



THE SKILLS AND APPLICATIONS OF WORD PROCESSING SOFTWARE USING VCW LIBRARY USERS: A CASE STUDY

Dr.S.MUTHUVENNILA¹, Dr.M.MUTHUMANI²

¹Assistant Professor, PG & Research Department of Library and Information Science, Vellalar College for Women (Autonomous), Thindal, Erode. E-mail:muthuvennila.s28@gmail.com

²Founder Cum Librarian and Information Scientist, V.V.A.M.U. Pandian Memorial Bhagat Singh Padippagam, Madurai. E-mail: Muthumani30@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

The paper describes is to examines the skills and applications of word processing software using VCW library users. The main objective of this study is to examine the purpose, frequency, advantages, and applications of word-processing software which is currently used by VCW students. Nowadays, word processing software plays a phenomenal role in all aspects, particularly in studies and research-related areas. Out of 180 questionnaires, 168 are fully responded to by respondents. Collected data were analyzed through descriptive statistical methods by using computerized data processing techniques. The majority of the respondents belong to the category of age (18-20) 84 (50%). Most of the students are accessing the word processor under the guidelines of library professionals in the VCW library 53(31.5%). Most of the students use word processor for preparing seminars/conferences for their academic exposures 70 (41.7%). 82 (48.8%) of the students use the word processor, at least once a week.

Keywords: Applications, Skills, Word Processing, Software, Library.

INTRODUCTION

Text documents, such a resume or a report, are edited using word processing software. The software offers tools for copying, erasing, and many sorts of formatting, and you normally enter text by typing. Creating, editing, saving, and printing documents as well as copying, pasting, moving, and deleting text from within a document are some of the capabilities of word processing software. Text formatting, such as italicizing, bolding, or underlining. Adding to and changing tables. Adding components from other software, such as images or illustrations. Making grammar and spelling corrections.

Many formatting tools are available in word processing. For instance, you can insert images, set page numbers, and organize your content into columns. Word processing does not, however, allow you total control over how your project will appear and feel. Use desktop publishing tools to give you more control over the arrangement of your pages when design starts to matter.

Most word-processing applications also provide tools that make it simpler for you to complete routine chores. Consider the scenario when you need to notify all of your clients about a new policy. All clients receive the same letter, with the exception of the name and address at the top.

Using a single template document, a table in the database containing customer names and addresses, and the mail merge function, you can create all the letters.

Word processing software shouldn't be mistaken with text editors. They only function with plain text, but they do let you create, edit, and save text documents. No formatting, such as underlining or different fonts, is used in text editors. Word processing software has a totally distinct function from text editors. They are utilized to work with plain text files, such as operating system configuration files or the source code of computer programs. On the Windows operating system, Notepad serves as an illustration of a text editor.

Word Processing Software

There are many different word processing programs available. Word, a program included in Microsoft Office, is one of the most popular ones. WordPerfect, produced by the Corel Corporation, is an additional popular one. Writer, a component of Apache's Open Office, is a third. The first two are commercial programs, but Open Office is open source and is available for free download and usage. The last tool is Pages, which is a component of Apple's I Work.

Although there are many variances among the many word-processing programs, they all essentially achieve the same goal. Which one you choose depends in part on your preferences. It's also critical to take into account the software that the individuals with whom you typically collaborate use.

Word processor

A word processor is a machine or piece of software that can produce, save, and print text documents. Users can enter text, edit it, view it on a screen, save it digitally, and print it off. One of the most widely used technological tools in the world; word processing software enables users to produce a variety of documents, including resumes and cover letters, business correspondence, blog entries, novels, and more.

In the past, word processors were computer programs that were downloaded to a certain number of machines. But as cloud computing has spread, browser-based word processors have followed suit. These often don't have the more sophisticated capabilities of a conventional program, but they do allow more flexibility and real-time collaboration.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Brysbaert, Mandera & Keuleers (2018) the word frequency effect, as described in these publications, is the finding that high-frequency words are processed more quickly than low-frequency terms. Nevertheless, he goes into detail regarding the most recent years. It is now obvious that there are significant quality disparities in frequency estimates, and we require a new standardized frequency metric that does not deceive users. Finally, a few recent advancements emphasize the significance of semantic variety rather than only variations in word frequency and the significance of considering word prevalence in addition to word frequency

Bujdosó (2011) this says that the brief about curriculum of basic IT (or computer science in general) always implies teaching word processing. In this, he discusses how word processing has received a poor reputation despite the fact that we use it frequently and that it is a crucial component of other computer science disciplines, including typography, human computer

interaction, and web design. Programmers also use word processing to create user interfaces for software, write user manuals and documentation, and create personal documents. The purpose of this study is to investigate specific aspects of gender-based educational disparities at a computer science faculty in order to gather beneficial information for improving e-learning materials. These topics are examined by gender in this paper.

Kobayashi & Ogawa (2022) the parallel processing of words in this study has shown that many words' orthographic features can be processed at once. However, there has been substantial discussion regarding the feasibility of parallel lexical processing. With the flanker lexical decision task, they even looked at this debate in the Japanese language. The findings indicated that following priming, parallel processing of a lexical feature was seen, which suggests that reading makes it easier to direct attention to the right during the processing of a given word. The findings suggested that during reading, attention-allocation techniques are in use. The current study also suggests that the flanker lexical decision task and the priming approach may be used to measure word processing while reading.

Katsurai (2020) this paper say about the research field of library and information science (LIS), pattern recognition and machine learning approaches have often been adopted to analyze massive amounts of textual data in digital libraries. This paper presents a short survey of how word embedding's have been used in LIS research, especially focusing on articles published in LIS journals between 2009 and 2019. They even analyzed 15 papers were briefly described under the following categories: knowledge extraction and visualization from scholarly data, classification in scholarly data, and others that focus on more general corpora.

Kim, Seo, & Choi (2019) this study says about the both domain analyses on the field of open access by co-word analysis: based on published journals of library and information science during 2013 to 2018. The purpose of this study is to suggest the intellectual structure that reflects the newest research trend in the field of open access, to identify how the subject area is structured by using co-word analysis, and compare and analyze with the existing study. They even collected the total number of dataset was 761 papers from Web of Science during the period from January 2012 to November 2018 using information science and 2,321 keywords as a noun phase are extracted from titles and abstracts,13topic clusters are extracted by network analysis and the keywords with higher centrality are drawn by visualizing the intellectual relationship. In addition, after clustering analysis, the relationship was analyzed by plotting the result on the multidimensional scaling map. As a result, it is expected that our research helps the research direction of open access for the future.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To examine the purpose of using word processing software for using VCW Students.
- To identify the frequency of using word processing software for using VCW Students.
- To identify the advantage of word processing software for using VCW Students.
- To examine the website accessing to the students of word processing software for using VCW students.
- To identify the using word processing applications of using VCW Students.

METHODOLOGY

A Questionnaire was designed to gather primary data which was distributed among 180 and received 168 filled-in questionnaires from the respondent's remaining missing data is 12 with a

response rate of 93.3%. Proper care was taken to select the representative sample from each category for simple random sampling on the basis of total strength of category concerned. Simple random sampling method was used to collection the data. The data was then analyzed through descriptive statistical methods by using computerized data processing techniques.

Summary of the total questionnaire and response rate

- The Sample Size of the study-180
- Returned questionnaires-168
- Non-returned questionnaires-12
- Response rate-93.3%

Scope and limitation of the Study

I have selected for the present study is limited to Postgraduate students only in Vellalar College for women (Autonomous) Erode. The main aim of the study was to accessing of word processing, purpose of word processing, and frequency of using word processing, time spent for word processing, skills, applications, advantages, features and web site accessing of word processing. A sample of 164 PG students were taken covering science disciplines such as Tamil, English, mathematics, physics, chemistry, food & Nutrition's, computer applications, commerce, library and information science. The survey and questionnaire methods were adopted for collecting the data.

Sample size

The sample of the respondents had been drafted from the Vellalar College for women (Autonomous) Erode. A total of 180 questionnaires were distributed to the users from different categories and 164 were responded which amounts to 93.3% Percentage.

Hypotheses

- There is no significant difference in Skills of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.
- There is no significant difference in Applications of word processing software for with respect to Department of the respondents.
- There is no significant difference in Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.
- There is no significant difference in Features of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.
- There is no significant difference in Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing of the respondents.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table:1 Age Wise Distribution of The Respondents

S. No	Age Wise Distribution	Frequency	Percent
1	18-20	84	50.0
2	21-22	47	28.0
3	23-25	37	22.0
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that age wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. majority of the respondents in the 18-20 years age group in the 84(50%), 20-22 age wise of the respondents in the 47(28%) of the respondents, 22-25 age group wise distribution of the respondents in 37(22%) of the respondents using word processing.

Table: 2 Department Wise Distributions of the Respondents

S. No	Department Wise Distribution	Frequency	Percent
1	Tamil	17	10.1
2	English	20	11.9
3	Math's	19	11.3
4	Physics	20	11.9
5	Chemistry	17	10.1
6	Foods & Nutrition	18	10.7
7	Computer Applications	19	11.3
8	Commerce	19	11.3
9	Library & Information Science	19	11.3
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that department wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Majority of the respondents in the 20(11.9%) of the respondents in English and Physics. 19(11.3%) of the respondents in the Math's, computer applications, commerce, library & information science. 18(10.7%) of the respondents in the Foods & Nutrition's.

Table: 3 year wise distribution of the respondents

S. No	year wise distribution	Frequency	Percent
1	1 year	72	42.9
2	2year's	96	57.1
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Majority of the respondents in the 2 years in 96 (57.1%) of the respondents, 72(42.9%) of the respondents using in word processing in the 1 year.

Table: 4 Age wise distribution of the respondents * year wise distribution of the respondents Cross tabulation

Age wise distribution of the respondents * year wise distribution of the respondents Cross tabulation				
S. No	Age wise distribution of the respondents	Year wise distribution of the respondents		Total
		1 year	2year	
1	18-20	29	55	84
2	21-22	26	21	47
3	23-25	17	20	37
Total		72	96	168

Interpretation

This table shows that the Cross tabulation, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. majority of the respondents in the 18-20 , 2 years in 55, 1 year in the 29 total respondents in the 84, followed by 21-22 respondents in the using word processing in the 2 years in 21, 1 year in 26 total respondents in 47.

Table: 5 accessing of word processing

S. No	Accessing of Word Processing	Frequency	Percent
1	Library professionals	53	31.5
2	Faculty members	36	21.4
3	Orientation programmers	28	16.7
4	Self interest	12	7.1
5	Other	39	23.2
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that accessing of word processing distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Majority of the respondents in the library professionals 53(31.5%) of the respondents, others in 39(23.2%) of the respondents, faculty members wise respondents in the 36(21.4%) of the respondents using accessing of word processing.

Table: 6 purpose of using word processing software

S. No	purpose of using WP	Frequency	Percent
1	For Research	42	25.0
2	Preparing seminar/conference	70	41.7
3	writes of articles	56	33.3
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Majority of the respondents in the study

preparing seminar/conference in 70 (41.7%) of the respondents using the word processing software, writes of articles 56(33.3%) of the respondents using the word processing software.

Table: 7 Frequency of using word processing software * year wise distribution of the respondents Cross tabulation

S. No	Frequency of using word processing Software	Year wise distribution of the respondents		Total
		1 year	2year	
1	Daily	13	13	26
2	Weekly	28	54	82
3	Twice in a week	17	26	43
4	Monthly once	14	3	17
Total		72	96	168

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the Cross tabulation, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. The majority of the respondents using word processing software in weekly basis 1 year (28), 2 years in (54), total respondents in the (82) of the respondents in the twice in a week in the 1 year (14), 2 years in the (3), total respondents in the (17) of the word processing software.

Table: 8 Time spent for word processing software * Age wise distribution of the respondents Cross tabulation

S. No	Time spent for word processing software	Age wise distribution of the respondents			Total
		18-20	21-22	23-25	
1	Below 1 hour	1	0	0	1
2	1-2 hours	9	15	4	28
3	2-3 hours	65	10	20	95
4	above 3 hours	9	22	13	44
Total		84	47	37	168

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the cross tabulation, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Majority of the respondents in the 2-3 hours of usage (95), above 3 hours in the (44) of the time spent for word processing software.

Table: 9 Time spent for word processing software * Frequency of using word processing software Cross tabulation

S.No	Time spent for word processing software	Frequency of using word processing software				Total
		Daily	Weekly	Twice in a week	Monthly Once	
1	Below 1 hour	0	0	1	0	1
2	1-2 hours	0	13	12	3	28
3	2-3 hours	12	68	15	0	95
4	above 3 hours	14	1	15	14	44
Total		26	82	43	17	168

Interpretation

This table shows that from the Cross tabulation, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Time spent and frequency of using word processing software in the majority of the respondents in the 2-3 hours of the (95) of the respondents, above 3 hours of the using and time spend for the (44) of the respondents in the word processing software.

Table: 10 Frequency of using word processing software

S. No	Frequency of using word processing	Frequency	Percent
1	Daily	26	15.5
2	Weekly	82	48.8
3	Twice in a week	43	25.6
4	Monthly once	17	10.1
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. Frequency of using word processing of the software in the weekly basis 82(48.8%) of the majority of the respondents, twice in a week 43(25.6%) of the respondents using word processing software.

Table: 11 Time spent for word processing software

S. No	Time spent for word processing software	Frequency	Percent
1	Time spent for word processing		
2	Below 1 hour	1	.6
3	1-2 hours	28	16.7
4	2-3 hours	95	56.5
5	above 3 hours	44	26.2
Total		168	100.0

Interpretation

This table shows that the from the percentage analysis, it was found that year wise distribution of the respondents, out of 168 Considered for the study. 2-3 hours in the 95(56.5%) of the majority

of the respondents spent their time for word processing software, above 3 hours using 44(26.2%) of the using word processing software.

Skills of word processing software for with respect to year

The ANOVA test was carried out to identify whether there is significant difference in Skills of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in Skills of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.

Table 12: ANOVA test- Skills of word processing software for with respect to year

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. Add text	Between Groups	33.018	1	33.018	21.593	.000
	Within Groups	253.833	166	1.529		
	Total	286.851	167			
2. Enter text	Between Groups	16.250	1	16.250	10.107	.002
	Within Groups	266.892	166	1.608		
	Total	283.143	167			
3. Format text	Between Groups	8.254	1	8.254	7.806	.006
	Within Groups	175.531	166	1.057		
	Total	183.786	167			
4. Adjust and spacing	Between Groups	2.941	1	2.941	3.114	.079
	Within Groups	156.767	166	.944		
	Total	159.708	167			
5. Insert and format word art	Between Groups	1.004	1	1.004	.646	.423
	Within Groups	258.115	166	1.555		
	Total	259.119	167			
6. Insert and format clip art	Between Groups	1.290	1	1.290	.686	.409
	Within Groups	311.990	166	1.879		
	Total	313.280	167			
7. Modify the text wrap of an object	Between Groups	.875	1	.875	.845	.359
	Within Groups	171.958	166	1.036		
	Total	172.833	167			
8. Draw and format shapes	Between Groups	24.889	1	24.889	18.710	.000
	Within Groups	220.819	166	1.330		
	Total	245.708	167			

Interpretation

This table show that the estimated significance value is less than 0.05 for all the items hence, the null hypothesis is rejected i.e. there is significant difference in (Add text-.000, Enter text-.002, Format text-.006, Draw and format shapes-.000) Skills of word processing software for with respect to year.

But, for the item (Adjust and spacing-sig.079, Insert and format word art-sig 423, Insert and format clip art – sig .409, Modify the text wrap of an object – sig .359) the estimated significance values is greater than 0.05 hence, the null hypothesis is accepted i.e. there is no significant difference in Skills of word processing software for with respect to year.

Applications of word processing software for with respect to Department

The ANOVA test was carried out to identify whether there is significant difference in Applications of word processing software for with respect to Department

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in Applications of word processing software for with respect to Department of the respondents.

Table 13: ANOVA test- Applications of word processing software for with respect to Department

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1.Word processor to write an e-Book	Between Groups	13.179	8	1.647	.832	.576
	Within Groups	314.815	159	1.980		
	Total	327.994	167			
2.Blog post	Between Groups	7.327	8	.916	.466	.879
	Within Groups	312.649	159	1.966		
	Total	319.976	167			
3.Journal	Between Groups	4.416	8	.552	.381	.930
	Within Groups	230.435	159	1.449		
	Total	234.851	167			
4.letter	Between Groups	10.166	8	1.271	.409	.914
	Within Groups	493.828	159	3.106		
	Total	503.994	167			
5.Resume	Between Groups	8.720	8	1.090	.537	.827
	Within Groups	322.560	159	2.029		
	Total	331.280	167			
6.To write manage stories	Between Groups	5.092	8	.637	.437	.897
	Within Groups	231.384	159	1.455		
	Total	236.476	167			

7.E-mail	Between Groups	9.569	8	1.196	.682	.707
	Within Groups	278.806	159	1.753		
	Total	288.375	167			
8.Social media posts	Between Groups	7.008	8	.876	.466	.879
	Within Groups	298.843	159	1.880		
	Total	305.851	167			
9.Articles	Between Groups	10.503	8	1.313	.791	.611
	Within Groups	263.777	159	1.659		
	Total	274.280	167			

Interpretation

This table show that the estimated significance value for the item (Word processor to write an e-Book - sig.576, Blog post – sig .879, Journal – sig. 930, letter- sig. .914, Resume – sig .827, To write manage stories – sig .897, E-mail – sig .707, Social media posts – sig .879, Articles – sig.611) the estimated significance values is greater than 0.05 hence, the null hypothesis is accepted i.e. there is no significant difference in Applications of word processing software for with respect to Department.

Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year

The ANOVA test was carried out to identify whether there is significant difference in Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.

Table 14: ANOVA test- Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1.Review and rewrite the document	Between Groups	.540	1	.540	.305	.581
	Within Groups	293.531	166	1.768		
	Total	294.071	167			
2.It is faster and easier than writing by hand	Between Groups	8.127	1	8.127	5.816	.017
	Within Groups	231.944	166	1.397		
	Total	240.071	167			
3.Spelling grammar and language tools	Between Groups	48.286	1	48.286	26.134	.000
	Within Groups	306.708	166	1.848		
	Total	354.994	167			
4.Print copies of the documents	Between Groups	12.540	1	12.540	12.662	.000
	Within Groups	164.406	166	.990		

	Total	176.946	167			
5.It won't improve the typing speed	Between Groups	12.698	1	12.698	6.143	.014
	Within Groups	343.153	166	2.067		
	Total	355.851	167			
6.Easier to correct and modify the document	Between Groups	58.698	1	58.698	54.000	.000
	Within Groups	180.444	166	1.087		
	Total	239.143	167			

Interpretation

This table show that the estimated significance value is less than 0.05 for all the items hence, the null hypothesis is rejected i.e. there is significant difference in (It is faster and easier than writing by hand -.017, Spelling grammar and language tools, Print copies of the documents, Easier to correct and modify the document -.000, It won't improve the typing speed -.014) Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year.

But, for the item (Review and rewrite the document – sig .581) the estimated significance values is greater than 0.05 hence, the null hypothesis is accepted i.e. there is no significant difference in Advantage of word processing software for with respect to year.

Features of word processing software for with respect to year

The ANOVA test was carried out to identify whether there is significant difference in Features of word processing software for with respect to year

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in Features of word processing software for with respect to year of the respondents.

Table 15: ANOVA test- Features of word processing software for with respect to year

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1.Solves grammatical errors like punctuation	Between Groups	3.417	1	3.417	2.030	.156
	Within Groups	279.434	166	1.683		
	Total	282.851	167			
2. sentence structuring	Between Groups	.794	1	.794	.727	.395
	Within Groups	181.153	166	1.091		
	Total	181.946	167			
3.Subject-verb agreement	Between Groups	6.002	1	6.002	3.382	.068
	Within Groups	294.569	166	1.775		
	Total	300.571	167			

4. Writing style and wording	Between Groups	52.716	1	52.716	81.572	.000
	Within Groups	107.278	166	.646		
	Total	159.994	167			
5. Export text file to Markdown	Between Groups	29.290	1	29.290	16.503	.000
	Within Groups	294.615	166	1.775		
	Total	323.905	167			
6. HTML or rich text.	Between Groups	4.108	1	4.108	3.300	.071
	Within Groups	206.601	166	1.245		
	Total	210.708	167			
7. It helps you to make writing easier	Between Groups	.389	1	.389	.253	.615
	Within Groups	254.944	166	1.536		
	Total	255.333	167			

Interpretation

This table shows that the estimated significance value is less than 0.05 for all the items hence, the null hypothesis is rejected i.e. there is significant difference in (Writing style and wording, Export text file to Markdown - sig.000) Features of word processing software for with respect to year.

But, for the item (Solves grammatical errors like punctuation-sig.156, sentence structuring- sig .395, Subject-verb agreement-sig.068, HTML or rich text-sig.071, It helps you to make writing easier- sig.615) the estimated significance values is greater than 0.05 hence, the null hypothesis is accepted i.e. there is no significant difference in Features of word processing software for with respect to year.

Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing

The ANOVA test was carried out to identify whether there is significant difference in Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing of the respondents.

Table 16: ANOVA test- Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing

ANOVA		Sum Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. Microsoft word online	Between Groups	68.593	4	17.148	12.223	.000
	Within Groups	228.687	163	1.403		
	Total	297.280	167			
2. Google Docs	Between Groups	31.781	4	7.945	6.311	.000
	Within Groups	205.213	163	1.259		
	Total	236.994	167			
3. Zoho writer	Between Groups	7.342	4	1.835	1.485	.209
	Within Groups	201.509	163	1.236		
	Total	208.851	167			
4. Pages for cloud	Between Groups	88.452	4	22.113	26.260	.000
	Within Groups	137.257	163	.842		
	Total	225.708	167			
5. Quip	Between Groups	32.634	4	8.158	5.580	.000
	Within Groups	238.312	163	1.462		
	Total	270.946	167			
6. Drop box paper	Between Groups	10.528	4	2.632	1.300	.272
	Within Groups	329.990	163	2.024		
	Total	340.518	167			
7. Only office document editor	Between Groups	39.600	4	9.900	7.171	.000
	Within Groups	225.043	163	1.381		
	Total	264.643	167			
8. Writer	Between Groups	3.845	4	.961	.861	.489
	Within Groups	182.006	163	1.117		
	Total	185.851	167			

Interpretation

This table show that the estimated significance value is less than 0.05 for all the items hence, the null hypothesis is rejected i.e. there is significant difference in (Microsoft word online, Google Docs, Pages for cloud, Quip, Only office document editor, - sig.000) Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing.

But, for the item (Zoho writer -sig .209, Drop box paper - sig .272, Writer -sig. 489) the estimated significance values is greater than 0.05 hence, the null hypothesis is accepted i.e. there

is no significant difference in Web site accessing to the student of word processors software of word processing software for with respect to Access accessing of word processing.

FINDINGS

1. Majority of the respondents are belongs to the category of age in (18-20) 84 (50%)
2. Majority of the respondents from the departments of English and Physics 20(11.9%).
3. Majority of the respondents in the 2 years is 96 (57.1%)
4. Most of the students are accessing the word processor under the guidelines of library professionals in the VCW library 53(31.5%)
5. Most of the students using word processor for preparing seminars/conferences for their academic exposures 70 (41.7%)
6. Majority of the respondents spent their time for word processing software is around 2-3 hours 95(56.5%)
7. 82 (48.8%) of the students using the word processor, at least once in a week.

CONCLUSIONS

One of the most popular technological tools in education, word processing software is installed on practically every computer and is used for anything from creating to storing lesson plans. Students are gaining equal amounts of experience using word processing, and the majority of teachers have some basic experience. Due to the fact that many of our students do not currently have access to computers, they are working to acquire the technology abilities that other kids seem to have. In addition to learning a second language. The use of word processing to enhance language ability and learning while obtaining modern technology skills is discussed in this article for both teachers and students. Conducting awareness and workshops related to word processing software in the library makes to gain better knowledge about word processing software.

REFERENCE

1. Brysbaert, M., Mandera, P., & Keuleers, E. (2018). The word frequency effect in word processing: An updated review. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(1), 45-50.
2. Bujdosó, G. (2011). Analyzing Differences in Education by Gender by Using Word Processing. *Proceedings of ICERI2011*, 2106-2111.
3. Kobayashi, H., & Ogawa, H. (2022). Priming with Horizontal Reading Influences the Deployment of Visual Attention During Word Processing 1. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 64(1), 73-81.
4. Katsurai, M. (2020). Using word embeddings for library and information science research: a short survey. *ACM SIGWEB Newsletter*, (Spring), 1-7.
5. Kim, S. K., Kim, W. J., Seo, T. S., & Choi, H. J. (2019). Domain analysis on the field of open access by co-word analysis: based on published journals of library and information science during 2013 to 2018. *Journal of Korean Library and Information Science Society*, 50(1), 333-356.
6. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-word-processing-software-definition-types-examples.html>