

## Users satisfaction of library resources and services at university of horticulture science, Bagalkote, Karnataka

Narasanna <sup>1,\*</sup> and Ramesh R. Naik <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dept. of Library and Information Science, Karnataka University, Dharwad.

<sup>2</sup> Senior Professor, DLIS, Karnataka University, Dharwad.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 24(02), 2717-2727

Publication history: Received on 15 September 2024; revised on 26 November 2024; accepted on 28 November 2024.

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.24.2.3194>

### Abstract

A user satisfaction survey is one of the most crucial tools for assessing the level of service provided by a library. The objectives of this study were to find out the purposes of using a library and to evaluate user satisfaction towards the library services and library resources of the University of Horticulture Science, Bagalkote, Karnataka. The population of the study was the students pursuing their under graduation, post-graduation and PhD who had registered in the library of the University of Horticulture Science, Bagalkote, Karnataka. Total sample size was 610 inclusive of all the three categories of students (UG, PG, Research scholars). Purposive sampling technique was utilized to get a representative sample. Primary data were collected with the help of a survey using a structured questionnaire, designed specifically for the purpose. Analysis of primary data was done using frequency tables and basic descriptive statistics such as mean, Std. Deviation etc. User satisfaction was evaluated under two parameters (a) Library services; (b) Library resources, covering a wide range of attributes focusing on library facilities, staffs, website and Information access, print and online resources etc. It was identified that the respondents used the library for different purposes. Study results indicated reading journals/newspapers, preparing assignments/reading notes, using computers to access information, and access to internet as the major purposes of using the library. The results of the study also revealed that on average, the respondents were generally satisfied with the library facilities and library resources as a whole. While the respondents generally perceive library services positively, there were some areas that users were not much satisfied with, particularly, CDs/DVDs and conference/seminar proceedings, annual reports, subject gate ways, Interlibrary loan and selective dissemination of information (SDI), bibliographic service, reprographic service, document retrieval speed, service quality, staff knowledge, and fairness of treatment where improvements can be made to enhance user satisfaction and consistency in experiences.

**Keywords:** Horticulture University; Library Resources; Library Services; User opinion; User Satisfaction

### 1. Introduction

Libraries are not just repositories of books and information; they are the heartbeats of academic institutions, serving as vital hubs for learning, research, and intellectual growth. In the dynamic landscape of higher education, the role of libraries has evolved from traditional book repositories to multifaceted centres of knowledge dissemination, equipped with a diverse array of resources and services catering to the ever-changing needs of students, faculty, and researchers.

The advent of digital technologies has revolutionized the way information is accessed, disseminated, and utilized. Academic libraries have embraced this digital transformation, expanding their collections to encompass a wide range of electronic resources, including e-books, scholarly databases, and online journals. Furthermore, libraries have diversified their services to accommodate remote access, interlibrary loan systems, and digital reference assistance, catering to the needs of users in an increasingly interconnected world.

\* Corresponding author: Narasanna

However, the proliferation of digital resources has also presented challenges, including issues of accessibility, licensing agreements, and information overload. As libraries navigate this complex digital landscape, understanding user satisfaction with digital resources and services becomes paramount. Factors such as ease of access, search functionality, and content relevance play a crucial role in shaping user perceptions and utilization patterns.

Academic libraries face a myriad of challenges in their quest to meet the diverse needs of users while navigating budget constraints, technological disruptions, and evolving scholarly practices. Limited financial resources often necessitate difficult decisions regarding resource allocation, collection development, and service provision. Additionally, libraries must contend with the changing information-seeking behaviours of users, who increasingly rely on digital platforms and alternative sources of information.

However, amidst these challenges lie opportunities for innovation and collaboration. Libraries can leverage emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, data analytics, and machine learning to enhance resource discovery, personalize services, and streamline administrative processes. Furthermore, partnerships with other academic institutions, consortia, and industry stakeholders can facilitate resource sharing, knowledge exchange, and collaborative initiatives aimed at addressing common challenges.

User satisfaction assessment serves as a critical tool for evaluating the effectiveness and relevance of library resources and services. In an era characterized by rapid technological advancements and changing user preferences, understanding the expectations and experiences of library patrons is essential for informed decision-making and resource allocation. By soliciting feedback from users, libraries can identify areas for improvement, address gaps in service delivery, and enhance overall user experience.

Moreover, user satisfaction is intricately linked to the success and reputation of academic institutions. Satisfied users are more likely to perceive the library as a valuable asset, fostering a sense of loyalty and engagement within the academic community. Conversely, dissatisfaction can lead to disengagement, diminishing the library's role as a central hub for learning and research. Thus, by prioritizing user satisfaction, libraries can bolster their standing as indispensable pillars of academic support.

Satisfying users' needs in the academic libraries has been the primary objective of libraries and librarians. Every year, new students come to the university with different needs and expectations. Besides, new technology, databases, and more innovative systems for accessing information, have made the library more complicated and challenging for librarians and users alike. Academic libraries should strive to survive and grow their user base focusing on meeting their user's expectations. Jayasundara (2008) opines that user perceptions and expectation studies have become one of the most popular studies in the area of service quality in many academic libraries. The user expectations and satisfaction has been used to determine the service quality which is been seen as critical for service organizations to position themselves strongly in a competitive environment (Jayasundara, 2008).

The University of Horticulture Sciences, located in Bagalkote, Karnataka, stands as a support of academic excellence in the field of horticulture. As the university continues to expand its academic offerings and research endeavours, the library plays a pivotal role in providing access to relevant resources, fostering a culture of inquiry, and supporting scholarly communication. Understanding the satisfaction levels of users with library resources and services is paramount for the continuous enhancement and optimization of these facilities to meet the evolving demands of the academic community.

In this background the study sets to explore the users' satisfaction with library resources and services at the University of Horticulture Sciences, Bagalkote, Karnataka. It delves into the significance of user satisfaction assessment, the evolving role of libraries in the digital age, the unique challenges and opportunities faced by academic libraries, and the specific context of the University of Horticulture Sciences.

---

## 2. Review of Literature

### 2.1. Ogbuiyi (2013)

conducted a study evaluating library material and service usage across four private universities in southwest Nigeria: Babcock University, Covenant University, Lead City University, and Redeemer University. The objective was to assess resource usage, client perceptions of resource adequacy, and user satisfaction levels. Findings highlighted inadequacies in book and audio-visual holdings, indicating room for improvement in resource provision and service delivery.

## **2.2. Pandiya&Sarmah (2014)**

studied the influencing factors and satisfaction levels of library users at IIM Lucknow. They found that students rated physical aspects like atmosphere and amenities highly, but services such as orientation and initiatives like new arrivals display were less satisfactory. Satisfaction with gadget use and institutional repository handling was moderate.

## **2.3. Saikia and Gohain (2015)**

investigated the use of library resources, users' satisfaction, and information-seeking behaviour among students and research scholars at Tezpur University. They distributed 200 questionnaires, receiving responses from 79.5% (159) of library users. The study highlights the vital role of the library in meeting the diverse needs of students and scholars. It suggests the necessity of user guidance to help patron's access resources effectively and raise awareness about available services.

## **2.4. Gudi and Paradkar (2018)**

examined satisfaction levels of students and faculty with library resources in Pune city engineering colleges. Users expressed satisfaction with print resources like reference books and journals, as well as e-resources such as e-journals and e-books. The study underscores the importance of soliciting user suggestions to meet information needs and increasing the number of book copies to fulfil regular demand.

## **2.5. Dhanraju et al. (2021)**

surveyed user opinions and satisfaction regarding library information resources in engineering college libraries in Krishna district, Andhra Pradesh, India. The research revealed that a majority of library users are satisfied with available information resources. The study recommended that engineering college libraries should offer standard electronic databases and regularly conduct orientation programs to facilitate effective resource utilization and address users' evolving needs in line with current trends.

## **2.6. Bhat and Ganai (2017)**

assessed user satisfaction with Electronic Information Resources (EIRs) in agriculture and allied disciplines across seven universities. Despite limited access to e-books and e-theses databases, high satisfaction levels were reported for e-abstract databases (87.92%) and e-journals (89.67%). Notably, a significant percentage of users expressed satisfaction with e-books (69.08%) and e-theses (60.33%) despite limited availability.

## **2.7. Yahaya (2019)**

investigated users' satisfaction with information resources in agricultural research institute libraries in Nigeria. Using a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design, the study aimed to identify resources, assess satisfaction levels, and uncover user challenges. A questionnaire was used to collect data from 946 researchers sampled from six libraries out of nineteen institutes. Results showed satisfaction with relevance, content, and accuracy of resources, but dissatisfaction with resource organization, accessibility, and awareness. Recommendations included improving power supply with solar energy or inverters, providing up-to-date print and electronic resources, and enhancing awareness of resource availability.

## **2.8. Research Objectives**

- To identify the purposes of using library.
- Evaluate user satisfaction towards the library services and library resources of the University of Horticulture Science, Bagalkote, Karnataka.

---

## **3. Methodology**

The study employed a quantitative research approach, utilizing a survey method to gather primary data through a structured questionnaire. The target population consisted of students enrolled in undergraduate, postgraduate, and PhD programs registered in the University of Horticulture Science, Bagalkote, Karnataka, totaling 1,098 library members during the 2021-22 academic year. Utilizing Krejcie& Morgan's (1970) sampling method, a sample size of 610 was estimated, encompassing all three student categories. Purposive sampling was employed to ensure a representative sample.

Data collection involved administering the structured questionnaire designed specifically for this purpose. Analysis of the primary data included generating frequency tables and basic descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation. Validity and reliability of statements measuring user satisfaction were assessed using Cronbach Alpha testing. User satisfaction was evaluated across two dimensions: Library resources and Library services.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

The table 1 presents a comprehensive breakdown of the respondents' demographics based on gender and age classification.

**Table 1** Demographic information

<b>Gender-wise distribution of respondents</b>				
Gender	UG	PG	RS	Total
Male	213 (46.4)	37 (37.4)	24 (46.2)	274 (44.9)
Female	246 (53.6)	62 (62.6)	28 (53.8)	336 (55.1)
Total	459 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	610 (100.0)
<b>Age classification of respondents</b>				
Age	UG	PG	RS	Total
Below 20 years	272 (59.3)	22 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	294 (48.2)
21 to 25 years	187 (40.7)	64 (64.6)	0 (0.0)	251 (41.1)
Above 25 years	0 (0.0)	13 (13.1)	52 (100.0)	65 (10.7)
Total	459 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	610 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis denotes percentage.

Notably, among PG respondents, females constitute a significant majority, comprising 62.6% of the total, compared to males at 37.4%. However, in the UG category, the gender distribution is more balanced, with females comprising 53.6% and males 46.4%. Interestingly, among research scholars, the gender distribution aligns more closely with the UG category, with females slightly outnumbering males.

Regarding age classification, the data underscores distinct patterns within each educational level. The majority of UG respondents fall below the age of 20, comprising 59.3% of the total UG sample. In contrast, PG respondents exhibit a different age distribution, with a substantial majority (64.6%) falling within the 21 to 25 years age range. Notably, there are no respondents below 20 years in the PG category. Conversely, all research scholars are above 25 years old, indicating a distinct age profile compared to UG and PG respondents.

##### 4.1. Proximity of respondents to library

The data provided in table 2 offers insights into the frequency of visits to the library and the average time spent by respondents, categorized by educational level (UG, PG, RS).

**Table 2** Proximity of respondents to library

<b>Frequency of visit to library</b>				
<b>Frequency</b>	<b>UG</b>	<b>PG</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Total</b>
Everyday	72 (15.7)	21 (21.2)	0 (0.0)	93 (15.2)
Once in two days	95 (20.7)	22 (22.2)	50 (96.2)	167 (27.4)
Twice a week	97 (21.1)	24 (24.2)	2 (3.8)	123 (20.2)
Once a week	87 (19.0)	11 (11.1)	0 (0.0)	98 (16.1)

Fortnightly	15 (3.3)	3 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (3.0)
Occasionally	89 (19.4)	17 (17.2)	0 (0.0)	106 (17.4)
Never	4 (0.9)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.8)
Total	459 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	610 (100.0)
<b>Average Time Spent in library</b>				
Frequency	UG	PG	RS	Total
Less than one Hour	123 (26.8)	26 (26.3)	0 (0.0)	149 (24.4)
One Hour	205 (44.7)	27 (27.3)	46 (88.5)	278 (45.6)
Two Hours	106 (23.1)	26 (26.3)	6 (11.5)	138 (22.6)
Three Hours	19 (4.1)	11 (11.1)	0 (0.0)	30 (4.9)
More than Three Hours	6 (1.3)	9 (9.1)	0 (0.0)	15 (2.5)
Total	459 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	610 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis denotes percentage.

#### 4.2. Frequency of Library Visits

The majority of respondents visit the library once in two days, constituting 27.4% of the total sample. Following closely, twice a week visits account for 20.2% of responses. Notably, everyday visits are prominent among PG respondents, comprising 21.2% of their responses. A significant portion of respondents, particularly UG and PG, visit occasionally or once a week.

#### 4.3. Average Time Spent in Library

The most common duration spent in the library is one hour, with 45.6% of respondents falling into this category. Less than one hour is also a prevalent duration, constituting 24.4% of responses. For PG respondents, a considerable proportion (88.5%) spend one hour in the library. Notably, a small percentage of respondents spend more than three hours, with PG respondents being the highest in this category.

Overall, the data underscores varied patterns in library usage among different educational levels, with significant proportions of respondents visiting regularly and spending a considerable amount of time in the library, particularly among PG respondents.

#### 4.4. Source of Knowledge and preferences of using library resources

The data in table 3 presents insights into the sources of knowledge on library resources and preferences for using these resources, categorized by educational level (UG, PG, RS).

**Table 3** Source of Knowledge and preferences of using library resources

<b>Source of knowledge on library resources</b>				
Frequency	UG	PG	RS	Total
Reference desk	111 (24.2)	24 (24.2)	0 (0.0)	135 (22.1)
Library website	28 (6.1)	10 (10.1)	34 (65.4)	72 (11.8)
Library orientation	63 (13.7)	14 (14.1)	14 (26.9)	91 (14.9)
From teachers	123 (26.8)	12 (12.1)	3 (5.8)	138 (22.6)
From Friends	51 (11.1)	19 (19.2)	0 (0.0)	70 (11.5)
Self	83 (18.1)	20 (20.2)	1 (1.9)	104 (17.0)
Total	459 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	610 (100.0)

<b>Preferences of using library resources</b>				
<b>Frequency</b>	<b>UG</b>	<b>PG</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Total</b>
Print Resources	163 (35.5)	29 (29.3)	1 (1.9)	193 (31.6)
Electronic Resources	47 (10.2)	12 (12.1)	4 (7.7)	63 (10.3)
Both	249 (54.2)	58 (58.6)	47 (90.4)	354 (58.0)
Total	459 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	610 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parenthesis denotes percentage.

#### 4.5. Sources of Knowledge on Library Resources

The most common source of knowledge on library resources is through teachers, with 22.6% of respondents citing this as their primary source. Reference desk interactions are also prevalent, accounting for 22.1% of responses. Notably, the library website emerges as a significant source, particularly among research scholars, with 65.4% of responses indicating reliance on this platform. Additionally, library orientation sessions and peer recommendations also contribute to respondents' awareness of library resources, although to a lesser extent.

#### 4.6. Preferences for Using Library Resources

The majority of respondents prefer utilizing both print and electronic resources, representing 58.0% of the total sample. Print resources remain popular across all educational levels, with 31.6% of respondents expressing a preference for them. Electronic resources, while less favoured compared to print, still garner a notable preference from a significant portion of respondents, comprising 10.3% of the total.

Overall, the data underscores a diverse array of sources contributing to respondents' knowledge of library resources, with a preference for utilizing a combination of print and electronic resources. These findings suggest the importance of offering comprehensive support across various channels to cater to the diverse needs and preferences of the library users.

#### 4.7. Purpose of Visiting the Library

The table 4 presents the results of the survey conducted among horticulture course students to understand the purposes of their visits to the library. The respondents were asked to express their level of agreement or disagreement with various purposes based on the five point likert scale of(1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Uncertain, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly Agree). The data is summarized in terms of the mean score and standard deviations for each purpose that offers insights into the overall trends and variations in responses.

**Table 4** Purpose of Visiting the Library

<b>Purpose of visit</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Read Journals / Magazines / Newspapers	4.13	.928
Use reference books	3.77	1.043
Use Computer services	3.82	1.126
Use photocopy services	3.70	1.207
Access Internet	3.88	1.083
Access electronic resources	3.77	1.082
Access to library OPAC	3.59	1.038
Prepare Assignments / Notes reading	4.27	.912
Communication and current affairs	4.00	.799
Write articles and books	3.69	1.046
Reading within the premises of the library	3.94	.988
Group discussions / group studies	3.75	1.127

The mean scores and standard deviations for various purposes of visiting the library, notable findings include high importance placed on "reading journals/newspapers" (mean=4.13) and "preparing assignments/reading notes" (mean=4.27). Accessing the "library OPAC" received a lower score (mean=3.59), indicating varied preferences. Standard deviations suggest varied opinions for computer services, photocopy services, and writing articles/books, while communication and current affairs activities show high consensus.

Overall the findings suggest that horticulture course students utilize the library for a diverse range of purposes, including traditional study activities, digital resource access, and collaborative learning with some activities consistently valued and others showing more variability. The high agreement levels across various categories indicate a strong reliance on the library as a multifaceted resource centre supporting different facets of their academic journey in horticulture.

#### 4.8. User Satisfaction

This study evaluated the user satisfaction and their opinion under two dimensions: (a) Library services; (b) Library resources. These two dimensions covers a wide range of attributes based on the facilities in the library, staffs, website and Information access, print and online resources etc. The level of satisfaction of the users for each dimension was measured using five-point likert scale of (1-Strongly Dissatisfied, 2-Dissatisfied, 3-Average, 4-Satisfied, 5-Strongly Satisfied). The opinions of the users for each dimension was measured using five point likert scale of (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Uncertain, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly Agree). The number of statements under each dimension varied.

#### 4.9. Level of Satisfaction towards Library Resources

The data in table 5 provides a comprehensive overview of the level of satisfaction towards various library resources, as indicated by the mean scores and standard deviations.

**Table 5** User's Level of Satisfaction towards Library Resources

Library resources	Mean	Std. Dev.
Print books (Text Books/Reference Books)	4.21	1.027
Print journals/magazine	3.92	.933
Journals bound volumes (Back volumes)	3.64	.941
Conference/seminar proceedings	3.47	.954
Annual reports	3.49	1.016
E-books	3.62	1.018
E-journals	3.66	1.067
E-reports	3.48	1.043
CeRA	3.56	1.149
J-Gate Agricultural & Biological Science (JABS)	3.48	1.187
IndoAgriSat	3.62	1.075
Subject gateways-AGRIGATE	3.55	1.008
CDs/ DVDs	3.42	1.128
Theses and Dissertations	3.65	1.174
News papers	4.04	1.044
Technical reports	3.73	1.032
State-of-the-Report	3.59	1.092

Among the library resources, print books (textbooks/reference books) and newspapers emerge as the most highly rated in terms of satisfaction, with mean scores of 4.21 and 4.04, respectively. This suggests a strong positive perception of the quality and utility of these resources among respondents. Moreover, the standard deviations for these resources are

relatively low (1.027 for print books and 1.044 for newspapers), indicating a high level of consensus among respondents regarding their satisfaction levels.

Conversely, CDs/DVDs and conference/seminar proceedings exhibit the lowest mean scores of 3.42 and 3.47, respectively, suggesting comparatively lower levels of satisfaction with these resources. Additionally, these resources also demonstrate higher standard deviations (1.128 for CDs/DVDs and 0.954 for conference/seminar proceedings), indicating greater variability in respondents' satisfaction levels. This variability could stem from factors such as the relevance of content, accessibility issues, or perceived quality of resources.

Overall, while print books and newspapers garner high levels of satisfaction among respondents, there is room for improvement in satisfaction levels with resources such as CDs/DVDs and conference/seminar proceedings. Understanding the factors contributing to both high and low satisfaction levels, as indicated by mean scores and standard deviations, can inform strategic initiatives aimed at enhancing the overall quality and utility of library resources.

#### 4.10. Opinion about Library Resources

The data in table 6 reveals insights into respondents' opinions about various aspects of library resources, gauged by mean scores and standard deviations, representing levels of agreement or disagreement.

**Table 6** Perception of users about Library Resources

Statements	Mean	Std. Dev.
It is relevant to study or do research using library resources	4.34	.888
Library resources are timely updated	3.95	.963
Good quality resources are available	4.05	.965
Library resources are ambiguous in nature	3.92	1.020
Library resources support personal and academic development	4.11	.977
Resources are appropriate for my course needs	4.06	1.014
Library resources are easy to use	4.06	.948
Rules and regulations are clearly stated	4.02	1.086
Library resources found more items than expected	3.65	1.227
Library resources are very difficult to use	3.04	1.383

Among the statements, "It is relevant to study or do research using library resources" receives the highest mean score of 4.34, indicating strong agreement among respondents. This suggests a widespread recognition of the importance and relevance of utilizing library resources for academic and research purposes. Furthermore, the statement "Library resources support personal and academic development" also garners a high mean score of 4.11, reflecting a positive perception of the resources' role in facilitating individual growth and scholarly pursuits.

Conversely, "Library resources found more items than expected" and "Library resources are very difficult to use" exhibit the lowest mean scores of 3.65 and 3.04, respectively, indicating lower levels of agreement among respondents. While the former suggests that respondents generally did not find library resources to exceed their expectations in terms of quantity or variety, the latter highlights challenges or difficulties perceived in utilizing these resources effectively.

In terms of standard deviations, "Library resources are very difficult to use" stands out with the highest variation of 1.383, suggesting significant variability in respondents' opinions regarding the ease of use of library resources. Conversely, "It is relevant to study or do research using library resources" demonstrates the lowest standard deviation of 0.888, indicating a high level of consensus among respondents regarding the relevance of library resources for academic and research endeavours.

Overall, the data underscores a positive perception of the relevance and utility of library resources for academic and research purposes, with some variability in opinions regarding ease of use and expectations met. Understanding these

nuances can inform efforts to enhance the accessibility, quality, and user experience of library resources to better meet the diverse needs of respondents.

#### 4.11. Level of Satisfaction towards Library Services

The data in table 7 provides insights into respondents' levels of satisfaction towards various library services, as indicated by mean scores and standard deviations.

**Table 7** User's level of Satisfaction towards Library Services

Library services	Mean	Std. Dev.
Reference desk	4.01	1.047
OPAC/Web OPAC	3.80	.992
Circulation service	3.85	.932
Reference service	3.87	.921
Referral service	3.73	.953
Web portal services	3.75	.989
Reprographic service	3.69	.971
Indexing/abstracting Service	3.71	.999
Newspaper clipping services	3.92	1.009
Internet services	3.98	1.049
Inter library loan	3.38	1.246
Book bank scheme	3.68	1.183
Web based services	3.68	1.085
Current awareness service (CAS)	3.75	.976
Selective dissemination of information (SDI)	3.59	1.016
Bibliographic service	3.65	1.052
E-mail alert services	3.86	1.099
Services using social media platforms	3.80	1.112

Among the library services, "Reference desk" and "Internet services" emerge as the most highly rated in terms of satisfaction, with mean scores of 4.01 and 3.98, respectively. This suggests a strong positive perception of the quality and effectiveness of these services among respondents. Additionally, the standard deviations for both these services are relatively high (1.047 for the reference desk and 1.049 for internet services), indicating a considerable degree of variability in respondents' satisfaction levels. This variability could stem from factors such as individual experiences, expectations, or usage patterns.

Conversely, "Interlibrary loan" and "Selective dissemination of information (SDI)" exhibit the lowest mean scores of 3.38 and 3.59, respectively, suggesting comparatively lower levels of satisfaction with these services. Additionally, both these services demonstrate higher standard deviations (1.246 for interlibrary loan and 1.016 for SDI), indicating greater variability in respondents' satisfaction levels. This variability may reflect differing opinions and experiences regarding the accessibility, efficiency, or relevance of these services to respondents' needs.

Overall, while certain library services such as the reference desk and internet services receive relatively high mean scores, there is room for improvement in satisfaction levels with services such as interlibrary loan and SDI. Understanding the factors contributing to both high and low satisfaction levels, as indicated by mean scores and standard deviations, can inform strategic initiatives aimed at enhancing the overall quality and effectiveness of library services to better meet the diverse needs and preferences of respondents.

#### 4.12. Opinion about Library Services

The data in table8 reveals insights into respondents' opinions about various aspects of library services, gauged by mean scores and standard deviations, representing levels of agreement or disagreement.

**Table 8** Perception of users about library services

Statements	Mean	Std. Dev.
Services are provided on time	4.03	1.162
Services helped me in finding the documents faster	3.95	.974
Staff members of the library are knowledgeable to answer the queries	3.86	1.180
Library staff provide quality service	3.86	.996
Library staff treats me fairly and without discrimination	3.90	1.191
Staff members of the library are always willing to help	4.01	1.039
Library staffs are user friendly	3.89	1.133
Interaction with the library services to carry out my searches/study was clear and understandable	3.93	1.051

The two highest mean scores are for "Services are provided on time" (Mean = 4.03) and "Staff members of the library are always willing to help" (Mean = 4.01). These indicate that respondents generally agree that services are timely and that library staff are readily available to assist.

On the other hand, the two lowest mean scores are for "Services helped me in finding the documents faster" (Mean = 3.95) and "Library staff provide quality service" (Mean = 3.86). These suggest that while respondents generally agree with these statements, there is some room for improvement, particularly in terms of the speed and quality of document retrieval and service provision.

In terms of standard deviation, the highest variability is observed for "Staff members of the library are knowledgeable to answer the queries" (Std. Dev. = 1.180) and "Library staff treats me fairly and without discrimination" (Std. Dev. = 1.191). This suggests that opinions are more diverse regarding the knowledge of staff to answer queries and the fairness of treatment, indicating potential areas where perceptions vary among respondents.

Conversely, the lowest variability is seen for "Services helped me in finding the documents faster" (Std. Dev. = 0.974) and "Library staff provide quality service" (Std. Dev. = 0.996). This implies that respondents' opinions are more consistent regarding these aspects of library services, with less variability in their perceptions.

In summary, while respondents generally perceive library services positively, there are areas such as document retrieval speed, service quality, staff knowledge, and fairness of treatment where improvements can be made to enhance user satisfaction and consistency in experiences.

#### *Recommendations*

Based on the understanding gained from the findings and discussions, the subsequent suggestions can be drawn:

- Expand online databases, e-journals, and e-books relevant to horticulture studies to meet high demand for digital resources.
- Update and expand collections for CDs/DVDs and conference materials, ensuring easy access and relevance.
- Enhance search interfaces, provide user-friendly guides, and gather feedback for continual service refinement.
- Streamline processes, forge partnerships for wider access, and employ technology to expedite requests for interlibrary loans and SDI.
- Enhance staff knowledge, approachability, and responsiveness through targeted training programs, improving overall service quality and user experience.

## 5. Conclusion

The study conducted at the University of Horticulture Science, Bagalkote, Karnataka, sheds light on the satisfaction levels of students with library resources and services. Overall, the findings suggest a positive perception of the library's relevance and utility in supporting academic and research endeavours in horticulture. However, there are areas for improvement, particularly in enhancing the diversity and accessibility of digital resources, addressing shortcomings in specific services such as interlibrary loan and SDI, and investing in staff training to enhance service quality.

By implementing the recommended strategies, the university library can better meet the diverse needs and preferences of its users, ultimately enhancing overall satisfaction and consistency in user experiences. This, in turn, can contribute to the university's academic excellence and support the success of students in their horticulture studies.

---

## Compliance with ethical standards

### *Disclosure of conflict of interest*

No conflict of interest to be disclosed

### *Statement of informed consent*

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

---

## References

- [1] Bhat, N., &Ganaie, S. (2017). Impact of Availability of E-Resources on User Satisfaction in Agricultural Libraries of Northern India. SRELS Journal of Information Management. 54. 51. 10.17821/srels/2017/v54i1/109488.
- [2] Gudi, S., &Paradkar, P. (2018). Users' Satisfaction with Library Resources: A Survey of Engineering College Libraries, Pune, India. 54. 135-142.
- [3] Jayasundara, C. C. (2008). User Perceptions and Expectations on EInformation Literacy Development Programmes. National University Library, 10(4): 82.
- [4] Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement.
- [5] Ogbuiyi, S., &Okpe, I. (2013). Evaluation of Library Materials Usage and Services in Private Universities in Nigeria. Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review. 2. 33-41. 10.12816/0001225.
- [6] Pandiya, N., &Sarmah, M. (2021). A study on the level of satisfaction of the Library Users of IIM,Lucknow. 10.14662/IJALIS2014.023.
- [7] Saikia, M., &Gohain, A. (2013). Use and user's satisfaction in library resources and services: A study in Tezpur University (India). International Journal of Library and Information Science. 5. 167-175.
- [8] Veeramallu, D., Ramakrishna, K., &Rudraksha, G. (2021). User Opinion and Satisfaction about Library Information Resources in Engineering College Libraries.
- [9] Yahaya, R. (2019). Users' satisfaction with information resources in libraries of agricultural research institutes in Nigeria. Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management. 10. 59. 10.4314/ijikm.v10i1.6.