



Information Needs and Information Seeking Behavior of Television Media Professionals in Bengaluru: A Study

Prasanna Kumara BM* and Divyananda K

- 1 Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore India
- 2 Dean-Industry-Institute interaction, SIT, Tumakuru, India

Abstract

This paper provided insight into the information needs and seeking behavior of television media professionals in Bengaluru, Karnataka. The comprehensive information was obtained through a well-structured questionnaire informal interview and observation methods, which involved several aspects of media information resources usage such as awareness, frequency and place of access, awareness of the availability of information resources, learn to use, purpose and benefits, rating of electronic information resources based on their features, preferred search engines, The overall attitude towards the use of information resources among television media professional was shown to be very positive. Further, the usage of these resources can be increased if users are motivated to use these services in the media library by providing them help in searching and downloading the information. This study has served as a benchmark for the use of media information resources by the media professionals of television media in Bengaluru city, Karnataka.

Keywords: Information needs; Information seeking behavior; Library services; Television media; Media libraries; Media professionals

*Corresponding author: Prasanna kumara

✉ prasannamlib23@gmail.com

Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore India.

Tel: 0816-2282696, 2214000

Citation: Prasanna Kumara BM, Divyananda K. Information Needs and Information Seeking Behavior of Television Media Professionals in Bengaluru: A Study. Global Media Journal. 2017, 15:28.

Received: April 21, 2017; **Accepted:** May 18, 2017; **Published:** May 28, 2017

Introduction

Information plays a significant role in our professional and personal lives. People need information to work properly in their respective fields. The advent of technology introduced into both newsrooms and the media culture in the past ten years has changed the needs and habits of print and television journalists. The Indian model of television programmers is unique as it is expected to pass on the culture from one generation to other and persuasion. Media professionals working in media organizations need current, authoritative and factual information to construct the news and programmers. There is an enormous need to identify the need of media professionals because they are "information users as well as information producers and information communicators". The proliferation of information on the Internet, the diffusion of communication technologies such as cell phones and personal digital assistants have increased television media professionals capabilities at both seeking and gathering information for their work. This study aims to describe the television media professionals and their information needs and information seeking behaviors throughout the working day. Television media professional's nature is information gathering.

Review of Literature

Rosamma Joseph [1], in 1993 studied on "How Indian Journalists Use Libraries". The results of that study showed that the journalists working on the eight Kerala newspapers used libraries for conducting any research on their news, which were published in these Kerala newspapers. This study concluded that there was a room for improvement in the collections and services of the libraries concerned.

Gupta [2], in 2012 studied on information needs and information and sought behavior of print and electronic media journalists in M.P. with special reference to Rewa division. The findings of this research showed that maximum numbers of journalists were graduate, maximum number of journalist preferred to visit personally to obtain information, maximum number of journalists desired to avail library services free of cost and few journalists prefer fee-based library services in both print media and electronic media.

Obijoor [3], in 2013 conduct a studied on "News channels professionals' Perceptions and Use of the Internet as a News

Channel” and observed that news channels professionals relied basically on internet as most popular source for news. Results from this study showed that news channels professionals were highly selective of the news media for satisfaction their news needs.

Gurdev Singh [4] study examined the information behaviors of New Delhi newspapers journalists. Study found that the information needs of the journalists studied matched the information gathering behaviors observed. Most of the journalist uses the periodicals, news magazines, current issues of newspapers, newspaper clipping files and dictionaries/biographical dictionaries are most frequently used sources of information by them.

Need and purpose of the study

It is necessary to find, which are the media Information Sources available? What the professionals prefer to get information from the media library, web and other source? What is the awareness among the professionals of television media in Bengaluru about available media information resources and services? What is the role of media library while providing the media information? [5].

The study delves into the information needs and information seeking behavior of Television media Professionals in Bengaluru, Karnataka. In the past, there was no study or analysis done in the way television media professionals in the country use and procure information. This is a ‘first-of-its-kind’ study which researches extensively on a definitive pattern in the way information is sought and used, and the requirements of these professionals in the Garden City. The findings in this study will prove to be a useful tool for library professionals and information experts who are keen to improvise the planning and design of library-related services.

Objectives of the study

The primary objective of this study is to disclose the information requirements and how data is used among television media professionals in Bengaluru. The detailed objectives of this study are mentioned below:

- To find out the television media professional’s purpose and methods of information seeking.
- To identify the availability of various type of information sources preferred by television media professional working at Bengaluru.
- To examine the preferred information channels used for gathering required information by television media professionals.
- To identify the role of media libraries while gathering specific information by television media professionals.
- To assess the role of web for various journalistic tasks of television media professionals.
- To find out discouraging factors of television media professionals while accessing the information.

Scope of the study and limitation of the study

Scope of the study is limited to various television channels functioning at Bengaluru city for elicit data. Also the study limited to the working professionals of various television channels considered has core respondents of the study.

Methodology

Researcher has adopted quantitative research design for the study and employed questionnaires as a tool for data collection. The questionnaire method for data collection was considered appropriate to conduct this study. An attempt has been made to collect the studies carried in globally and India which are related to research problem [6]. However personal visits, interactions, observations, interviews, indirect studies were adopted for data collection. A total of 29 television media are identified in Bengaluru city Karnataka State. As a sample frame totally 1320 media professionals were selected for the study.

Data Analysis

Distribution of questionnaire

A total of 1320 questionnaire were distributed among the media professional i.e. Entertainment and news media types in Bengaluru, Karnataka, of which 1132 filled-up questionnaire were received back consisting of 85.80% responses [7].

The **Table 1** so depicts that 400 questionnaire were distributed among respondents belonging to Entertainment profession, of which 313 filled-up questionnaire were received back consisting of 78.25% responses and 920 questionnaire were distributed among respondents belonging News profession, of which 819 filled-up questionnaire were received back consisting of 89.02% responses.

Professional wise distribution

The **Table 2** depicts that 133 (11.75%) of respondents are assistant producer, followed by 112 (9.89%) are new producers, 112 (9.89%) are video editors, 109 (9.63%) are Writer, 101 (9.92%) are photographer, 100 (8.83%) are anchor, 94 (8.30%) are graphic designer, 93 (8.22%) are reporter, 88 (7.77%) are editor, 87 (7.69%) are internet specialist, 85 (7.51%) are technician and 18 (1.59%) are chief editors.

Library visit

The **Table 3** depicts that 995 (87.89%) of respondent opine as ‘Yes’ i.e. they visit the library and 137 (12.10%) of respondents opine as ‘No’ i.e. they do not visit the library.

The **Table 3** also depicts that 289 (92.33%) of entertainment professional and 706 (86.20%) of news professionals opine as ‘Yes’ i.e. they visit the library and 24 (7.66%) of entertainment professionals and 113 (13.79%) of news professionals opine as ‘No’ i.e. they do not visit the library [8].

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between library visit and the respondents ($\chi^2=7.998$, $df=1$, $p=0.004<0.05$).

Table 1: Distribution of questionnaire.

Media Type	Questionnaire distributed	Questionnaire received	Percentage
Entertainment	400	313	78.25
News	920	819	89.02
Total	1320	1132	85.8

Table 2: Professional wise distribution.

Profession	Entertainment (N=313)	News (N=819)	Total (N=1132)
Chief Editor	06 (01.92)	12 (01.47)	18 (01.59)
Editor	34 (10.86)	54 (06.59)	88 (07.77)
News Producer	00 (00.00)	112 (13.68)	112 (09.89)
Anchor	41 (13.10)	59 (07.20)	100 (08.83)
Reporter	22 (07.03)	71 (08.67)	93 (08.22)
Photographer	40 (12.78)	61 (07.45)	101 (08.92)
Video editor	24 (07.67)	88 (10.74)	112 (09.89)
Internet Specialist	36 (11.50)	51 (06.23)	87 (07.69)
Graphic Designer	25 (07.99)	69 (08.42)	94 (08.30)
Writer	44 (14.06)	65 (07.94)	109 (09.63)
Assistant Producer	35 (11.18)	98 (11.97)	133 (11.75)
Technician	06 (01.92)	79 (09.65)	85 (07.51)

Table 3: Library visit.

Library Visit	Entertainment (N=313)	News (N=819)	Total (N=1132)
Yes	289 (92.33)	706 (86.20)	995 (87.89)
No	24 (07.66)	113 (13.79)	137 (12.10)

$\chi^2=7.998$, $df=1$, $P=0.004$

Frequency of visit to the library

The **Table 4** depicts that 315 (31.66%) of respondents visit library 'Twice a week' with mean value of 1.7651 and SD 0.42462, followed by 191 (19.20%) of respondents visit the library 'Daily' with mean value of 1.6283 and SD 0.32613, about 163 (16.38%) of respondents visit the library 'Occasionally' with mean value of 1.7730 and SD 0.42018, about 133 (13.37%) of respondents visit the library 'Once in a week' with mean value of 1.5639 and SD 0.49777, about 115 (11.56%) of respondents visit the library 'Fortnightly' with mean value of 1.7043 and SD 0.45833 and 78 (07.84%) of respondents visit the library 'Monthly' with mean value of 1.8077 and SD 0.39666.

Average time spent in the library

The **Table 5** depicts that 388 (38.99%) of respondents spend '15 to 30 Minutes' in a day with mean value 1.7474 and SD 0.43505, followed by 202 (20.30%) of respondents spend '30 Minutes to 2 Hours' in a day with mean value 1.6287 and SD 0.48435, 201 (20.20%) of respondents spend 'Less than 15 minutes' in a day with mean value 1.7363 and SD 0.44173, 119 (11.96%) of respondents spend '1 to 2 Hours' in a day with mean value 1.7143 and SD 0.45366 and about 85 (08.54%) of respondents spend 'More than 2 Hours' in a day in the library with mean value 1.6588 and SD 0.47692.

Information gathering on definite topic

The way of gathering information on definite topic by the

respondents has been summarized in **Table 6**, majority of the respondent 508 (51.06%) 'Never' gather information on definite topic by Searching the shelves, About 536 (53.87%) of respondents 'Consistently' gather information on definite topic by asking the librarian, About 391 (39.30%) of respondents 'Rarely' gather information on definite topic by discussion with colleagues, about 601 (60.40%) of respondents 'Never' gather information on definite topic by Subject Bibliography and About 819 (82.31%) of respondents 'Never' gather information on definite topic by Library OPAC [9].

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between information gathering on definite topic and the respondents ($\chi^2=1444.293$, $df=8$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Library needs for user

The **Table 7** depicts that 409 (41.11%) of respondents opine as 'Effective' with mean value of 1.7433 and SD 0.43736, followed by 234 (23.52%) of respondents opine as 'Very Effective' with mean value of 1.6026 and SD 0.49042, about 187 (18.79%) of respondents opine as 'Somewhat Effective' with mean value of 1.7273 and SD 0.44656, 122 (12.26%) of respondents opine as 'Ineffective' with mean value of 1.7869 and SD 0.41120 and about 43 (04.32%) of respondents opine as 'Very Ineffective' with mean value of 1.6744 and SD 0.47414.

Access to web resources

The **Table 8** depicts that 1120 (98.93%) of respondents opine as 'Yes', i.e. they access web resources and 12 (01.06%) of respondents opine as 'No', i.e. they do not access to web resources.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between access to web resources and the respondents ($\chi^2=9.289$, $df=1$, $p=0.002<0.05$).

The ANOVA conducted to test the relationship between access to web resources and the respondents ($F=9.289$, $df=1$, $p=0.002<0.05$).

E resource for journalistic task

The E-Resources used for journalistic task by the respondents has been summarized in **Table 9**.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between e-resource for journalist task and the respondents ($\chi^2=640.897$, $df=36$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Criteria for evaluation of E-resource

The criteria for Evaluation of E-resource by the respondents have been summarized in **Table 10**.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between criteria for evaluation of e-resource and the respondents ($\chi^2=384.428$, $df=32$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Table 4: Frequency of visit to the library.

Frequency of Visit	Entertainment (N=289)	News (N=706)	Total (N=995)	Mean	SD
Daily	71 (24.57)	120 (17.00)	191 (19.20)	1.6283	0.48454
Twice a Week	74 (25.61)	241 (34.14)	315 (31.66)	1.7651	0.42462
Once in a Week	58 (20.07)	75 (10.62)	133 (13.37)	1.5639	0.49777
Fortnightly	34 (11.76)	81 (11.47)	115 (11.56)	1.7043	0.45833
Monthly	15 (05.19)	63 (08.92)	78 (07.84)	1.8077	0.39666
Occasionally	37 (12.80)	126 (17.85)	163 (16.38)	1.7730	0.42018

$\chi^2=31.369$, $df=5$, $P=0.000$

Table 5: Average time spent in the library.

Time	Entertainment (N=289)	News (N=706)	Total (N=995)	Mean	SD
Less than 15 min.	53 (18.34)	148 (20.96)	201 (20.20)	1.7363	0.44173
15-30 min.	98 (33.91)	290 (41.08)	388 (38.99)	1.7474	0.43505
30 min. to 1 Hr.	75 (25.95)	127 (17.99)	202 (20.30)	1.6287	0.48435
1 to 2 Hr.	34 (11.76)	85 (12.04)	119 (11.96)	1.7143	0.45366
More than 2 Hr.	29 (10.03)	56 (07.93)	85 (08.54)	1.6588	0.47692

$\chi^2=13.626$, $df=4$, $P=0.008$

Table 6: Information gathering on definite topic.

Sources	Consistently	Rarely	Never
Searching the Shelves	146 (14.67)	341 (34.27)	508 (51.06)
Asking the Librarian	536 (53.87)	346 (34.77)	113 (11.36)
Discussion with Colleagues	351 (35.28)	391 (39.30)	253 (25.43)
Subject Bibliography	158 (15.88)	236 (23.72)	601 (60.40)
Library OPAC	62 (06.23)	114 (11.46)	819 (82.31)

$\chi^2=1444.293$, $df=8$, $P=0.00$

Importance of E-resource for journalistic task

The Importance of E-Resource for Journalistic Task by the respondents has been summarized in **Table 11**.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between importance of e-resource for journalistic task and the respondents ($\chi^2=146.527$, $df=36$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Awareness and usage of social networks

The awareness and usage of social networks by the respondents has been summarized in **Table 12**.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between awareness and usage of social networks and the respondents ($\chi^2=689.778$, $df=36$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Rating of E-resource based on its features

The respondents rating of E-Resource based on its features has been summarized in **Table 13**.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between rating of e-resource based on its features and the respondents ($\chi^2=281.19$, $df=24$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Preferred version of resources prefer

The **Table 14** depicts that 547 (48.83%) of respondents prefer

‘Both’ i.e. print and electronic version of information resources with mean value of 1.7148 and SD 0.45192, followed by 397 (35.44%) of respondents prefer ‘Electronic Version’ of information resources with mean value of 1.7859 and SD 0.41072 and 176 (15.71%) of respondents prefer ‘Print Version’ of information resources with mean value of 1.6364 and SD 0.48242.

Factors influencing the use e-resources for professional tasks

The factors influencing the use e-resources for professional tasks among the respondents have been summarized in **Table 15**.

The χ^2 -test conducted for 2 d.f. at the 5% level of significance shows that there is a significant relationship between factors influencing the use e-resources for professional tasks and the respondents ($\chi^2=201.261$, $df=24$, $p=0.00<0.05$).

Extent of satisfaction with the availability of E-resources

The **Table 16** depicts that 497 (44.38%) of respondents opine as they are satisfied ‘To a great extent’ with mean value of 1.6962 and SD 0.46037, followed by 413 (36.88%) of respondents opine as they are satisfied ‘To some extent’ with mean value of 1.7942 and SD 0.40478, 153 (13.66%) of respondents opine as they are satisfied ‘To a little extent’ with mean value of 1.6928 and SD 0.462184 and about 57 (05.09%) of respondents opine as they are ‘Not at all’ satisfied with mean value of 1.6140 and SD 0.49115 towards use of e-resources.

Level of satisfaction with subject coverage in the E-resource

The **Table 17** depicts that 341 (30.45%) of respondents opine as they are ‘Satisfied’ with mean value of 1.8035 and SD 0.39792, followed by 339 (30.27%) of respondents opine as they are ‘Highly Satisfied’ with mean value of 1.6608 and SD 0.47415, 239 (21.34%) of respondents opine as they are ‘Moderately Satisfied’ with mean value of 1.7322 and SD 0.44373, 127 (11.34%) of

Table 7: Library need for users.

Time	Entertainment (N=289)	News (N=706)	Total (N=995)	Mean	SD
Very effectively	93 (32.18)	141 (19.97)	234 (23.52)	1.6026	.49042
Effectively	105 (36.33)	304 (43.06)	409 (41.11)	1.7433	.43736
Somewhat effectively	51 (17.65)	136 (19.26)	187 (18.79)	1.7273	.44656
Ineffective	26 (09.00)	96 (13.60)	122 (12.26)	1.7869	.41120
Very ineffective	14 (04.84)	29 (04.11)	43 (04.32)	1.6744	.47414

$\chi^2=19.336$, $df=4$, $P=0.000$

Table 8: Access to web resources.

Web resources	Entertainment (N=313)	News (N=819)	Total (N=1132)
Yes	305 (97.44)	815 (99.51)	1120 (98.93)
No	08 (02.55)	04 (00.48)	12 (01.06)

$\chi^2=9.289$, $df=1$, $P=0.002$

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.846	1	1.846	9.289	.002
Within Groups	224.609	1130	.199		
Total	226.455	1131			

Table 9: E-Resource for journalist task.

Electronic Resource	(N=1120)				
	Always	Most of the Time	Often	Rarely	Never
E-Directories/Reports	141 (12.59)	239 (21.34)	264 (23.57)	291 (25.98)	185 (16.52)
Entertainment/Sports	236 (21.07)	241 (21.52)	251 (22.41)	294 (26.25)	98 (8.75)
E-Graphics/Pictures	236 (21.07)	265 (23.66)	296 (26.43)	279 (24.91)	44 (3.92)
Live streaming video/audio (YouTube)	240 (21.43)	203 (18.13)	277 (24.73)	290 (25.89)	110 (9.82)
News services (i.e. Reuters)	119 (10.63)	251 (22.41)	214 (19.11)	295 (26.34)	241 (21.52)
E-Newspapers	251 (22.41)	356 (31.79)	324 (28.93)	101 (9.01)	88 (7.85)
Press releases	188 (16.79)	201 (17.95)	222 (19.82)	288 (25.71)	221 (19.73)
E-Reference	156 (13.93)	196 (17.5)	201 (17.95)	345 (30.8)	222 (19.82)
Scientific information	145 (12.95)	274 (24.46)	378 (33.75)	226 (20.18)	97 (8.66)
Statistics	167 (14.91)	241 (21.52)	277 (24.73)	320 (28.57)	115 (10.27)

$\chi^2=640.897$, $df=36$, $P=0.00$

Table 10: Criteria for evaluation of E-resource.

Criteria	(N=1120)				
	Always	Most of the Time	Often	Rarely	Never
Authority of publisher	222 (19.82)	256 (22.86)	295 (26.34)	201 (17.95)	146 (13.04)
Accuracy of information	215 (19.2)	293 (26.16)	296 (26.43)	201 (17.95)	115 (10.27)
Convenience in obtaining information	213 (19.02)	261 (23.3)	351 (31.34)	188 (16.79)	107 (9.55)
Currency of information	133 (11.88)	236 (21.07)	271 (24.2)	325 (29.02)	155 (13.84)
Coverage of topic	236 (21.07)	265 (23.66)	296 (26.43)	279 (24.91)	44 (3.92)
Interactivity with website	159 (14.2)	263 (23.48)	321 (28.66)	281 (25.09)	96 (8.57)
Objectivity of publisher	119 (10.63)	183 (16.34)	264 (23.57)	356 (31.79)	198 (17.68)
Promptness in obtaining information	240 (21.43)	203 (18.13)	277 (24.73)	290 (25.89)	110 (9.82)
Cost of obtaining information	198 (17.68)	277 (24.73)	301 (26.88)	266 (23.75)	78 (6.96)

$\chi^2=384.428$, $df=32$, $P=0.00$

respondents opine as they are 'Satisfied to a little extent' with mean value of 1.6929 and SD 0.46311 and about 74 (06.61%) of respondents opine as they are 'Un satisfied' with mean value of 1.7297 and SD 0.44713 towards subject coverage in the e-resources.

Rating the importance of the E-resource for professional task

The **Table 18** depicts that that 395 (35.27%) of respondents rate e-resources for professional tasks as 'Highly Important' with

mean value of 1.7620 and SD 0.42638, followed by 355 (31.70%) of respondents rate as 'Important' with mean value 1.6845 and SD 0.46537, 216 (19.29%) of respondents rate as 'Moderately Important' with mean value 1.8056 and SD 0.39669, 102 (09.11%) of respondents rate as 'Little Important' with mean value of 1.6275 and SD 0.48587 and about 52 (04.64%) of respondents rate e-resources for professional tasks as 'Not at all Important' with mean value of 1.6346 and SD 0.48624.

Suggestions and Recommendations

- To offer several modes such as beginner, intermediary and advanced, so this helps those in the media field to work in an e-environment, which is more comfortable for them.

- Ensure that library instructions are specific to the topic and showcase the online resources. It should also be a platform to discuss issues like cost, quality and access.
- Established the new digital library for television media channels for easy access of information
- More informative, user friendly and well organised media library website that makes easy access to the information resources should be offered by the library.
- The web search engines retrieve information based on the metadata. It is strongly suggested that the search engine should have content based information search facilities for effective information retrieval.

Table 11: Importance of E-resource for journalistic task.

Journalistic task	(N=1120)				
	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neither Important or Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
Background for a news item	201 (17.95)	278 (24.82)	289 (25.8)	211 (18.84)	141 (12.59)
Conduct research	178 (15.89)	290 (25.89)	288 (25.71)	199 (17.77)	165 (14.73)
Contact sources	166 (14.82)	271 (24.2)	256 (22.86)	289 (25.8)	138 (12.32)
Define terms or concepts	144 (12.86)	244 (21.79)	279 (24.91)	299 (26.7)	154 (13.75)
Fact-checking and verification	185 (16.52)	277 (24.73)	243 (21.7)	260 (23.21)	155 (13.84)
Find photographs/Graphs	201 (17.95)	211 (18.84)	281 (25.09)	250 (22.32)	177 (15.8)
Find story ideas	233 (20.8)	256 (22.86)	264 (23.57)	199 (17.77)	168 (15)
Statistics for a news item	189 (16.88)	258 (23.04)	274 (24.46)	261 (23.3)	138 (12.32)
Write editorial/feature/opinion/analysis	210 (18.75)	291 (25.98)	289 (25.8)	249 (22.23)	81 (7.23)

$\chi^2=146.527$, $df=36$, $P=0.00$

Table 12: Awareness and usage of social networks.

Social Networks	(N=1120)				
	Extremely aware	Very aware	Moderately aware	Slightly aware	Not at all aware
Facebook	274 (24.46)	299 (26.7)	311 (27.77)	192 (17.14)	44 (3.92)
Flickr	166 (14.82)	199 (17.77)	259 (23.13)	311 (27.77)	185 (16.52)
Google+	197 (17.59)	256 (22.86)	259 (23.13)	297 (26.52)	111 (9.91)
hi5	169 (15.09)	184 (16.43)	254 (22.68)	312 (27.86)	201 (17.95)
Ibibo	114 (10.18)	188 (16.79)	198 (17.68)	356 (31.79)	264 (23.57)
Instagram	161 (14.38)	208 (18.57)	264 (23.57)	298 (26.61)	189 (16.88)
LinkedIn	188 (16.79)	201 (17.95)	253 (22.59)	289 (25.8)	189 (16.88)
Meetup	144 (12.86)	198 (17.68)	202 (18.04)	270 (24.11)	306 (27.32)
Twitter	226 (20.18)	263 (23.48)	304 (27.14)	226 (20.18)	101 (9.01)
YouTube	219 (19.55)	288 (25.71)	320 (28.57)	216 (19.29)	77 (6.87)

$\chi^2=689.778$, $df=36$, $P=0.00$

Table 13: Rating of E-resource based on its features.

Features	(N=1120)			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Easy to use	356 (31.79)	459 (40.98)	229 (20.45)	76 (06.79)
Up-to-date	229 (20.45)	399 (35.63)	376 (33.57)	116 (10.36)
Accessibility	344 (30.71)	413 (36.88)	267 (23.84)	96 (08.57)
Access Speed	340 (30.36)	436 (38.93)	256 (22.86)	88 (07.86)
Usefulness	317 (28.30)	406 (36.25)	289 (25.80)	108 (09.64)
Hypertext links	316 (28.21)	388 (34.64)	306 (27.32)	110 (09.82)
Organized information	211 (18.84)	356 (31.79)	356 (31.79)	197 (17.59)
Comprehensiveness	232 (20.71)	377 (33.66)	399 (35.63)	112 (10.00)
Flexibility	278 (24.82)	369 (32.95)	335 (29.91)	138 (12.32)

$\chi^2=281.19$, $df=24$, $P=0.00$

Table 14: Preferred version of resources.

Version	Entertainment (N=305)	News (N=815)	Total (N=1120)	Mean	SD
Print versions	64 (20.98)	112 (13.74)	176 (15.71)	1.6364	0.48242
Electronic versions	85 (27.86)	312 (38.28)	397 (35.44)	1.7859	0.41072
Both	156 (51.14)	391 (47.97)	547 (48.83)	1.7148	0.45192

$\chi^2=14.653$, $df=2$, $P=0.000$

Table 15: Factors influencing the use e-resources for professional tasks.

Factors (N=1120)	Consistently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Through the Internet I often find new informants/experts	556 (49.64)	361 (32.23)	116 (10.36)	87 (07.77)
Through the Internet I often find new information sources	446 (39.82)	374 (33.39)	219 (19.55)	81 (07.23)
I often use the Internet when searching for an idea for a story or coverage	394 (35.18)	456 (40.71)	203 (18.13)	67 (05.98)
The Internet is a good tool for finding information	441 (39.38)	356 (31.79)	246 (21.96)	77 (06.88)
I always check email information	488 (43.57)	438 (39.11)	138 (12.32)	56 (05.00)
The Internet as source for new ideas/information	396 (35.36)	421 (37.59)	216 (19.29)	87 (07.77)
Efficiency gain by the Internet	386 (34.46)	379 (33.84)	279 (24.91)	76 (06.79)
Credibility Internet information	484 (43.21)	340 (30.36)	203 (18.13)	93 (08.30)
Credibility governmental and non-governmental websites	424 (37.86)	389 (34.73)	236 (21.07)	81 (07.23)

$\chi^2=201.261$, $df=24$, $P=0.000$

Table 16: Extent of Satisfaction with the availability of e-resources.

Extent of Satisfaction	Entertainment (N=305)	News (N=815)	Total (N=1120)	Mean	SD
To a great extent	151 (49.51)	346 (42.45)	497 (44.38)	1.6962	0.46037
To some extent	85 (27.87)	328 (40.25)	413 (36.88)	1.7942	0.40478
To a little extent	47 (15.41)	106 (13.01)	153 (13.66)	1.6928	0.46284
Not at all	22 (07.21)	35 (04.29)	57 (05.09)	1.6140	0.49115

$\chi^2=16.362$, $df=3$, $P=0.000$

Table 17: Level of satisfaction with subject coverage in the E-resource.

Level of Satisfaction with Subject Coverage	Entertainment (N=305)	News (N=815)	Total (N=1120)	Mean	SD
Highly satisfied	115 (37.70)	224 (27.48)	339 (30.27)	1.6608	0.47415
Satisfied	67 (21.97)	274 (33.62)	341 (30.45)	1.8035	0.39792
Moderately satisfied	64 (20.98)	175 (21.47)	239 (21.34)	1.7322	0.44373
Satisfied to a little extent	39 (12.79)	88 (10.80)	127 (11.34)	1.6929	0.46311
Unsatisfied	20 (06.56)	54 (06.63)	74 (06.61)	1.7297	0.44713

$\chi^2=18.358$, $df=4$, $P=0.001$

Table 18: Rating the importance of the e-resource for professional task.

Rating the importance of the e-Resource	Entertainment (N=305)	News (N=815)	Total (N=1120)	Mean	SD
Highly important	94 (30.82)	301 (36.93)	395 (35.27)	1.7620	0.42638
Important	112 (36.72)	243 (29.82)	355 (31.70)	1.6845	0.46537
Moderately Important	42 (13.77)	174 (21.35)	216 (19.29)	1.8056	0.39669
Little important	38 (12.46)	64 (07.85)	102 (09.11)	1.6275	0.48587
Not at all important	19 (06.23)	33 (04.05)	52 (04.64)	1.6346	0.48624

$\chi^2=19.745$, $df=4$, $P=0.000$

- As reflected in the study, most of the media libraries do not have a professional librarian to look into the acquisition, processing, organization and dissemination of information in a professional style.

Conclusion

Frequency of use and high importance accorded to electronic information resources. Although the use of media information resources at television media libraries in Bengaluru city, Karnataka under study is well established, there is a need to increase the

use of Media Information Resources. Further, the usage of these resources can be increased if users are motivated to use these services in the media library by providing them help in searching and downloading the information. Thus, the media library should continue to provide electronic information resources. This survey has served as a benchmark for the use of media information resources by the media professionals of television media in Bengaluru city, Karnataka. It is hoped that the results of this study enable the media libraries to evaluate and realign resources and services according to users' requirements effectively.

References

- 1 Joseph R (1993) How Indian Journalists Use Libraries. *Information Development* 9(1/2): 70-74.
- 2 Kamlesh Kumar G (2012) A comparative study of information needs and information seeking behaviour of print and electronic media journalists in MP with special reference to Rewa division. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Dr. Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Sagar, Madhya Pradesh, India.
- 3 Obijiofor L, Hanusch F (2013) Students' perceptions and use of the Internet as a news channel. *Covenant J Commu* 1: 1-18.
- 4 Singh G, Sharma M (2013) Information seeking behavior of newspaper journalists. *International Journal of Library and Information Science* 5: 225-234.
- 5 Mehta N (2008) *Television in India: Satellites, politics, and cultural change*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 6 Nicholas D, Martin H (1997) Assessing information needs: a case study of journalists. *ASLIB Proceedings* 49: 43-52.
- 7 Prasanna BK, Divyananda K (2015) Attitude towards the usage of Electronic Information Resources by Television Media Professionals in Bengaluru. *International Research: Journal of Library & Information Science* 5: 562-579.
- 8 Prasanna BK, Divyananda K (2016) Determinants of Television Media Libraries' Use, Collections, and Services among the Television Media Professionals in Bengaluru: A Study. *Indian Journal of Library and Information Science* 10: 245-254.
- 9 (2011) R TV Journalism In India: Is It Really Growing?