Inadequate library infrastructure is the main constraint (35.56%) for information seeking, faced by the teaching faculty (Table 9). Although there is no significant difference between Professors & Associate Professors with regard to the opinion about the constraints for information seeking behaviour, which is supported with lesser chi-square calculated values than chi-square table values, whereas, there is significant difference between Associate Professors & Assistant Professor and also Professors & Assistant Professors congruent with the higher chi-square computed value than chi-square table values.

These results are harmonious with the conclusions of Lewis & Mallaiah who also opined that inadequate library infrastructure is the main constraint faced by the users in engineering college libraries of Dakshin Kannada and Udupi Districts.
There is significant difference between Professor & Associate Professor-Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:2.201 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 Sig at 0.05 level

Associate Professor-Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:4.427 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 Sig at 0.05 level

Professor - Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:0.917 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 NSig at 0.05 level

Rating of Resources

Information Seeking Behaviour of teaching faculty prefers electronic resources as the overall best suitable form. 53.33% of teaching faculty preferred e-resource for overall best suitability (Table 10) when compared to both forms of information resources.

There is a significant difference between Professor & Associate Professor and Professor & Assistant Professor regarding the opinion about overall best suitable form of information resource, which can be interpreted from higher chi-square calculated value than chi-square table value. There is no significant difference between Associate Professor & Assistant Professor regarding the opinion about overall best suitable form of information resource as reflected in lesser chi-square calculated value than chi-square table value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Professors (%/age)</th>
<th>Associate Professors (%/age)</th>
<th>Assistant Professors (%/age)</th>
<th>Total (%/age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate library infrastructure</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(14.31.11)</td>
<td>(16.35.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Speed of Internet</td>
<td>(24.44)</td>
<td>(40.89)</td>
<td>(71.56.11)</td>
<td>(13.28.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Failure</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(20.44.44)</td>
<td>(40.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Awareness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(20.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given 2 options</td>
<td>(36.67)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(51.11.11)</td>
<td>(81.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given 3 options</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(20.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(81.78)</td>
<td>(81.78)</td>
<td>(29.64.44)</td>
<td>(45.100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor - Associate Professor
\[ x^2:0.917 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 NSig at 0.05 level

Associate Professor - Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:2.23 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 Sig at 0.05 level

Professor - Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:2.344 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 Sig at 0.05 level

Association Professor - Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:0.554 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 NSig at 0.05 level

Professor - Assistant Professor
\[ x^2:2.201 \text{ df:} 2 \] TV: 1.386 Sig at 0.05 level

Fig: 1: Overall Opinion

Table 9: Constraints of Information Seeking Behaviour

Table 10: Overall Rating of Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Professors (%/age)</th>
<th>Associate Professors (%/age)</th>
<th>Assistant Professors (%/age)</th>
<th>Total (%/age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed form</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(36.67)</td>
<td>(11.24.44)</td>
<td>(15.33.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Resource</td>
<td>(61.33)</td>
<td>(40.89)</td>
<td>(14.31.11)</td>
<td>(24.53.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(20.44)</td>
<td>(36.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(20.44)</td>
<td>(36.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(81.78)</td>
<td>(81.78)</td>
<td>(29.64.44)</td>
<td>(45.100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

The need for information, whether printed or other sources, arises from different motives. The various types of information needs include personal needs, professional needs etc., and the various approaches to acquire the required information include current approach, every day approach, exhaustive approach etc. The information seeking behaviour of teaching faculty are intricate to be determined, as the information needs are diverge. Earlier, teaching faculty used to spend a lot of time in libraries, looking for books, journals, magazines, and other print media to support their teaching and research. Of late, the information seeking behavior of teaching faculty has transformed to a greater degree. Depending upon the working customs of the individual requiring information, the efforts on obtaining it, the amenities accessible for seeking it, the acquaintance about these amenities, the opinion of their value, the prospects of getting what is sought, all of these factors influence the information seeking behaviour.

The present study aimed at assessing the Information Seeking Behaviour and awareness regarding the available Information Resources consulted by the faculty members of College of Veterinary Science, Proddatur, Andhra Pradesh. The findings illustrate that printed form of information is favored more than E-resource of information. The main rationale of seeking information among the teaching staff is to update their subject knowledge. Majority of the teaching faculty had a daily frequency of using information resource. Most of the staff gave two options pertaining to location for accessing the information resources viz., at home and at college library. Almost all of the respondents opined that E-resource is the easy source of information. The most common method of seeking information by the respondents is obtaining information from internet. A greater part of teaching faculty had a satisfactory level of satisfaction for both printed form and electronic form. It can be concluded that the teaching staff unanimously opted E-resource is the overall best suited form of information. Also the respondents opined that efforts have to be focused on providing proper measures to overcome the inadequate library infrastructure in the college, which seem to be the main constraint of information seeking behaviour, as faced by mainstream of respondents.
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