

College Librarians as Catalysts: ICT, Research, Quality Enhancement, and Publication Roles

Mrs. Manisha S. Tandale¹; Prof. (Dr.) Jyoti Bhabal²

Research Scholar, SHPT School of Library Science, SNDT Women's University, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400020¹; Professor, SHPT School of Library Science, SNDT Women's University, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400020, India²

ABSTRACT

This study aims to evaluate the participation of college librarians in ICT integration, research support, quality enhancement initiatives, and publication activities, while analyzing how demographic factors such as age, gender, and professional experience influence their involvement. Employing a descriptive survey method, a structured questionnaire was distributed among 580 college librarians affiliated with the University of Mumbai and SNDT University, yielding 223 valid responses primarily from mid-career professionals with 11 to 25 years of experience. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and chi-square tests to determine the significance of demographic variables on various activities. The findings reveal that librarians are actively engaged in ICT tasks, research facilitation, and quality assurance, with higher involvement observed among those with greater age and experience. Despite systemic challenges such as resource limitations, time constraints, and insufficient training, librarians report high satisfaction levels and recognition for their contributions. The study emphasizes the vital role of librarians as catalysts in institutional development, highlighting the need for enhanced support mechanisms to maximize their potential in higher education.

KEYWORDS: Librarian; Research; ICT; Quality; Publication.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the present era of higher education, the role of college librarians has undergone a remarkable transformation. Traditionally viewed as custodians of books and providers of information, they are now recognized as proactive partners in the academic and institutional development process. With the rapid growth of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), the emergence of digital resources, and the increasing demands of accreditation and quality assurance bodies, librarians have expanded their contributions far beyond routine library management. They function as catalysts who not only support but also enhance teaching, learning, and research activities within their institutions.

One of the most significant areas of their evolving role is in the integration and management of ICT. College librarians are at the forefront of digital transformation, facilitating access to e-resources, online databases, digital repositories, and Open Educational Resources (OERs). By promoting digital literacy and training students and faculty in the effective use of these resources, they ensure that the academic community remains technologically competent and information-savvy. Other than providing just digital resources librarians also manage college website, social media, campus management software and other ICT equipment required for the campus.

Librarians also play a crucial role in research support. They assist faculty and students in literature searches, reference management, plagiarism checking, and navigating scholarly databases. In addition, they contribute to research visibility by managing institutional repositories and guiding in publication ethics, citation practices, and indexing processes. Their support strengthens the research culture of colleges and directly impacts the quality and credibility of academic work produced.

Furthermore, librarians are actively involved in quality enhancement activities, particularly in the context of institutional accreditation processes such as National Assessment and Accreditation Council of India (NAAC) in India. They contribute valuable data, prepare documentation, and provide evidence of the library's role in academic excellence. Their efforts in resource management, user satisfaction, and innovative practices are often highlighted as key indicators of institutional quality.

Another emerging dimension of their work is their involvement in publication activities. Librarians often facilitate or coordinate institutional publications such as newsletters, journals, and conference proceedings. By ensuring adherence to academic standards, promoting open access initiatives, and assisting in editorial processes, they enhance the scholarly output and reputation of the institution.

Thus, college librarians today are not merely information providers but academic partners and change agents who significantly influence the teaching-learning environment, research productivity, and overall institutional growth. Their evolving roles in ICT, research support, quality enhancement, and publication activities underscore their indispensable position in higher education, making them true catalysts of academic progress.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Studies highlight the expanding role of librarians in research data management (RDM), scholarly communication, and digital inclusion. Dalbehera (2019) showed libraries in Odisha providing advanced RDM services, while Cheng and Hoffman (2020) emphasized their contributions to research impact and student success despite differing stakeholder views. Bradley (2018) identified common themes between LIS and RA literature, including funding, methodologies, and infrastructure.

Other research noted librarians' growing responsibilities in promoting research (AIP Publishing, 2020), developing RDM policies (Pinfield, 2014), and shaping the emerging blueprint for data librarianship (Ohaji et al., 2019). Surveys at Parul University (Bunkar & Bhut, 2020) and among health sciences librarians (Lessick, 2016) confirmed support for library involvement in RDM, though concerns about intellectual property and engagement disparities persist. Beyond RDM, Wakimoto (2015) highlighted librarians' reliance on self-learning and institutional support

for graphic design, while Reynolds, Smith, and D'Silva (2013) demonstrated how librarians facilitated research on social media's role during political uprisings.

Public libraries also play a critical role in bridging digital divides, as shown by Bertot, Real, and Jaeger (2013), and rural libraries in Appalachia were found to foster community engagement through technology (Mehra, Sikes, & Singh, 2019). Expanding to scholarly practices, Sugimoto (2014) revealed the multiple channels librarians use for research dissemination and teaching, while Fitzgibbons, Kloda, and Miller-Nesbitt (2017) showed that journal clubs strengthen professional learning and research culture. Finally, Boufarss and Harviainen (2021) demonstrated librarians' proactive role in promoting Open Access (OA), and Braddlee and VanScoy (2019) emphasized their essential support for Open Educational Resources (OER), both of which highlight librarians' evolving contributions to scholarly communication and institutional advancement.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- ✓ To assess the level of participation of college librarians in ICT integration, research support, quality enhancement initiatives, and publication-related activities.
- ✓ To analyze librarians' participation in ICT, research, quality enhancement, and publication activities with respect to gender, age, and professional experience.
- ✓ To examine the challenges encountered by librarians while performing these roles.
- ✓ To explore the satisfaction levels of college librarians regarding their participation in these activities.

4. HYPOTHESIS

- Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no statistically significant difference in the participation of librarian in ICT integration, research support, quality enhancement initiatives, and publication-related activities with respect to their age, gender and professional experience.

Whereas

- Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): There is a statistically significant difference in the involvement of librarians in ICT integration, research support, quality enhancement initiatives, and publication related activities with respect to their age, gender and professional experience.

5. METHODOLOGY

The study is a survey, conducted at various colleges affiliated with University of Mumbai and SNDT University residing in Mumbai City, Mumbai Suburban, and Thane districts. A structured questionnaire was distributed to 580 college librarians, out of which 223 librarians' responses were received.

6. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

6.1 Respondents Demographic Profile

Out of 223 participants, a significant 73.5% (N=164) respondents were female, while only 26.5% (N=59) respondents were male. Experience wise majority of respondents are mid-career professionals, with 11 to 25 years of experience. The largest group consists of 25.6% (N=57) respondents with 16 to 20 years of service, followed by

22.9% (N=51) respondents with 11 to 15 years of experience, 18.4% (N=41) respondents have between 21 and 25 years of experience and in contrast, very few respondents are at either end of the experience spectrum, with only 2.2% (N=5) respondents having less than 5 years or more than 30 years of experience.

6.2 Participation in ICT Management / Upgradation

Table 1 Participation in ICT Management / Upgradation

ICT Activity		Always	Usually	Frequently	Sometimes	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
College Website	N	79	14	14	24	30	20	42	223
	%	35.4%	6.3%	6.3%	10.8%	13.5%	9.0%	18.8%	100%
Language Lab	N	18	11	6	14	9	25	140	223
	%	8.1%	4.9%	2.7%	6.3%	4.0%	11.2%	62.8%	100%
ICT Infrastructure	N	37	30	17	27	24	17	71	223
	%	16.6%	13.5%	7.6%	12.1%	10.8%	7.6%	31.8%	100%
Computer Lab	N	22	20	22	24	20	18	97	223
	%	9.9%	9.0%	9.9%	10.8%	9.0%	8.1%	43.5%	100%
LMS Management	N	54	14	17	17	21	27	73	223
	%	24.2%	6.3%	7.6%	7.6%	9.4%	12.1%	32.7%	100%
ERP Management	N	28	13	16	12	16	24	114	223
	%	12.6%	5.8%	7.2%	5.4%	7.2%	10.8%	51.1%	100%
Social media	N	32	18	23	29	28	30	63	223
	%	14.3%	8.1%	10.3%	13.0%	12.6%	13.5%	28.3%	100%

Table 1 shows strong involvement of librarians in the college’s ICT activities, providing technical and administrative support in managing various digital and technological resources. Findings show that college website 35.4% (N=79) respondents and (Learning Management System) LMS management 24.2% (N=54) respondents were always engaged, highlighting a positive focus on communication and digital learning. Social Media (Facebook, Instagram, YouTube) Management also reflects active participation, strengthening institutional outreach. While areas such as Language Labs, (Enterprise Resource Planning) ERP, and Computer Labs record lower engagement, they present opportunities for further growth. Overall, the results indicate a solid foundation in ICT activities, with scope to expand participation into technical and administrative domains.

Table 2

Chi-Square Analysis of Librarians’ Involvement in ICT Activities by Age, Gender, and Experience

ICT Activity	Age	Interpretation	Gender	Interpretation	Experience	Interpretation
	χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)	
College Website	42.271 (0.218)	Not Significant	10.778 (0.095)	Not Significant	48.192 (0.084)	Not Significant

Language Lab	78.759 (0.0)	Significant	9.822 (0.132)	Not Significant	37.694 (0.392)	Not Significant
ICT Infrastructure	58.393 (0.011)	Significant	18.809 (0.004)	Significant	44.168 (0.165)	Not Significant
Computer Lab	60.395 (0.007)	Significant	16.215 (0.013)	Significant	62.485 (0.004)	Significant
LMS Management	66.248 (0.002)	Significant	6.270 (0.394)	Not Significant	47.360 (0.097)	Not Significant
ERP Management	61.215 (0.005)	Significant	11.276 (0.08)	Not Significant	58.156 (0.011)	Significant
Social media	56.320 (0.017)	Significant	9.173a (0.164)	Not Significant	52.922a (0.034)	Significant

Table 2 highlights the Chi-square analysis highlights significant associations between demographic variables and involvement in ICT activities. Age shows significant influence on participation in the Language Lab, ICT Infrastructure, Computer Lab, LMS, ERP, and Social Media, whereas no significant relation was found with college website management. Gender displays significance only for ICT infrastructure and Computer Lab activities, while other areas remain unaffected. Experience is significantly associated with Computer Lab, ERP, and Social Media involvement, but not with other domains. Overall, the findings suggest that age has the strongest impact across activities, followed by experience, while gender shows comparatively limited influence.

The highest mean rank was observed among librarians aged 31–35 years for LMS Management (Mean Rank = 169.64), while the lowest was among those aged 26–30 years for Social Media Management (Mean Rank = 82.58). Among genders, female librarians showed greater involvement across ICT management activities such as Computer Lab Management (Mean Rank = 120.83) and Social Media Management (Mean Rank = 118.46), whereas male librarians consistently recorded lower mean ranks, with the least participation observed in Computer Lab Management (Mean Rank = 87.45). Across genders, female librarians consistently showed higher involvement in ICT management activities such as Computer Lab (Mean Rank = 120.83) and Social Media Management (Mean Rank = 118.46), whereas male librarians recorded comparatively lower participation, with the least mean rank observed in Computer Lab Management (Mean Rank = 87.45).

6.3 Participation in Research Support Activities

Table 3 Participation in Research Support Activities

Research Activity		Always	Usually	Frequently	Sometimes	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
Research Committee Member	N	44	23	15	15	14	18	94	223
	%	19.7%	10.3%	6.7%	6.7%	6.3%	8.1%	42.2%	100%
Plagiarism Checking in Software	N	30	17	13	5	5	27	126	223
	%	13.5%	7.6%	5.8%	2.2%	2.2%	12.1%	56.5%	100%

Research Ethics Committee Member	N	35	23	15	6	10	20	114	223
	%	15.7%	10.3%	6.7%	2.7%	4.5%	9.0%	51.1%	100%
Handling Research Committee Visits	N	12	15	21	8	11	19	137	223
	%	5.4%	6.7%	9.4%	3.6%	4.9%	8.5%	61.4%	100%

Table 3 shows active involvement of librarians in research support, including participation in governance and decision-making, managing plagiarism detection software, providing guidance on research ethics, and assisting with Research Centre visits. with 19.7% (N=44) of respondents always serving as Research Committee Members, contributing to research governance. Engagement is also visible in Plagiarism Checking 13.5% (N=30) always and Research Ethics Committees 15.7% (N=35) always, reflecting attention to quality and ethics. While fewer respondents are involved in Handling Research Committee Visits, this offers scope for capacity building. The findings indicate a solid base of participation in research support, with opportunities to broaden involvement further.

Table 4 Chi-Square Analysis of Participation in Research Support Activities

Research Activity	Age	Interpretation	Gender	Interpretation	Experience	Interpretation
	χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)	
Research Committee Member	56.576 (0.016)	Significant	10.278 (0.113)	Not Significant	66.366 (0.002)	Significant
Plagiarism Checking in Software	48.209 (0.084)	Not Significant	17.296 (0.008)	Significant	55.913 (0.018)	Significant
Research Ethics Committee Member	58.791 (0.01)	Significant	11.199 (0.082)	Not Significant	72.310 (0)	Significant
Handling Research Committee Visits	50.065 (0.06)	Not Significant	20.350 (0.002)	Significant	51.735 (0.043)	Significant

Table 4 highlights the Chi-square analysis reveals meaningful associations between demographic factors and involvement in research support activities. Age significantly influences participation in research committee membership and research ethics committee membership, indicating that different age groups contribute actively to governance and ethical oversight. Gender shows significance in plagiarism checking and handling research committee visits, suggesting variation in engagement across male and female respondents. Experience has the strongest influence, showing significant associations with all activities except plagiarism checking by age, highlighting that professional maturity plays a vital role in research support. Overall, the results suggest that demographic factors, particularly age and experience, shape participation in research-related responsibilities, offering useful insights for capacity building and inclusive planning.

The highest mean rank was observed among librarians with more than 30 years of experience for Research Committee Member (Mean Rank = 147.70), while the lowest was among those with 26–30 years of experience for Plagiarism Checking in Software (Mean Rank = 76.74). Among genders, female librarians showed greater

involvement in Handling Research Committee Visits (Mean Rank = 119.05), whereas male librarians had lower participation in Research Committee Member (Mean Rank = 91.57). Across age groups, the 31–35 years group had the highest involvement in Research Committee Member (Mean Rank = 132.00), while the 51–55 years group showed the least (Mean Rank = 72.26).

6.4 Participation in Quality Enhancement Activities

Table 5 Participation in Quality Enhancement Activities

Quality Enhancement Activity	Always	Usually	Frequently	Sometimes	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
NAAC	113	26	15	2	12	6	49	223
	50.7%	11.7%	6.7%	0.9%	5.4%	2.7%	22.0%	100%
NIRF	46	25	11	7	9	13	112	223
	20.6%	11.2%	4.9%	3.1%	4.0%	5.8%	50.2%	100%
ISO Certification	45	17	17	11	12	5	116	223
	20.2%	7.6%	7.6%	4.9%	5.4%	2.2%	52.0%	100%
UGC/AICTE/ NCTE Inspections	83	26	13	10	20	10	61	223
	37.2%	11.7%	5.8%	4.5%	9.0%	4.5%	27.4%	100%
Atal Ranking (ARIIA)	21	16	7	10	8	15	146	223
	9.4%	7.2%	3.1%	4.5%	3.6%	6.7%	65.5%	100%
Academic Audits	70	27	12	24	19	13	58	223
	31.4%	12.1%	5.4%	10.8%	8.5%	5.8%	26.0%	100%
College Development Committee Member	61	13	15	10	14	30	80	223
	27.4%	5.8%	6.7%	4.5%	6.3%	13.5%	35.9%	100%
College Autonomy	36	10	8	8	17	20	124	223
	16.1%	4.5%	3.6%	3.6%	7.6%	9.0%	55.6%	100%
RUSA Grants	36	6	7	2	13	19	140	223
	16.1%	2.7%	3.1%	0.9%	5.8%	8.5%	62.8%	100%
UGC Grants	42	17	9	6	16	23	110	223
	18.8%	7.6%	4.0%	2.7%	7.2%	10.3%	49.3%	100%
Autonomy Grants	27	12	12	4	12	23	133	223
	12.1%	5.4%	5.4%	1.8%	5.4%	10.3%	59.6%	100%

LMC Inspections	60	29	16	17	20	18	63	223
	26.9%	13.0%	7.2%	7.6%	9.0%	8.1%	28.3%	100%
College Best & Innovative Practices	58	22	15	11	15	13	89	223
	26.0%	9.9%	6.7%	4.9%	6.7%	5.8%	39.9%	100%
LIC Inspections	65	26	15	15	14	19	69	223
	29.1%	11.7%	6.7%	6.7%	6.3%	8.5%	30.9%	100%
Public Relations	53	16	18	16	10	19	91	223
	23.8%	7.2%	8.1%	7.2%	4.5%	8.5%	40.8%	100%

Table 5 describes that librarians are most actively engaged in NAAC work 50.7% (N=113) always, University Grants Commission(UGC)/All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE)/National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) inspections 37.2% (N=83) always, and academic audits 31.4% (N=70) always, reflecting their strong role in quality assurance. In contrast, involvement is minimal in Atal Ranking of Institutions on Innovation Achievements (ARIIA) 65.5% (N=146) never, Rashtriya Uchcharat Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) grants 62.8% never (N=140), and Autonomy Grants 59.6% (N=133) never. Participation in committee work, inspections, and public relations shows moderate but varied engagement. Overall, their role is concentrated in accreditation and compliance activities rather than grant or innovation-related functions.

Table 6 Chi-Square Analysis of Analysis of Participation in Quality Enhancement Activities

Activity	Age	Interpretation	Gender	Interpretation	Experience	Interpretation
	χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)	
NAAC	78.942 (0)	Significant	9.432a (0.151)	Not Significant	78.942 (0)	Significant
NIRF	56.581 (0.016)	Significant	12.490 (0.052)	Not Significant	56.581 (0.016)	Significant
ISO Certification	52.322 (0.039)	Significant	10.528 (0.104)	Not Significant	52.322 (0.039)	Significant
UGC / AICTE / NCTE Inspections	71.070 (0)	Significant	8.251 (0.22)	Not Significant	71.070 (0)	Significant
Atal Ranking (ARIIA)	68.632 (0.001)	Significant	9.732 (0.136)	Not Significant	68.632 (0.001)	Significant
Academic Audits	62.464 (0.004)	Significant	10.122 (0.12)	Not Significant	62.464 (0.004)	Significant
College Development Committee Member	73.491 (0)	Significant	16.088 (0.013)	Significant	73.491 (0)	Significant

College Autonomy	71.665 (0)	Significant	6.587 (0.361)	Not Significant	71.665 (0)	Significant
RUSA Grants	60.391 (0.007)	Significant	14.355 (0.026)	Significant	60.391 (0.007)	Significant
UGC Grants	93.610 (0)	Significant	15.783 (0.015)	Significant	93.610 (0)	Significant
Autonomy Grants	73.778 (0)	Significant	6.197 (0.401)	Not Significant	73.778 (0)	Significant
LMC Inspections	51.850 (0.042)	Significant	3.681 (0.72)	Not Significant	51.850 (0.042)	Significant
College Best & Innovative Practices	86.285 (0)	Significant	6.898 (0.33)	Not Significant	86.285 (0)	Significant
LIC Inspections	84.289 (0)	Significant	7.199 (0.303)	Not Significant	84.289 (0)	Significant
Public Relations	80.797 (0)	Significant	7.668 (0.263)	Not Significant	80.797 (0)	Significant

Table 6 shows the chi-square test results indicate that age and experience play a significant role in influencing perceptions across almost all institutional quality measures such as NAAC, National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), ISO certification, UGC/AICTE/NCTE inspections, ARIIA, academic audits, grants (RUSA), UGC, Autonomy, inspections Local Managing Committee (LMC), local Inquiry Committee (LIC), best practices, public relations, and college autonomy. In contrast, gender shows no significant association with most of these factors, except in the cases of College Development Committee membership, RUSA grants, and Universities Grants Commission (UGC) grants, where it emerges as significant. This suggests that perceptions of institutional quality assessments and audits vary substantially with respondents' age and work experience, while gender differences do not show much influence in most areas. Therefore, institutional accountability mechanisms and resource distributions appear to be shaped more by professional maturity and exposure rather than by gender differentiation. The 31–35 years' age group showed the highest involvement in UGC/AICTE/NCTE Inspections (Mean Rank = 162.96), while the 51–55 years' group had the lowest in LIC Inspections (Mean Rank = 71.43). Female librarians were more active in ISO Certification (Mean Rank = 117.29) than males (Mean Rank = 97.31). Librarians with less than 5 years of experience showed the greatest participation in College Best & Innovative Practices (Mean Rank = 168.80), whereas those with 26–30 years of experience had the lowest in UGC Grants (Mean Rank = 66.18).

6.5 Participation in Publication Support Activities

Table 7 Participation in Publication Support Activities

Activity		Always	Usually	Frequently	Sometimes	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
Book Publication	N	39	25	17	17	20	37	68	223
	%	17.5%	11.2%	7.6%	7.6%	9.0%	16.6%	30.5%	100%

Magazine	N	59	21	15	11	28	38	51	223
	%	26.5%	9.4%	6.7%	4.9%	12.6%	17.0%	22.9%	100%
Newsletter	N	39	17	18	17	27	35	70	223
	%	17.5%	7.6%	8.1%	7.6%	12.1%	15.7%	31.4%	100%
Research Journal	N	40	13	17	9	22	33	89	223
	%	17.9%	5.8%	7.6%	4.0%	9.9%	14.8%	39.9%	100%
Standards	N	13	8	10	5	7	18	162	223
	%	5.8%	3.6%	4.5%	2.2%	3.1%	8.1%	72.6%	100%
Patents	N	10	4	11	8	8	14	168	223
	%	4.5%	1.8%	4.9%	3.6%	3.6%	6.3%	75.3%	100%
ISBN procurement	N	43	6	17	6	24	25	102	223
	%	19.3%	2.7%	7.6%	2.7%	10.8%	11.2%	45.7%	100%
ISSN procurement	N	34	6	18	6	24	25	110	223
	%	15.2%	2.7%	8.1%	2.7%	10.8%	11.2%	49.3%	100%
News / Press Release	N	25	12	20	10	13	24	119	223
	%	11.2%	5.4%	9.0%	4.5%	5.8%	10.8%	53.4%	100%
Conference Seminar Proceedings	N	49	14	24	17	24	31	64	223
	%	22.0%	6.3%	10.8%	7.6%	10.8%	13.9%	28.7%	100%
News Bulletin	N	21	15	19	12	18	20	118	223
	%	9.4%	6.7%	8.5%	5.4%	8.1%	9.0%	52.9%	100%
UGC Care Publications	N	28	15	19	15	22	23	101	223
	%	12.6%	6.7%	8.5%	6.7%	9.9%	10.3%	45.3%	100%

Table 7 provides the data highlights the involvement of librarians in different modes of publication. Librarians are more engaged in book publications, magazines, and conference/seminar proceedings, reflecting their active role in traditional academic contributions. However, their involvement is relatively low in areas such as standards, patents, press releases, and news bulletins, where most reported “never.” Similarly, participation in ISBN/ISSN procurement and UGC Care publications is limited. Overall, librarians show stronger involvement in conventional scholarly outputs compared to formal documentation and media-related publications.

Table 8 Chi-Square Analysis of Librarians’ Involvement in ICT Activities by Age, Gender, and Experience Analysis of Participation in Publication Support Activities

Activity	Age	Interpretation	Gender	Interpretation	Experience	Interpretation
	χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)		χ^2 (p)	

Book Publication	69.986 (0.001)	Significant	13.629 (0.034)	Significant	60.340 (0.007)	Significant
Magazine	73.599 (0)	Significant	5.827 (0.354)	Not Significant	77.962 (0)	Significant
Newsletter	87.274 (0)	Significant	14.168 (0.028)	Significant	70.374 (0.001)	Significant
Research Journal	67.970 (0.001)	Significant	4.596 (0.597)	Not Significant	79.743 (0)	Significant
Standards	47.713 (0.092)	Not Significant	8.765 (0.187)	Not Significant	59.401 (0.008)	Significant
Patents	66.712 (0.001)	Significant	8.585 (0.198)	Not Significant	61.168 (0.006)	Significant
ISBN procurement	46.182 (0.119)	Not Significant	2.948 (0.815)	Not Significant	57.796 (0.012)	Significant
ISSN procurement	55.372 (0.021)	Significant	2.648 (0.852)	Not Significant	66.490 (0.001)	Significant
News / Press Release	43.852 (0.173)	Not Significant	5.421 (0.491)	Not Significant	79.290 (0)	Significant
Conference / Seminar Proceedings	70.894 (0)	Significant	7.667 (0.264)	Not Significant	95.455 (0)	Significant
News Bulletin	47.893 (0.089)	Not Significant	8.011 (0.237)	Not Significant	41.654 (0.238)	Not Significant
UGC Care Publications	44.963 (0.145)	Not Significant	4.998 (0.582)	Not Significant	54.067 (0.027)	Significant

Table 8 explains the chi-square test results show that age significantly influences most NAAC related activities such as book publication, magazine, newsletter, research journal, patents, ISSN procurement, and conference proceedings, while it has no significant effect on standards, ISBN procurement, news/press release, news bulletin, and UGC Care publications. Gender shows limited influence, being significant only for book publication and newsletters, while it remains non-significant for most other activities. Experience, on the other hand, emerges as the most influential factor, as it significantly affects almost all activities including book publication, magazines, newsletters, research journals, standards, patents, ISBN and ISSN procurement, press releases, conference proceedings, and UGC Care publications, with the only exception being news bulletins. This indicates that experience plays the dominant role in NAAC-related contributions, followed by age, while gender differences are relatively minimal.

Younger librarians with 31–35 years showed the highest involvement in Conference/Seminar Proceedings (Mean Rank = 160.21), while older librarians having age 51–55 years had the lowest in Research Journal (Mean Rank = 68.65). Female librarians were more involved in Conference/Seminar Proceedings (Mean Rank = 116.23) than males (100.24). Librarians with less than 5 years of experience were most active in News Bulletin (Mean Rank = 164.50), while those with 26–30 years of experience showed the least involvement in ISBN Procurement (Mean Rank = 66.64), indicating that participation declines with age and experience.

6.6 Challenges Faced When Involved in Other Than Library Activities

Table 9 Satisfaction Level of Other Than Library Activities Performed

Challenges Faced	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree			Strongly Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Uncooperative team workers	18	8.1%	71	31.8%	68	30.5%	46	20.6%	20	9.0%	223	100%	
Lack of interest	14	6.3%	46	20.6%	73	32.7%	63	28.3%	27	12.1%	223	100%	
Lack of skills	14	6.3%	52	23.3%	70	31.4%	66	29.6%	21	9.4%	223	100%	
Inadequate instructions & training	19	8.5%	68	30.5%	75	33.6%	44	19.7%	17	7.6%	223	100%	
Insufficient Support from library staff	25	11.2%	67	30.0%	64	28.7%	47	21.1%	20	9.0%	223	100%	
Scarcity of the required Resources or facilities	29	13.0%	75	33.6%	71	31.8%	33	14.8%	15	6.7%	223	100%	
Affects Health	27	12.1%	58	26.0%	76	34.1%	37	16.6%	25	11.2%	223	100%	
Time constraints	63	28.3%	109	48.9%	29	13.0%	15	6.7%	7	3.1%	223	100%	
No credit /appreciation of the work done	34	15.2%	70	31.4%	57	25.6%	53	23.8%	9	4.0%	223	100%	
Affects professional development	35	15.7%	71	31.8%	55	24.7%	53	23.8%	9	4.0%	223	100%	
Insufficient Library staff	58	26.0%	97	43.5%	35	15.7%	25	11.2%	8	3.6%	223	100%	
Collaborating with other staff becomes difficult as working on the isolated post	29	13.0%	78	35.0%	45	20.2%	59	26.5%	12	5.4%	223	100%	
Not treated as part of the teaching community	31	13.9%	57	25.6%	60	26.9%	54	24.2%	21	9.4%	223	100%	

Table 9 gives the analysis of challenges faced by librarians reveals multiple concerns affecting their work environment and professional growth. Time constraints 77.2% (N=172) respondents, insufficient library staff 69.5% (N=155) respondents, and scarcity of resources or facilities 46.6% (N=104) respondents emerged as the most significant challenges, with a majority agreeing or strongly agreeing. Issues such as lack of cooperation from team workers 39.9% (N=89) respondents, inadequate instructions and training 39.0% (N=87) respondents, and insufficient support from library staff 41.2% (N=92) respondents also hinder smooth functioning. Additionally, lack of interest 26.9% (N=60) respondents, lack of skills 29.6% (N=66) respondents, and difficulty collaborating due to isolation 48% (N=107) respondents further add to their difficulties. Many librarians also feel undervalued, with 46.6% (N=104) respondents reporting no credit or appreciation and 47.5% (N=106) respondents feeling their professional development is negatively affected. Emotional and health-related impacts are evident too, as 38.1% (N=85) respondents agreed that work pressures affect their health, and 39.5% (N=88) respondents felt excluded from the teaching community. Overall, the findings highlight systemic challenges that demand institutional attention to ensure librarians receive adequate support, recognition, and resources.

6.7 Satisfaction Level of Other Than Library Activities Performed

Table 10 Satisfaction Level of Other Than Library Activities Performed

Satisfaction Aspect	Highly Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral		Unsatisfied		Highly Unsatisfied		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Assigned duties (beyond the library)	53	23.8%	101	45.3%	52	23.3%	13	5.8%	4	1.8%	223	100%
Opportunities for being creative	61	27.4%	118	52.9%	39	17.5%	4	1.8%	1	0.4%	223	100%
Prospects to use abilities, and skills	72	32.3%	116	52.0%	30	13.5%	4	1.8%	1	0.4%	223	100%
Freedom for using own judgment	54	24.2%	115	51.6%	45	20.2%	7	3.1%	2	0.9%	223	100%
Freedom to take required decisions	54	24.2%	111	49.8%	46	20.6%	9	4.0%	3	1.3%	223	100%
Freedom for alterations as per the need	47	21.1%	111	49.8%	56	25.1%	6	2.7%	3	1.3%	223	100%
New roles played	55	24.7%	115	51.6%	45	20.2%	4	1.8%	4	1.8%	223	100%
Credit and appreciation received	56	25.1%	105	47.1%	48	21.5%	7	3.1%	7	3.1%	223	100%

Table 10 provides the survey results which reveal a strong overall satisfaction among staff regarding duties performed outside traditional library activities. Most respondents reported being either “Satisfied” or “Highly Satisfied” across all assessed aspects—including assigned duties, opportunities for creativity, ability to use personal skills, freedom to make decisions and judgments, adapting to needs, taking on new roles, and receiving credit or appreciation. Neutral and dissatisfied responses were notably less frequent. These findings indicate that the organization effectively fosters autonomy, personal growth, and recognition in non-library responsibilities, contributing to high engagement and staff morale. The overwhelmingly positive feedback suggests ongoing initiatives in these areas should be maintained and further enhanced.

DISCUSSION

The study highlights that college librarians have emerged as key contributors in multiple academic and institutional domains, extending far beyond traditional library management. Their **involvement in ICT activities** is strong, particularly in managing college websites and learning management systems, which demonstrates their central role in promoting digital learning and communication. While engagement in social media management strengthens institutional outreach, relatively lower participation in ERP, language labs, and computer labs suggests areas where further capacity building and institutional support are needed. Demographic analysis indicates that **age and experience strongly influence ICT involvement**, whereas gender plays only a limited role.

In the domain of **research support**, librarians show active participation in governance and ethical oversight through research committees and plagiarism checking. Their involvement underscores a growing commitment to promoting research integrity and quality. Age and experience were again found to significantly shape engagement, especially in governance-related roles, while gender differences appeared in specific areas such as plagiarism checking and research committee visits. These results reinforce that **professional maturity is a critical factor in research-related responsibilities**.

The findings also establish librarians as central actors in **quality enhancement activities**, particularly in accreditation processes such as NAAC, UGC/AICTE/NCTE inspections, and academic audits, where their participation is consistently high. However, their involvement remains limited in grant-related and innovation-oriented functions like RUSA and ARIIA. Age and experience strongly influence quality-related activities, whereas gender plays a minimal role, highlighting that institutional accountability work is more closely tied to exposure and expertise than demographic differences.

In the area of **publication activities**, librarians display stronger engagement with conventional outputs such as books, magazines, newsletters, and conference proceedings, while their participation in patents, standards, press releases, and UGC Care publications remains limited. Here again, **experience emerges as the dominant factor** influencing participation, followed by age, while gender plays only a marginal role. This suggests that librarians’ publication contributions are rooted more in accumulated professional expertise than in demographic variations.

The analysis of **challenges** reveals systemic issues, with time constraints, inadequate staffing, and resource scarcity being the most critical barriers to performance. Additionally, lack of cooperation, insufficient training, undervaluation, and limited recognition further undermine motivation and professional development. These

challenges emphasize the need for structural reforms and greater institutional support to enhance librarians' effectiveness.

Despite these challenges, the survey shows **high levels of satisfaction** among librarians regarding duties performed outside traditional library work. Opportunities for creativity, autonomy, recognition, and skill utilization contribute to strong engagement and morale. This positive finding indicates that librarians value roles that allow them to expand their professional identity and contribute meaningfully to institutional development.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the study concludes that **college librarians are active catalysts in ICT integration, research support, quality assurance, and publication activities**, with age and experience being the most influential factors shaping their contributions. While systemic challenges persist, particularly in staffing and resource allocation, the high levels of satisfaction and commitment expressed by librarians underline their potential as strategic partners in academic excellence and institutional growth. Strengthening support mechanisms, expanding training opportunities, and diversifying roles will further enhance their contributions to higher education.

REFERENCES

- [1] AIP Publishing. (2020, October). Promoting research: the importance of the librarian's role. Retrieved June 23, 2023, from https://publishing.aip.org/wpcontent/uploads/2020/10/AIPP_PromotingResearch_LibrariansRole.pdf
- [2] Bertot, J. C., Real, B. & Jaeger, P. (2016). Public libraries building digitally inclusive communities: data and findings from the 2013 digital inclusion survey. *The Library Quarterly*, 86(3), 270-289. <https://doi.org/10.1086/686674>
- [3] Boufarss, M., & Harviainen, J. T. (2021). Librarians as gate-openers in open access publishing: A case study in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(5), 102425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102425>
- [4] Braddlee, D., & VanScoy, A. (2019). Bridging the chasm: faculty support roles for academic librarians in the adoption of open educational resources. *College & Research Libraries*, 80(4), 426. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.80.4.426>
- [5] Bradley, C. (2018). Research support priorities of and relationships among librarians and research administrators: a content analysis of the professional literature. *Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice*, 13(4), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip29478>
- [6] Bunkar, A., & Bhatt, D. D. (2020). Perception of researchers & academicians of Parul University towards research data management system & role of library. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 40(03), 139-146. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.40.03.15302>
- [7] Cheng, J., and Hoffman, S. (2020). Librarians and administrators on academic library impact research: characteristics and perspectives. *College and Research Libraries*, 81(3), 538-569. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.3.538>
- [8] Chigateri, N., & Jange, S. (2017). NAAC indicators and government degree college libraries of North Karnataka: a study. *International Journal of Library Science and Research*, 7(4), 15-22. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318304474_NAAC_Indicators_and_Government_Degree_College_Libraries_of_North_Karnataka_A_Study

- [9] Dalbehera, S. (2019). Research data management services in technical university libraries of Odisha: a study, International Conference on Digital Landscape- Digital Transformation for an Agile Environment, November 6-8, 2019 (pp. 75-391)
- [10] Fernandes, J. (2016). *Impact of Accreditation on Engineering College Libraries in Mumbai* (Doctoral Thesis). Shodhganga, <https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/166487>
- [11] Fitzgibbons, M., Kloda, L., & Miller-Nesbitt, A. (2017). Exploring the value of academic librarians' participation in journal clubs. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(6), 774. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.78.6.774>
- [12] Jange, S. (2021). NAAC accreditation and academic libraries: Librarians' role beyond librarianship. *Journal of Indian Library Association*, 57(4), 12-23. <https://www.ilaindia.net/jila/index.php/jila/article/view/1295/291>
- [13] Jilani, G., & Ahmad, N. (2021). Role of librarians and information scientists in plagiarism control a study of NIRF ranked engineering institutions ranked in 2020. *DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology*, 41(03), 206–212. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.41.03.16716>
- [14] Lessick, S., Perryman, C., Billman, B. L., Alpi, K. M., De Groote, S. L., & Babin, T. D., (2016). Research engagement of health sciences librarians: a survey of research-related activities and attitudes. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 104(2), 166–173. <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.104.2.015>
- [16] More, R. and Jadhav, S. (2022). Role of College Librarian in NAAC Accreditation Process. *VIDYAWARTA: International Multilingual Referred Research Journal*. 35-38. April (Special Issue). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362697361_Role_of_College_Librarian_in_NAAC_Process
- [17] More, T. (2008). Role of libraries and librarians in research and publication of research works. *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*, 68/69, 391–407. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42931223>
- [18] Ohaji, I.K., Chawner, B. and Yoong, P. (2019). The role of a data librarian in academic and research libraries. *Information Research*, 24(4), <https://www.informationr.net/ir/24-4/paper844.html>
- [19] Pinfield, S, Cox, A.M., & Smith, J. (2014). Research data management and libraries: relationships, activities, drivers and influences. *PLOS ONE*, 9(12), 1-28, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114734>
- [20] Reynolds, L. M., Smith, S. E., & D'Silva, M. U. (2013). The search for elusive social media data: An evolving librarian-faculty collaboration. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(5), 378-384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2013.02.007>
- [21] Sengupta, S. (2021). NAAC Accreditation and Responsibility of College Libraries in India. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, Fall. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=11954&context=lib_philprac
- [22] Sugimoto, C. R., Tsou, A., Naslund, S., Hauser, A., Brandon, M., Winter, D., Behles, C., & Finlay, S. C. (2014). Beyond Gatekeepers of Knowledge: Scholarly communication practices of academic librarians and archivists at ARL institutions. *College & Research Libraries/College and Research Libraries*, 75(2), 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl12-398>