

Information Access and Usage Trends among Students of Rajasthan Technical University, Kota

Vineeta Chauhan*

Abstract

The rapid growth of information and communication technologies has significantly influenced the ways in which university students locate, access, and use academic information. The present study examines the information access patterns of students enrolled at Rajasthan Technical University (RTU), Kota, with a focus on the use of electronic resources, print-based collections, and available digital library services. The study aimed to identify the primary information sources favored by students, evaluate the level of electronic resource usage, investigate challenges encountered in information retrieval, and assess user satisfaction with current library services. The study's main data came from a structured questionnaire sent to undergraduate and graduate students from a variety of academic fields. Descriptive statistical methods were used to look at the answers that were collected. The analysis shows that students mostly use electronic resources like online databases, e-journals, and web-based platforms because they are easy to find and cover a lot of ground. Printed books are still very important, especially for studying and reading deeply. Many of the people who answered the survey knew about the electronic resources that the Central Library subscribed to, but they couldn't use them well because they didn't have enough information literacy skills or training opportunities. Students said that common problems included having trouble connecting to the internet, not knowing how to use databases properly, and not knowing enough about sources of information that are specific to their field. The study emphasizes the need for regular user-orientation and training programmes, improved promotion of library resources, and strengthened ICT infrastructure. It also shows how important it is to have customized information literacy programs that help students go from just having access to information to using it in a way that is useful for school. The study's results should help librarians, academic administrators, and policymakers improve library services and help students learn better in a world where learning is becoming more digital.

Keywords: Information-seeking behavior, electronic resources, university libraries, Rajasthan technical university, information use patterns, digital access

INTRODUCTION

The present academic environment is characterized by a rapid and continuous growth of information.

In a broad sense, information may be understood as knowledge generated from events, experiences, research activities, education, and observation, and it is available in both printed and electronic forms. To ensure that teaching, learning, and research activities are meaningful, pertinent information must be accessible to the appropriate users at the appropriate time (Case & L. M. (2016).) [1]. Timely access to accurate and up-to-date information serves as a foundation for the creation of new knowledge, particularly in the fields of research and development. The amazing progress made in science and technology in the 20th century led to a huge rise in scholarly publications, many of which are still helping to drive innovation and social

*Author for Correspondence

Vineeta Chauhan

E-mail: Inchargelibrary.codst@sknau.ac.in

¹Assistant Librarian & In-charge, College of Dairy Science and Technology, Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Received Date: March 19, 2026

Accepted Date: March 28, 2026

Published Date: June 19, 2026

Citation: Vineeta Chauhan, Information Access and Usage Trends among Students of Rajasthan Technical University, Kota. Journal of Advancements in Library Sciences. 2026; 13(2): 27–38p

progress (Meho & Tibbo, 2003) [2]. To do good research, scholars need to keep up with new developments and trends in their fields. Libraries and information centres play a vital role in this process by organizing, preserving, and providing access to diverse information resources (Thanuskodi, 2011) [3]. By making it easier to find information, libraries help cut down on duplicate research and make research more efficient overall. Even though libraries are very important, they have a lot of trouble meeting the changing and complicated information needs of today's researchers. These challenges stem from the vast amount of scholarly literature, its interdisciplinary and multilingual characteristics, and its extensive global dissemination (Majid, Anwar, & Eisenschitz, 2000) [4]. Because of this, it has become more and more important to understand how academic users look for information. Studies in this area focus on identifying users' information needs, preferred sources, access channels, retrieval methods, and patterns of library and internet usage (Kumar & Sharma, 2010) [5]. Insights gained from user behaviour studies enable libraries to design and deliver more effective, user-centered services and information systems. There are general models of how people look for information, but user needs can vary depending on the institution, culture, and local conditions (Bhatnagar, 2013) [6]. Consequently, institution-specific studies are imperative, as they furnish empirical evidence for the enhancement of existing services and the implementation of new facilities tailored to user requirements. In numerous cases, such studies have guided decisions concerning infrastructure development, digital resource management, and service delivery models (Tella, Ayeni, & Popoola, 2007) [7]. In light of this, the current study investigates the information access and utilization patterns of students at Rajasthan Technical University, Kota, to comprehend their engagement with print and electronic information resources and to pinpoint opportunities for enhancement in library services.

About the Central Library of Rajasthan Technical University

Central Library of Rajasthan The Central Library of Rajasthan Technical University (RTU), which used to be called the University College of Engineering, Kota, was set up in 1984 to help faculty, students, staff, and research scholars find the information they need. National consortia like INDEST-AICTE, DELNET, and UGC-INFONET have helped Indian university libraries grow their print and electronic collections (Kumar & Malhan, 2010) [8]. RTU, like other Indian technical university libraries, lets people subscribe to IEEE Xplore, ASME, Emerald, Taylor & Francis, Science Direct, and other digital platforms. These resources are essential for engineering education and research (Raza & Upadhyay, 2006) [9]. The Central Library of Rajasthan Technical University has a lot of electronic journals, databases, and digital collections that teachers, students, and researchers can use. ScienceDirect, Emerald Insight, Wiley Online Library, Taylor & Francis Online, and IEEE Xplore are some of the most important multidisciplinary and subject-specific platforms. Together, they cover a wide range of literature in engineering, technology, management, and applied sciences.

Scope of the Study

The present research is designed to examine how students and faculty members of Rajasthan Technical University (RTU), Kota, search for and utilize information. It focuses on figuring out how people look for information and how well the Central Library's different services work. This study aims to systematically identify the information needs of faculty and students, thereby offering valuable insights to enhance resource management, inform future collection development, and improve the overall quality of library services at Rajasthan Technical University (RTU). By systematically identifying the information needs of both faculty members and students, this study seeks to provide meaningful insights that can support improved resource management, guide future collection development, and enhance the overall quality of library services at Rajasthan Technical University (RTU).

Objectives of the Study

The Study is Directed by the Subsequent Objectives:

- To look into the information needs and how RTU students and faculty use it.
- To find out what kinds of search engines people like to use to find academic information.
- To find out how many people know about the e-resources that the university library has.
- To look at how long people spend using e-resources.

- To look into the reasons why different types of users use e-resources.
- To find out how much library users know and understand about intellectual property rights (IPR).
- To ascertain the obstacles, limitations, and difficulties encountered by users in accessing electronic resources and library services.

Hypothesis of the Study :The Subsequent Hypothesis Was Developed to Direct the Research

- Different user groups have very different kinds of problems when they try to use library resources.
- Different types of users go to the library at different rates.
- Different types of users spend different amounts of time in the library.
- Different users have different ways of getting to library resources.
- Different people use search engines for different reasons and with different levels of intensity.
- Users don't know much about intellectual property rights (IPR), and this needs to change.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1 Frequency of Visit to the Library by Types of Users

The study at Rajasthan Technical University (RTU) looked at two main things to figure out what students and faculty needed and how they used library resources and services: how often they went to the library and how long they spent using library resources and services. Every time they came. Respondents were asked detailed questions about these things, and their answers were used for statistical analysis and interpretation. This method gave a better idea of how often people used the library and how much time they spent getting to the resources they needed. The users were questioned about the frequency of their visits to the library and their responses are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency of visit to the library by types of users.

Frequency of visits	Overall	Student	Faculty
	%	%	%
Often	28	29	25
Twice in a day	8	8	1
Once in a day	23	23	16
Once in a week	24	24	25
Once in a month	9	9	14
Once in a while	8	7	19
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 2. Frequency of visit to the library (grouped) by types of students and faculty.

User types		Frequency		Chi / d f / Sig
		<i>Often</i>	<i>Not very often</i>	
		%	%	
Student	UG	48	66	62.710 / 2 / 0.000
	PG	35	13	
	Research Scholar	17	21	
	Total	100.0	100.0	
Faculty	Assistant Professor	38	39	0.177 / 2 / 0.915
	Associate Professor	32	28	
	Professor	29	33	
	Total	100.0	100.0	

From Table 1, it would be noticed that a larger proportion of Students visit the library at least once a day while the corresponding proportion is lesser among the faculty. In order to have a better understanding of the frequency of visit, the Researcher regrouped the frequency into two larger groups namely, often (if the respondent visits the library at least once) and not very often (if the library is not visited daily by the respondent).

The respondents were posed a question to find out Frequency of Visit to the Library. Their responses are given in the Table 2.

The association between the types of Student/Faculties and their frequency of visit to the library was studied using a chi square test. As far as the students were concerned, the chi squared value was 62.710, the degrees of freedom 2 and the significance value 0.000 which is lesser than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis that there is no association between the type of Student and their frequency of visit to the library was rejected. While the overall proportion of students who visited the library often was 61.1%, a distinctly larger proportion (81.4%) among the PGs visited the library often. As far as the faculty are concerned, the chi squared value as 0.177, degrees of freedom 2 and the significance value 0.915 which is greater than 0.05. The hypothesis is accepted and conclude that there is no significant association between the faculty type (Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors) and their frequency of visit to the library.

To understand the needs and use pattern of users in Rajasthan Technical University, Kota, apart from the frequency of visits to the library, the time spent by the users to browse e-journals and e-resources was also ascertained. The respondents were posed a question to find out whether they spend one, two, three or more than three hours during their visit to the library. Their responses are given in the following Table 3.

The data collected was broadly reclassified into smaller number of categories namely those who spend only one hour and those who spend more than one hour and the distribution is studied for its association with the type of Students/Faculty. The results are tabulated in Table 3.

The respondents were posed a question to find out Times Spent at the Library and their responses are given in the Table 4.

Table 3. Average duration of time spent at the library by types of users.

Frequency of visit	Overall	Student	Faculty
	%	%	%
One Hour	65	67	43
Two Hours	23	23	26
Three Hours	7	6	19
> 3 Hours	5	4	12
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 4. Times spent at the library by types of students and faculty.

Types of users		Time spent				Chi / d f / Sig.
		1 hour		> 1 hour		
		Col N %	Row N %	Col N %	Row N %	
Student	UG	60.0	73	49	27	24.490 / 2 / 0.000
	PG	22	55	35	44	
	Research Scholar	18	65	19	35	
Faculty	Assistant Professor	47	51	33	48	1.953 / 2 / 0.379
	Associate Professor	23	33	35	67	
	Professor	29	40	33	60.0	
	Total	100.0		100.0		

The association between the types of Student/Faculties and the time they spent at the library browsing e-journals and e-resources was studied using chi square test. As far as the students were concerned, the chi squared value was 24.490, the degrees of freedom 2 and the significance value 0.000 which is lesser than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis that there is no association between the type of Student and the time spent at the library was Rejected. PG students who were earlier found to be visiting the library more often were seen to be spending more than one hour in the library.

Information Access Patterns

Users mainly relied on OPAC and general browsing. Self-learning and peer assistance were also common methods, reflecting independent search behavior consistent with findings in previous studies (Nicholas et al., 2006) [10]. The Researcher goes on to find the pattern that was adopted by the user to access the information in the library. Different options posed to the respondents are listed below: The results are detailed in Table- 5. General browsing of the stack area (20%) and identifying information with the use of OPAC (21%) were the most exercised options while accessing the library resources by the users. The assistance from the faculty was the least used mode (6%).

Table 5 shows that general browsing of the stack area (20%) and identifying information with the use of OPAC (21%) were the most exercised options while accessing the library resources by the users. The assistance from the faculty was the least used mode (6%).

Use of Search Engines

The Researcher next determined from the respondents the search engine they used to access e-resources. Four popular search engines were listed and the respondents were asked specify the search engine(s) that they use.

Table 6.6 is the tabulation of the responses of the users shows that the most popular search engine used was Google followed by Yahoo. AltaVista and infoseek have very few users (1% of the respondents use these search engines). While it is clear that Google is the most used search engine, the Researcher tried to find whether the users were using only one of the search engines listed above or they used more than one search engine. Also, the association of this variable to the type of Student or Faculty. A significant association was found between the number of search engines used and the type of user (Student or Faculty). The chi square value is 7.006 and the significance value is 0.008. While the proportion of Faculty using more than one search engine is 22.5%, the corresponding proportion for Students is only 12.2%. But amongst the Faculty, there is no significant association seen between different type of Faculty (Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors).

Table 5. Information access patterns.

Information access patterns	Responses
	Percent (%)
General browsing of the stack area	20
Identifying the information with the use of card catalogue	11
Identifying the information with the use of OPAC	21
Identifying the information with the help of fellow users	11
With the help of library staff members	12
With help of faculty members	6.0
Through self-learning methods	18
Total	100.0

Table 6. Use of search engines.

Search engines	Percent (%)
Google	81.0
Yahoo	17.0
AltaVista	1
Info seek	1

Table 7. Use of search engines and time spent at the library.

		Search engine usage				Total <i>Chi/Df/Sig</i>
		Only one		More than one		
		<i>Row N %</i>	<i>Col N %</i>	<i>Row N %</i>	<i>Col N %</i>	
User Type	Student	87.8	93.3	12.2	87.0	7.006 / 1 /0.008
	Faculty	77.5	6.7	22.5	13.0	
Student	UG	90.8	56.8	9.2	41.7	11.507 / 2 /0.003
	PG	85.9	26.1	14.1	30.8	
	Research Scholar	81.8	17.1	18.2	27.5	
Faculty	Assistant Professor	71.0	35.5	29.0	50.0	1.317 / 2 /0.518
	Associate Professor	83.3	32.3	16.7	22.2	
	Professor	80.0	32.3	20.0	27.8	
Frequency	Often	85.8	58.8	14.2	65.2	2.003 / 1 /0.154
	Not very often	88.8	41.2	11.2	34.8	
Time spent	1 hour	88.7	66.2	11.3	56.5	4.904 / 1 /0.027
	> 1 hour	84.0	33.8	16.0	43.5	

Table 8. Awareness about E-resources

Awareness of E-resources	Responses
	<i>Percent (%)</i>
Databases	7
Full Text Databases	11
E-books	26
E-journals	21
E-newsletters	9
Web Resources	17.0
Open Sources	8.0
Total	100.0

Use of Search Engines and Time Spent at the Library

The respondents were posed a question to find out Use of Search Engines and Time Spent at the Library and their responses are given below in the Table 7.

While no significant association could be established between the number of search engines used and the frequency of visit to the library, a significant association was noticed with the average amount of time spent by the user in the library. A larger proportion of those who use more than one search engine spend more than one hour in the library. Thus, we find that the experimenting with multiple search engines mainly happens with Faculty or among the PGs or Research Scholars amongst the Student community. The UGs do not attempt at multiple search engines. Also, the usage is associated with larger time spent in the library.

Awareness About E-Resources

Awareness was highest for e-books and e-journals, while databases and open sources had lower awareness levels, consistent with earlier findings (Mani, 2014; Humbhi, 2022) [11]. Awareness of available e-resources helps users search for the right sources. Table 8 reveals the level of awareness of different types of resources.

Maximum awareness exists among the users about e-books followed by e-journals. Awareness level is the least about databases followed by open sources (Mani, 2014). Awareness of e-newsletters is also not far away. There is moderate awareness about full text databases. But as far as web resources, e-journals or e-books are concerned, the awareness level is high.

Available E-Resources Awareness Level – Descriptive Statistics

The statistical significance of the level of awareness is tested by running independent sample tests for the groups and the results are discussed as follows: An awareness point is generated for each respondent based on the number of e-resources he/she is aware of. Since responses are received with regard to 7 e-resources like databases, full text databases, e-books, e-journals, e-newsletters, web-resources and open sources the maximum awareness point any respondent can obtain is 7 and the minimum is 0. The results are tabulated in Table 9. It shows the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation of the ‘awareness’ level.

Though the awareness scoring ranges between 0 and 7, the mean value is 2.80 and the standard deviation is 1.69

E-resources were primarily used for academic purposes, general knowledge, and research activities, which is consistent with earlier research (Akuffo & Budu, 2019) [12]. The next part of the study attempts to find out the purpose for which the e-resources were accessed. The response on an overall level is listed in Table 10.

The main purpose seems to be for academic interest followed by general knowledge. Purposes like research works, lecture notes preparation and conference & seminars preparation were also mentioned as an important purpose. Article publications and building concept/theory were the least cited purposes.

Table 9. Available E-resources awareness level – descriptive statistics.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Level of awareness	100	.00	7.00	2.8011	1.68669
Valid N (list wise)	100				

Table 10. Purposes of use of E-resources.

Purposes of use of E-resources	Responses
	Percent (%)
Lecture notes preparations	14.0
Article publications	7.0
Research works	15.0
Academic interests	22.0
Building concept/theory	9.0
General knowledge	20.0
Conference & seminar	13
Total	100.0

Table 11. IPR Awareness

IPR Awareness		Percent (%)
Valid	Aware Some Extent	43
	Completely Aware	39
	No Idea	16
	Total	98
Missing		2
Total		100.0

A moderate level of awareness of intellectual property rights was observed, which is critical in preventing plagiarism and ensuring ethical use of information (Wilson, 1999) [13]. All sources are governed by intellectual property rights and copyright laws. Freely copied information from the web lead to plagiarism in research articles and documents published. Users will be expected to indicate the source in their reference section. The next section of the questionnaire tries to find out the level of awareness among the respondents regarding the e-resources intellectual property rights. Table 11 shows the level of awareness among the users regarding IPR.

From the Table 6.11 it is clear that 16% had said that they had no idea about the e-resources IPR, while around 39% is completely aware and 43% somewhat aware.

Difficulties in Access and Use of E-Resources

Users reported issues such as lack of time, poor internet connectivity, and insufficient training. Similar challenges have been reported in earlier studies (Prabakaran, 2013; Bentil, 2022) [14]. In order to find out the types of problems users faces in the library, different challenges were listed and the users were asked to say whether they strongly agree or strongly disagree with the statements. The table given below tabulates the responses (Table 12)

it can be seen that most of the respondents are strongly agree that the problem was high cost to access. Since the intensity of a problem should not be assessed only by looking into the number who had either said strongly agree or strongly disagree, an alternative way of finding out the most listed problem was by finding the modal value of each of the problem. In the case of the remaining problems listed, a larger proportion of the respondents said that they disagree.

Table 13 shown below tabulates the response given by the maximum number of users for the different Difficulties Experienced listed below.

Table 12. Difficulties in access and use of E-resources.

Difficulties experienced	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
	%	%	%	%
Lack of time in accessing e-resources	6	22	42	30
Lack of system speed and network capacity	4	28	40	27
Unawareness of the availability of the e-resources related to your research/study	6	28	41.0	25
Unawareness of the access mechanisms and lack of adequate access points	6	37	36	20
Lack of conducive physical environment	7	50	28	14
High cost to access	18	51	18	13.0
Lack of training program to access and use the e-resources	9	33	31	27
Lack of subject gateways	9	29	36	25
It is costlier of printing facilities	11.0	26	30	32

Table 13. Difficulties experienced – faculty vs. students.

Difficulties experienced	User type	
	<i>Student</i>	<i>Faculty</i>
Lack of time in accessing e-resources	Agree	Agree
Lack of system speed and network capacity	Agree	Agree
Unawareness of the availability of the e-resources related to your research/study	Agree	Disagree
Unawareness of the access mechanisms and lack of adequate access points	Disagree	Disagree
Lack of conducive physical environment	Disagree	Disagree
High cost to access	Disagree	Disagree
Lack of training program to access and use the e-resources	Disagree	Agree
Lack of subject gateways	Agree	Agree
It is costlier of printing facilities	Strongly Agree	Agree

Table 14. Difficulties experienced by types of faculties.

Difficulties experienced	Faculty types		
	<i>Assistant professor</i>	<i>Associate professor</i>	<i>Professor</i>
Lack of time in accessing e-resources	Agree	Agree	Disagree
Lack of system speed and network capacity	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Unawareness of the availability of the e-resources related to your research/study	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Unawareness of the access mechanisms and lack of adequate access points	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Lack of conducive physical environment	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
High cost to access	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Lack of training program to access and use the e-resources	Disagree	Agree	Agree
Lack of subject gateways	Agree	Agree	Agree
It is costlier of printing facilities	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Table 15. Difficulties experienced by types of students.

Difficulties experienced	UG	PG	Research scholar
Lack of time in accessing e-resources	Agree	Agree	Agree
Lack of system speed and network capacity	Agree	Disagree	Agree
Unawareness of the availability of the e-resources related to your research/study	Agree	Agree	Disagree
Unawareness of the access mechanisms and lack of adequate access points	Agree	Agree	Disagree
Lack of conducive physical environment	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
High cost to access	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Lack of training program to access and use the e-resources	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Lack of subject gateways	Agree	Agree	Agree
It is costlier of printing facilities	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree

Except for the three items which has been highlighted in bold, in all other cases, there is no difference in the extent to which the Faculty and Students felt about any problem.

Table 14 given the modal value of the responses by different types of Faculties, Lot of differences is seen in the responses of the different types of Faculties to the difficulties they face in accessing e-

resources. All three types of Faculties disagree that there is “unawareness of the availability of the e-resources related to your research/study”. Similarly, the responses were disagreed for the question on “high cost to access”.

Challenges Faced While using/Accessing E-Resources, the responses of the different types of Students with regard to the different difficulties are tabulated (Table 15).

All the Students are agreeing that there is “lack of time in accessing e-resources” or there is “lack of subject gateways”. Similarly, all the three types of Students disagree that there is “lack of conducive physical environment” or “high cost to access”. Nevertheless, their responses are different with regard to the other statements.

Challenges Faced While Using/Accessing E-Resources – Descriptive Statistics

A variable called ‘difficulty level’ was generated which is based on the responses of the faculty and students. A value of 4 is given if the respondent strongly agrees to the statement, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree and 1 for strongly disagree. Since there are 9 different difficulty statements listed, the difficulty score can range between 9 and 36 and the distribution is given in Table 16.

The minimum is 9, maximum 36 and the mean 24.27 with a standard deviation of 4.44 (Table 17)

The t-value is 1.800, the degrees of freedom is 2 and the significance value is 0.072 (Table 18) which is greater than 0.05. The hypothesis is accepted and conclude that there is no statistically significant difference in the mean value of difficulty level scores.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the mean of difficulty level score between different types of Faculties (Table 19).

Table 16. Challenges faced while using/accessing e-resources – descriptive statistics.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Difficulty Level Score	100	9.00	36.00	24.2684	4.44034
Valid N (list wise)	100				

Table 17. Difficulty level points – group statistics – faculty vs. student.

Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean
Difficulty Score Student	53	24.3592	4.50284	.18713
Faculty	47	23.1489	3.42611	.49975

Table 18. Difficulty level points – faculty vs. student – t-value.

	t-test for Equality of means		
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Difficulty Level Score	1.800	2	.072

Table 19. Difficulty level points – group statistics – types of faculties.

Faculty types	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Assistant Professor	15	23.2667	2.93906
Associate Professor	18	23.0556	4.06524
Professor	14	23.1429	3.25475
Total	47	23.1489	3.42611

Table 20. Difficulty level points – types of faculties – ANOVA.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.365	2	.183	.015	.985
Within Groups	539.592	44	12.263		
Total	539.957	46			

The F value is 0.015 and the significance value is 0.985 which is higher than 0.05 (Table 20). The hypothesis is accepted.

Findings

The Main findings of the study are listed here:

- Considerable variation exists across user groups in both the frequency of library visits and the duration of time spent during such visits.
- Distinct access patterns were observed among different categories of users, reflecting diverse approaches to information-seeking.
- The results reaffirm the centrality of Google as the preferred search engine, consistent with global trends in academic search practices.
- Users said they didn't need much help from library staff or faculty members, which could mean they were confident in their ability to search on their own or that there were gaps in the support services.
- The main reason people went to the library was for schoolwork, and textbooks were the most common source of information.
- A lot of people said that not having enough time was a big reason why they didn't use the library.
- A lack of knowledge about the services and resources that are available also made library services less useful.

CONCLUSION

The answers used in this study came from people who actually went to the library. But the data may not fully show how many people actually use electronic resources at Rajasthan Technical University because the whole campus has Wi-Fi. Students and faculty members can both access digital resources from anywhere, which means they don't have to go to the library as often. This point should be kept in mind when looking at the study's results. Postgraduate (PG) students were found to be the least likely to use the library compared to other groups of users. The lower level of involvement could be due to structural and academic reasons, such as the fact that postgraduate programs are shorter and that students are expected to do more work on projects or dissertations outside of school during their last semester. Undergraduate (UG) students, on the other hand, used the library more often, but their visits were mostly to look up information in required textbooks. Textbooks are still an important part of learning in school, but the results show that students need to be encouraged to use more reference materials, e-journals, and e-books to improve their research skills and information literacy. Also, the study may not have fully captured how much the University's Wi-Fi infrastructure makes it easier to access electronic resources from afar. This suggests that more research is needed into how digital resources are used.

SUGGESTIONS

The study's results and the problems it found led to the following suggestions:

Making Collections:

- To meet user demand, print more copies of textbooks that are often used and required.
- Add more reference books, periodicals, and scholarly journals to the collection to help with advanced learning and research.

Monitoring Digital Access and Use:

- Make subscriptions to digital information portals stronger so that users can get to more academic materials without having to rely on physical collections.
- Set up systems to keep an eye on and analyze how people use digital resources. This will help you understand how people access resources from outside the library.

Helping Library Staff Build Their Skills:

- Set up regular training sessions on how to find information, use technology, and help users.
- Make staff more aware of the resources available to them and help them improve their communication skills so they can help others more proactively.

Tools for User Awareness and Support:

- Create a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) module to help users find out where resources are available and how to use them effectively.
- Make library services more visible by holding orientations, workshops, and targeted campaigns.

Initiatives to Get Users Involved:

- Start academic competitions and activities that will encourage students and faculty to use library resources more fully.
- Make sure that these kinds of programs don't just get people to participate, but also help create a culture of using resources in smart and new ways.

REFERENCES

1. Case, D. O., & L. M. (2016). *Looking for information: A survey of research on information seeking, needs, and behavior* (4th Ed.). Emerald Publishing.
2. Meho, L. I., & Tibbo, H. R. (2003). Modeling the information-seeking behavior of social scientists. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54(6), 570–587.
3. Thanuskodi, S. (2011). User awareness and use of e-journals. *International Research Journal of Library and Information Science*, 1(2).
4. Majid, S., Anwar, M. A., & Eisenschitz, T. S. (2000). Information needs of scientists. *Information Development*, 16(1), 35–43.
5. Kumar, R., & Sharma, C. (2010). Information seeking behavior. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 1(1).
6. Bhatnagar, A. (2013). Information-seeking behavior. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 3(3).
7. Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. O. (2007). Self-efficacy and use of electronic information. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 8(2).
8. Kumar, D., & Malhan, I. V. (2010). Changing role of university libraries. *Library Management*, 31(8/9).
9. Raza, M. M., & Upadhyay, A. K. (2006). Usage of e-journals. *The International Information & Library Review*, 38(3).
10. Nicholas, D., Rowlands, I., & Huntington, P. (2006). Scholarly communication. *Learned Publishing*, 19(1).
11. Humbhi, S. (2022). Awareness of e-resources. *IAFOR Journal of Literature and Librarianship*, 12(2).
12. Akuffo, M. N., & Budu, S. (2019). Use of e-resources. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 21
13. Wilson, T. D. (1999). Models in information behaviour. *Journal of Documentation*, 55(3).
14. Benti, W. (2022). Usage of electronic resources. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 10(1).