

Use of E-Resources and Services by Users at Indian Institute of Management Indore: A Study

¹Vinod Kumar Singh, ²Dr. Meera

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Library & Information Science, University of Jammu, Jammu-6, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Library & Information Science, University of Delhi, Delhi-7, India

ABSTRACT: *The study investigated the use of electronic resources by the students, research scholars and faculty members of IIM Indore. It examined the user's awareness of the different types of e-resources available in the IIM Indore Library, purpose and frequency of using e-resources by the users, the factor affecting resource utilization, impact of e-resources and services on the academic work of the users, suggest the ways and means for the effective use of e-resources and services available in the IIM Indore Library, etc.*

KEYWORDS: *E-resources, IIM Indore Library, Indian Institutes of Management*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Information and Communication Technology (ICT) revolution and the advent of the Internet has had drastic and far-reaching impacts on the knowledge and information sector and added a new dimension to information retrieval platforms. It has created an environment where rapid continuous changes have become the norms. Developments in information and communication technologies have a profound impact on every sphere and academic activities. Academic libraries are not an exception for this. It has reduced the library stature from custodian of our literature heritage to being a competitor among many others in the information society changes have been noticed in the academic libraries in professionals, collection and policies. Changes have seen in information seeking behaviour of users. Their preferences have been changed. User satisfaction level has been increasing. Now libraries have been able to provide fast and seamless access of information to its users.

In the 21st century most of the library resources are being made available in electronic formats such as e-journals, e-books, e-databases, etc. Libraries are moving from print to e-resources either subscribing individually or through consortia. But selection of e-resources is one of the most difficult jobs faced by LIS professionals because there are too many products available in the market, making the task of a selector extremely difficult [1]. For this a survey is conducted to find out the use and awareness of e-resources available in the library for the users and impact of these resources on their academic work.

II. INDIAN INSTITUTES OF MANAGEMENT

The Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) are a group of 13 autonomous institutes of management education and research in India. They were established with the objective of providing quality management education. The thirteen IIMs established in India at Calcutta (1961, West Bengal), Ahmedabad (1961, Gujarat), Bangalore (1973, Karnataka), Indore (1984, Uttar Pradesh), Kozhikode (1996, Kerala), Indore (1996, Madhya Pradesh), Shillong (2007, Meghalaya), Rohtak (2010, Haryana), Ranchi (2010, Jharkhand), Raipur (2010, Chhattisgarh), Tiruchirappalli (2011, Tamil Nadu), Udaipur (2011, Rajasthan) and Kashipur (2011, Uttarakhand).

The IIMs primarily offer postgraduate, doctoral and executive education programmes. The overall strategy of IIMs is overseen by the IIM council. The IIM Council is headed by India's Minister of Human Resource Development and consists of the chairpersons and directors of all IIMs and senior officials from Ministry of Human Resource Development of the Government of India.

III. INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT INDORE AND ITS LIBRARY

Indian Institute of Management (IIM) Indore was established in 1996 by the Government of India as a national level school of excellence in management science. This institute has well known library naming as IIM Indore Learning Centre. The library has approx 25,000 books in the area of management and related subjects. The library subscribes 4 databases through IIM Consortium, 11 databases through INDEST-AICTE Consortium and more than 40 databases are individually subscribed.

IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Some of the studies related to use of e-resources are: Dastforoush and Venkatesha conducted a study to determine dependency on electronic and print journals by research scholars and faculty in Iran. Major findings of the study are: (i) 43.9% of the respondents did not find e-journals to be equivalent to print journals (ii) 57.9% of the respondents preferred electronic versions over printed ones [2]. Tahir, Mahmood, and Shafique conducted a study to examine the use of electronic information resources and facilities by humanities scholars at the University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. Major findings of the study are: (i) 69% of respondents preferred both print and electronic resources. (ii) A total of 55% of respondents mentioned that the amount of time they were spending on getting information has decreased due to electronic resources, whereas 30% mentioned no change in it and 13% thought that the amount of time has increased [3]. Dilek-Kayaoglu conducted a study to examine the use of electronic journals by faculty at Istanbul University, Turkey. Major findings of the study are: (i) 89% of the respondents stated that one of the benefits of e-journals was that there was no need to visit the library (ii) 67.5% of the respondents stated that they used e-journals for research, 49.2% used them for keeping him/herself updated on the subject field, 28.5% for browsing core journals, and 16.9% for teaching [4]. The study is limited to IIM Indore Library and its users (students, research scholars and faculty members).

VI. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Specific objectives of the study are:

1. To know the different types of e-resources and services available in the IIM Indore Library.
2. To know the awareness and use of different types of e-resources among the users.
3. To know the purpose and frequency of using the e-resources by the users.
4. To identify the frequently used databases for the purpose of literature searching by the users.
5. To identify the major problems faced by the users while accessing e-resources.
6. To ascertain the need for user orientation/training programmes in accessing e-resources.
7. To know the impact of e-resources and services on the academic work of the users.
8. To suggest the ways and means for the effective use of the e-resources and services available in the IIM Indore Library.

VII. METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was designed and was pre-tested before using it for the survey. The questionnaires were distributed personally among the students, research scholars and faculty members.

VIII. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A total of 100 questionnaires were randomly administered among the user community, i.e. 50 for students, 30 for research scholars and 20 for faculty members. Out of 100 questionnaires, 81 questionnaires (81%) were received.

Table I: Size of Sample

Categories of the Respondents	Distribute	Response
Student	50	44 (88)
Research Scholars	30	24 (80)
Faculty Members	20	13 (65)
Total	100	81 (100)

Note: Figures in parenthesis indicates percentage.

The Table I indicates that response rate of students are high (88%) whereas response rate of faculty members are low (65%).

Table II: Sex Wise Total of Questionnaires

Sex	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Male	37 (84.09)	21 (87.50)	09 (69.23)	67 (82.71)
Female	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	14 (17.28)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table II indicates that responded to questionnaire from male respondents are high in research scholars (87.50%) and low in faculty members (69.23%) whereas responded to questionnaire from female respondents are high in faculty members (30.77%) and low in research scholars (12.50%).

Table III: Library Membership

Membership	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Yes	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)
No	-	-	-	-
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table III indicates that all the students (100%), research scholars (100%) and faculty members (100%) are having membership of their library.

Table IV: Frequency of Visit to the Library

Frequency	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Daily	01 (2.72)	02 (8.33)	-	03 (3.70)
2-3 times a week	31 (70.45)	17 (70.83)	06 (46.15)	54 (66.67)
Once a week	04 (9.09)	02 (8.33)	05 (38.46)	11 (13.58)
2-3 times a month	05 (11.36)	01 (4.17)	-	06 (7.41)
Once a month	01 (2.72)	-	01 (7.69)	02 (2.47)
Occasionally	02 (4.54)	02 (8.33)	01 (7.69)	05 (6.17)
Never	-	-	-	-
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table IV indicates that majority of the students visit the library 2-3 times a week (70.45%). Majority of the research scholars (70.83%) and faculty members visit the library 2-3 times a week (46.15%).

Table V: Reason for do not Visit the Library Frequently

Reasons	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=24)
	Students (N=12)	Research Scholars (N=05)	Faculty Members (N=07)	
Library is far off from my work place	02 (16.67)	-	-	02 (8.33)
Library working hours is inconvenient	-	-	-	-
Library collection doesn't fulfill my information needs	-	-	-	-
Library collection is accessible from my work place through WiFi/LAN	09 (75)	05 (100)	07 (100)	21 (87.50)
Any other	01 (8.33)	-	-	01 (4.17)

The Table V indicates that majority of the students (75%), research scholars (100%) and faculty members (100%) stated the reason for do not visit the library frequently (Daily or 2-3 times a week) is library collection is accessible from their work place through WiFi/LAN.

Table VI: Purpose of Visit to the Library

Purposes	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
To borrow and return the books	42 (95.45)	20 (83.33)	10 (76.92)	72 (88.89)
For research work/project	36 (81.82)	22 (91.67)	01 (7.69)	59 (72.84)
To study	30 (68.18)	20 (83.33)	-	50 (61.73)
To consult print resources	35 (79.54)	16 (66.67)	11 (84.61)	62 (76.54)
To access e-resources	33 (75)	15 (62.50)	01 (7.69)	49 (60.49)
Any other	05 (11.36)	02 (8.33)	02 (15.38)	09 (11.11)

The Table VI indicates that the students (95.45%) visit the library to borrow and return the books. Majority of the research scholars (91.67%) visit for research work/project whereas faculty members (84.61%) visit the library to consult print resources.

Table VII: Awareness about E-resources Services and Facilities

Awareness	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Yes	36 (81.82)	23 (95.83)	13 (100)	72 (88.89)
No	08 (18.18)	01 (4.17)	-	09 (11.11)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table VII indicates that the majority of the students (81.82%), research scholars (95.83%) and faculty members (100%) are well aware of e-resource services and facilities provided by the library.

Table VIII: Awareness about Library Consortia

Awareness		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
		Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
IIM Consortium	Yes	39 (88.67)	22 (91.67)	11 (84.61)	72 (88.89)
	No	05 (11.36)	02 (8.33)	02 (15.38)	09 (11.11)
INDEST-AICTE Consortium	Yes	36 (81.82)	20 (83.33)	10 (76.92)	66 (81.48)
	No	08 (18.18)	04 (16.67)	03 (23.08)	15 (18.52)

Library is a member of both IIM Consortium and INDEST-AICTE Consortium. The Table VIII indicates that majority of the research scholars (91.67%) and students (88.67%) are well aware about library is a member of IIM Consortium. The table also indicates that research scholars (83.33%) and students (81.82%) are also well aware about library is a member of INDEST-AICTE Consortium

Table IX: Source of Awareness about E-resources Services and Facilities

Sources of Awareness	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Library orientation programmes	28 (63.64)	16 (66.67)	01 (7.69)	45 (55.55)
Library Staff	16 (36.36)	09 (37.50)	01 (7.69)	26 (32.10)
Friends/ Colleagues	36 (81.82)	18 (75)	06 (46.15)	60 (74.07)
Teachers/ Research Supervisors	25 (56.82)	21 (87.50)	-	46 (56.80)
Institution website	32 (72.73)	12 (50)	12 (92.31)	56 (69.13)
Printed sources	11 (25)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	15 (18.52)
E-mail notification from Library	20 (45.45)	14 (58.33)	07 (53.85)	41 (50.62)
Self Awareness	03 (6.82)	01 (4.17)	03 (23.08)	07 (8.64)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The Table IX indicates that the most popular sources of awareness about e-resource services and facilities provided by the library. Students stated friends/colleagues (81.82%) and institution website (72.73%). Research scholars stated teachers/ research supervisors (87.50%) and library orientation programmes (66.67%) whereas faculty members stated institution website (92.31%) and e-mail notification (53.85%) from the library.

Table X: Place of Access E-resources

Place of Access	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Central Library	17 (38.64)	13 (54.17)	03 (23.08)	33 (40.74)
Computer Centre	02 (4.54)	01(4.17)	-	03 (3.70)
Chamber/ Hostel/Residential Flat	42 (95.45)	23 (95.83)	13 (100)	78 (96.29)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The Table X indicates that students (95.45%), research scholars (95.83%) and faculty members (100%) are access e-resources in their chamber/Hostel/Residential.

Table XI: Frequency of Using E-resources

Frequency	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Daily	02 (4.54)	01 (4.17)	-	03 (3.70)
2-3 times a week	24 (54.54)	16 (66.67)	04 (30.77)	44 (54.32)
Once a week	05 (11.36)	02 (8.33)	02 (15.38)	09 (11.11)
2-3 times a month	03 (6.82)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	07 (8.64)
Once a month	02 (4.54)	01 (4.17)	04 (30.77)	07 (8.64)
Occasionally	08 (18.18)	01 (4.17)	02 (15.38)	11(13.58)
Never	-	-	-	-
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XI indicates that the majority of the students (54.54%) and research scholars (66.67%) responded 2-3 times a week whereas faculty members responded 2-3 times a week (30.77%) and once a month (30.77%) frequency of using e-resources.

Table XII: Method Used to Access E-resources

Methods	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Trial and error	16 (36.36)	04 (16.67)	05 (38.46)	25 (30.86)
Guidance by friends/ colleagues	23 (52.27)	17 (70.83)	11 (84.61)	51(62.96)
Guidance by library staff	31 (70.45)	07 (29.17)	04 (30.77)	42 (51.85)
Guidance by teachers/ supervisors	25 (56.82)	21 (87.50)	-	46 (56.80)
Course offered by the institution	11 (25)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	16 (19.75)
Library brochures/ pamphlets	07 (15.91)	01 (4.17)	-	08 (9.88)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The Table XII indicates that the majority of the students (70.45%) responded guidance by library staff and research scholars (87.50%) responded guidance by teachers/supervisors to access e-resources whereas faculty members (84.61%) responded guidance by friends/colleagues to access e-resources.

Table XIII: Method Used to Locate E-resources

Methods	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Through Institution website	38 (86.36)	22 (91.67)	11 (84.61)	71 (87.65)
Through Publisher's website	11 (25)	09 (37.50)	07 (53.85)	27 (33.33)
Through Search engines	07 (15.91)	01 (4.17)	02 (15.38)	10 (12.34)

The Table XIII indicates that the majority of the students (86.36%), research scholars (91.67%) and faculty members (84.61%) are used to locate e-resources through institution website.

Table XIV: Commonly Used Search Techniques to Retrieve Information

Search Techniques	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Simple search	29 (65.91)	07 (29.17)	03 (23.08)	39 (48.15)
Phrase search	16 (36.36)	15 (62.50)	09 (69.23)	40 (49.38)
Field search	21 (47.73)	18 (75)	11 (84.61)	50 (61.73)
Boolean search	03 (6.82)	04 (16.67)	07 (53.85)	14 (17.28)
Any other	02 (4.54)	-	04 (30.77)	06 (7.41)

The Table XIV indicates that the majority of the students (65.91%) prefer simple search, research scholars (62.50%) prefer phrase search whereas faculty members (84.61%) prefer field search to retrieve the information.

Table XV: Method Used for Reading Full Text Articles

Methods	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Read online	33 (75)	12 (50)	06 (46.15)	51 (62.96)
Take print out	11 (25)	07 (29.17)	08 (61.54)	26 (32.10)
Save in storage devices for further reference	21 (47.73)	18 (75)	09 (69.23)	48 (59.26)

The Table XV indicates that the majority of the students (75%) read full text articles online whereas research scholars (75%) and faculty members (69.23%) save full text articles in storage devices for further reference.

Table XVI: Participation in Orientation/Training Programmes

Participation	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Yes	28 (63.64)	16 (66.67)	01 (7.69)	45 (55.55)
No	16 (36.36)	08 (33.33)	12 (92.31)	36 (44.44)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XVI indicates that majority of the students (63.64%) and research scholars (66.67%) are participated in orientation/ training programmes whereas most of the faculty members (92.31%) are not participated in such orientation/training programmes.

Table XVII: Whether Faced Problem During Participation in Orientation/Training Programmes

Problems Faced	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=45)
	Students (N=28)	Research Scholars (N=16)	Faculty Members (N=01)	
Yes	07 (25)	04 (25)	-	11 (24.44)
No	21 (75)	12 (75)	01 (100)	34 (75.55)
Total	28 (100)	16 (100)	01 (100)	45 (100)

The question asked to the respondents whether they faced problem during participation in orientation and training programmes. The Table XVII indicates that majority of the students (75%), research scholars (75%) and faculty members (100%) are not faced any problem.

Table XVIII: Problem Faced During Participation in Orientation/Training Programmes

Problems	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=11)
	Students (N=07)	Research Scholars (N=04)	Faculty Members (N=00)	
Participants were from different subject background	02 (28.57)	01 (25)	-	03 (27.27)
The period was too short	03 (42.86)	03 (75)	-	06 (54.54)
Programmes were lecture oriented	01 (14.28)	-	-	01 (9.09)
Too many participants	04 (57.14)	01 (25)	-	05 (62.50)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The question asked to those respondents who faced the problem during orientation/training programmes. The *Table XVIII* indicates that majority of the students (57.14%) stated that there were too many participants whereas research scholars (75%) stated that the period was too short.

Table XIX: Reason for Non Participation in Orientation/Training Programmes

Reasons	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=36)
	Students (N=16)	Research Scholars (N=08)	Faculty Members (N=12)	
Lack of information	10 (62.50)	06 (75)	01 (8.33)	17 (47.22)
Not required	02 (12.50)	-	01 (8.33)	03 (8.33)
Lack of time	04 (25)	02 (25)	10 (83.33)	16 (44.44)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The question asked to the respondents give the reason for not participated in orientation/training programmes. The *Table XIX* indicates that majority of the students (62.50%) and research scholars (75%) stated the lack of information whereas faculty members (83.33%) stated the lack of time reason for not participating in any orientation/training programmes.

Table XX: Whether Need of Specialised Orientation/Training Programmes

Need	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Yes	39 (88.67)	22 (91.67)	10 (76.92)	71 (87.65)
No	05 (11.36)	02 (8.33)	03 (23.08)	10 (12.34)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The *Table XX* indicates that majority of the students (88.67%), research scholars (91.67%) and faculty members (76.92%) need a specialised orientation/training programmes.

Table XXI: Area Where Need of Specialised Orientation/Training Programmes

Areas	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=71)
	Students (N=39)	Research Scholars (N=22)	Faculty Members (N=10)	
To know all the e-resources and its coverage	35 (89.74)	19 (86.36)	08 (80)	62 (87.32)
How to search and retrieve the content	31 (79.49)	21 (95.45)	09 (90)	61 (85.91)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The question asked to the respondents in which area they need a specialized orientation/training programmes. The *Table XXI* indicates that the majority of the students (89.74%) stated that to know all the e-resources and its coverage whereas research scholars (95.45%) and faculty members (90%) stated that to know how to search and retrieve the content of e-resources subscribed by the library.

Table XXII: Purpose of Using E-resources

<i>Purposes</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
For studying course work	29 (65.91)	15 (62.50)	05 (38.46)	49 (60.49)
For research work/Project	35 (79.54)	19 (79.17)	07 (53.85)	61 (75.31)
For teaching purposes	-	-	09 (69.23)	09 (11.11)
To update the subject knowledge	23 (52.27)	18 (75)	08 (61.54)	49 (60.49)
For writing articles/research papers	18 (40.91)	22 (91.67)	12 (92.31)	52 (64.20)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table XXII* indicates that the majority of the students using e-resources for research work/project (79.54%). Most of the research scholars (91.67%) and faculty members (92.31%) are using e-resources for writing articles/research papers.

Table XXIII: Option Which Motivate to Use E-resources

<i>Options</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Archival Access	06 (13.64)	02 (8.33)	01 (7.69)	09 (11.11)
Core Journals	33 (75)	19 (79.17)	10 (76.92)	62 (76.54)
Wide range of Online databases/Journals	41 (93.18)	22 (91.67)	12 (92.31)	75 (92.59)
Expert assistance by library staff	04 (9.09)	01 (4.17)	-	05 (6.17)
Abstract of the articles	08 (18.18)	03 (12.50)	06 (46.15)	17 (20.99)
Table of content	03 (6.82)	01 (4.17)	02 (15.38)	06 (7.41)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table XXIII* indicates that the majority of the students (93.18%), research scholars (91.67%) and faculty members (92.31%) stated that the due to wide range of online databases/journals available, they have been using e-resources.

Table XXIV: Regularly Used E-resources

<i>Types of E-resources</i>		<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
		<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
E-books	Frequently	15 (34.09)	05 (20.83)	04 (30.77)	24 (29.63)
	Occasionally	16 (36.36)	12 (50)	06 (46.15)	34 (41.97)
	Never	13 (29.54)	07 (29.17)	03 (23.08)	23 (28.39)
E-journals	Frequently	29 (65.91)	13 (54.17)	05 (38.46)	47 (58.02)
	Occasionally	15 (34.09)	11 (45.83)	08 (61.54)	34 (41.97)
	Never	-	-	-	-
Online Databases	Frequently	21 (47.73)	18 (75)	11 (84.61)	50 (61.73)
	Occasionally	23 (52.27)	06 (25)	02 (15.38)	31 (38.27)
	Never	-	-	-	-
CDs/DVDs	Frequently	06 (13.64)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	11 (13.58)
	Occasionally	21 (47.73)	09 (37.50)	04 (30.77)	34 (41.97)
	Never	17 (38.64)	12 (50)	07 (53.85)	36 (44.44)
E-theses and Dissertations	Frequently	08 (18.18)	11 (45.83)	01 (7.69)	20 (24.69)
	Occasionally	11 (25)	12 (50)	05 (38.46)	28 (34.57)
	Never	25 (56.82)	01 (4.17)	07 (53.85)	33 (40.74)
Electronic Course-ware	Frequently	16 (36.36)	04 (16.67)	03 (23.08)	23 (28.39)
	Occasionally	16 (36.36)	12 (50)	06 (46.15)	34 (41.97)

	Never	12 (27.27)	08 (33.33)	04 (30.77)	24 (29.63)
E-reference sources	Frequently	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	11 (13.58)
	Occasionally	29 (65.91)	16 (66.67)	10 (76.92)	55 (67.90)
	Never	08 (18.18)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	15 (18.52)
E-research reports/projects	Frequently	09 (20.45)	08 (33.33)	04 (30.77)	21 (25.92)
	Occasionally	24 (54.54)	13 (54.17)	08 (61.54)	45 (55.55)
	Never	11 (25)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	15 (18.52)
Any other		-	-	-	-

The Table XXIV indicates that the e-journals are frequently used by students, e-journals and online databases are frequently used by research scholars whereas online databases are frequently used by faculty members. E-books, electronic coursewares (also frequently used by students), e-reference sources, e-research reports are occasionally used by students, research scholars and faculty members. Most of research scholars and faculty members never used the CDs/DVDs whereas e-theses and dissertations are also never used by most of the students and faculty members.

Table XXV: Consult E-journal Databases for Academic Work

Consult	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Yes	39 (88.67)	21 (87.50)	11 (84.61)	71 (87.65)
No	05 (11.36)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	10 (12.34)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXV indicates that majority of the students (88.67%), research scholars (87.50%) and faculty members (84.61%) consult e-journal databases for their academic work.

Table XXVI: Frequency of Using E-journal Databases Subscribed through IIM Consortium

Frequency of Using E-journal Databases		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
		Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Springer Link (Kluwer)	Frequently	23 (52.27)	05 (20.83)	03 (23.08)	31 (38.27)
	Occasionally	14 (31.82)	16 (66.67)	09 (69.23)	39 (48.15)
	Never	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	11 (13.58)
Sage HSS Collection	Frequently	13 (29.54)	09 (37.50)	04 (30.77)	26 (32.10)
	Occasionally	28 (63.64)	12 (50)	07 (53.85)	47 (58.02)
	Never	03 (6.82)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	08 (9.88)
Taylor and Francis	Frequently	19 (43.18)	18 (75)	08 (61.54)	45 (55.55)
	Occasionally	19 (43.18)	05 (20.83)	05 (38.46)	29 (35.80)
	Never	06 (13.64)	01 (4.17)	-	07 (8.64)
Wiley Interscience (Blackwell)	Frequently	11 (25)	05 (20.83)	06 (46.15)	22 (27.16)
	Occasionally	25 (56.82)	15 (62.50)	05 (38.46)	45 (55.55)
	Never	08 (18.18)	04 (16.67)	02 (15.38)	14 (17.28)

The Table XXVI indicates that Springer Link is frequently used by students but research scholars and faculty members are occasionally used it. Sage HSS Collection is occasionally used by the respondents whereas Taylor and Francis is frequently used by the respondents. Wiley Interscience is frequently used by the faculty members but occasionally used by the students and research scholars.

Table XXVII: Frequency of Using E-journal Databases Subscribed through INDEST-AICTE Consortium

Frequency of Using E-journal Databases		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
		Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
ABI/Inform (Proquest)	Frequently	13 (29.54)	05 (20.83)	04 (30.77)	22 (27.16)
	Occasionally	17 (38.64)	13 (54.17)	06 (46.15)	36 (44.44)
	Never	14 (31.82)	06 (25)	03 (23.08)	23 (28.39)
ACM Digital Library	Frequently	21 (47.73)	09 (37.50)	05 (38.46)	35 (43.21)
	Occasionally	14 (31.82)	12 (50)	04 (30.77)	30 (37.04)
	Never	09 (20.45)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	16 (19.75)
Business Source Complete (Ebsco)	Frequently	11 (25)	11 (45.83)	03 (23.08)	25 (30.86)
	Occasionally	21 (47.73)	07 (29.17)	07 (53.85)	35 (43.21)
	Never	12 (27.27)	06 (25)	03 (23.08)	21 (25.92)
Science Direct (Elsevier)	Frequently	19 (43.18)	06 (25)	02 (15.38)	27 (33.33)
	Occasionally	20 (45.45)	16 (66.67)	08 (61.54)	44 (54.32)
	Never	05 (11.36)	02 (8.33)	03 (23.08)	10 (12.34)
Emerald Management Extra	Frequently	13 (29.54)	12 (50)	02 (15.38)	27 (33.33)
	Occasionally	13 (29.54)	05 (20.83)	04 (30.77)	22 (27.16)
	Never	18 (40.91)	07 (29.17)	07 (53.85)	32 (39.51)
IEL Online	Frequently	08 (18.18)	09 (37.50)	05 (38.46)	22 (27.16)
	Occasionally	26 (59.09)	11 (45.83)	06 (46.15)	43 (53.09)
	Never	10 (22.73)	04 (16.67)	02 (15.38)	16 (19.75)
Euromonitor (GMID)	Frequently	19 (43.18)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	26 (32.10)
	Occasionally	16 (36.36)	15 (62.50)	06 (46.15)	37 (45.68)
	Never	09 (20.45)	06 (25)	03 (23.08)	18 (22.22)
INSIGHT (AERC)	Frequently	06 (13.64)	11 (45.83)	08 (61.54)	25 (30.86)
	Occasionally	27 (61.36)	10 (41.67)	04 (30.77)	41 (50.62)
	Never	11 (25)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	15 (18.52)
J-Gate Custom Content for Consortia	Frequently	14 (31.82)	05 (20.83)	03 (23.08)	22 (27.16)
	Occasionally	24 (54.54)	08 (33.33)	06 (46.15)	38 (46.91)
	Never	06 (13.64)	11 (45.83)	04 (30.77)	21 (25.92)
Capitaline Plus	Frequently	14 (31.82)	06 (25)	03 (23.08)	23 (28.39)
	Occasionally	17 (38.64)	11 (45.83)	06 (46.15)	34 (41.97)
	Never	13 (29.54)	07 (29.17)	04 (30.77)	24 (29.63)
CRIS INFAC (CRISIL Research)	Frequently	17 (38.64)	14 (58.33)	08 (61.54)	39 (48.15)
	Occasionally	16 (36.36)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	23 (28.39)
	Never	11 (25)	07 (29.17)	01 (7.69)	19 (23.46)

The Table XXVII indicates that CRIS INFAC is frequently used by most of the students, research scholars and faculty members whereas ABI/Inform, Science Direct, IEL Online and Capitaline Plus are occasionally used by most of the students, research scholars and faculty members. Euromonitor and ACM Digital Library are frequently used by most of the students but INSIGHT, J-Gate and Business Source Complete are occasionally used and Emerald is never used by most of them. Business Source Complete is frequently used by most of the research scholars but Euromonitor, ACM Digital Library and INSIGHT are occasionally used and J-gate is never used by most of them. INSIGHT and ACM Digital Library are frequently used by most of the faculty members but Euromonitor, J-Gate and Business Source Complete are occasionally used and Emerald is never used by most of them.

Table XXVIII: Frequency of Using E-journal Databases Subscribed individually by IIM Indore

Frequency of Using E-journal Databases		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
		Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
CMIE-Business Beacon	Frequently	15 (34.09)	15 (62.50)	02 (15.38)	32 (39.51)
	Occasionally	23 (52.27)	06 (25)	06 (46.15)	35 (43.21)
	Never	06 (13.64)	03 (12.50)	05 (38.46)	14 (17.28)
CMIE-CapEx (Online)	Frequently	11 (25)	12 (50)	02 (15.38)	25 (30.86)
	Occasionally	24 (54.54)	09 (37.50)	03 (23.08)	36 (44.44)
	Never	09 (20.45)	03 (12.50)	08 (61.54)	20 (24.69)
CMIE- Economic Intelligence	Frequently	17 (38.64)	04 (16.67)	05 (38.46)	26 (32.10)
	Occasionally	20 (45.45)	11 (45.83)	05 (38.46)	36 (44.44)
	Never	07 (15.91)	09 (37.50)	03 (23.08)	19 (23.46)
CMIE-India	Frequently	09 (20.45)	06 (25)	02 (15.38)	17 (20.99)

Trades	Occasionally	27 (61.36)	11 (45.83)	07 (53.85)	45 (55.55)
	Never	08 (18.18)	07 (29.17)	04 (30.77)	19 (23.46)
CMIE-Industry Analysis Service	Frequently	16 (36.36)	06 (25)	03 (23.08)	25 (30.86)
	Occasionally	17 (38.64)	13 (54.17)	03 (23.08)	33 (40.74)
	Never	11 (25)	05 (20.83)	07 (53.85)	23 (28.39)
CMIE-Prowess	Frequently	23 (52.27)	07 (29.17)	03 (23.08)	33 (40.74)
	Occasionally	13 (29.54)	11 (45.83)	06 (46.15)	30 (37.04)
	Never	08 (18.18)	06 (25)	04 (30.77)	18 (22.22)
Ebrary	Frequently	13 (29.54)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	20 (24.69)
	Occasionally	20 (45.45)	16 (66.67)	06 (46.15)	42 (51.85)
	Never	11 (25)	05 (20.83)	03 (23.08)	19 (23.46)
FT.com	Frequently	15 (34.09)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	22 (27.16)
	Occasionally	16 (36.36)	13 (54.17)	06 (46.15)	35 (43.21)
	Never	13 (29.54)	06 (25)	05 (38.46)	24 (29.63)
Indiastat.com	Frequently	11 (25)	12 (50)	04 (30.77)	27 (33.33)
	Occasionally	24 (54.54)	06 (25)	07 (53.85)	37 (45.68)
	Never	09 (20.45)	06 (25)	02 (15.38)	17 (20.99)
ISI Emerging Markets	Frequently	13 (29.54)	08 (33.33)	05 (38.46)	26 (32.10)
	Occasionally	27 (61.36)	11 (45.83)	06 (46.15)	44 (54.32)
	Never	04 (9.09)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	11 (13.58)
Jstor	Frequently	09 (20.45)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	16 (19.75)
	Occasionally	28 (63.64)	18 (75)	06 (46.15)	52 (64.20)
	Never	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	03 (23.08)	13 (16.05)
Marketline Advantage (Datamonitor 360)	Frequently	19 (43.18)	09 (37.50)	07 (53.85)	35 (43.21)
	Occasionally	19 (43.18)	12 (50)	04 (30.77)	35 (43.21)
	Never	06 (13.64)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	11 (13.58)
Proquest Dissertations & Theses	Frequently	06 (13.64)	05 (20.83)	03 (23.08)	14 (17.28)
	Occasionally	09 (20.45)	16 (66.67)	03 (23.08)	28 (34.57)
	Never	29 (65.91)	03 (12.50)	07 (53.85)	39 (48.15)
PsycARTICLES	Frequently	11 (25)	09 (37.50)	06 (46.15)	26 (32.10)
	Occasionally	26 (59.09)	12 (50)	05 (38.46)	43 (53.09)
	Never	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	12 (14.81)
World Bank-eLibrary	Frequently	12 (27.27)	10 (41.67)	02 (15.38)	24 (29.63)
	Occasionally	19 (43.18)	06 (25)	06 (46.15)	31 (38.27)
	Never	13 (29.54)	08 (33.33)	05 (38.46)	26 (32.10)
Project Muse	Frequently	17 (38.64)	06 (25)	04 (30.77)	27 (33.33)
	Occasionally	19 (43.18)	15 (62.50)	03 (23.08)	37 (45.68)
	Never	08 (18.18)	03 (12.50)	06 (46.15)	17 (20.99)

The Table XXVIII indicates that CMIE-Prowess and MarketLine Advantage (also occasionally) are frequently used by most of the students, CMIE-Business Beacon, CMIE-CapEx, IndiaStat.com, World Bank-eLibrary are frequently used by most of the research scholars and CMIE-Economic Intelligence, MarketLine Advantage and PsycARTICLES are frequently used by most of the faculty members. CMIE-India Trades, Ebrary, FT.com, ISI Emerging Markets and Jstor are occasionally used by most of the respondents.

Table XXIX: Way of Access Full Text Articles Not Subscribed by Library

Way of Access Full Text Articles	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=81)
	Students (N=44)	Research Scholars (N=24)	Faculty Members (N=13)	
Through friends/ colleagues	41 (93.18)	18 (75)	07 (53.85)	66 (81.48)
Through library's document delivery services	33 (75)	15 (62.50)	11 (84.61)	59 (72.84)
From other libraries	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	11 (13.58)
Obtain reprints/soft copy directly from the authors	09 (20.45)	04 (16.67)	07 (53.85)	20 (24.69)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The Table XXIX indicates that majority of the students (93.18%) and research scholars (75%) access full text articles not subscribed by the library through friends/colleagues whereas faculty members (84.61%) access through library's document delivery services.

Table XXX: Time Spent for Searching and Downloading of E-resources

<i>Time Spent</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Less than 1 hour	06 (13.64)	01 (4.17)	01 (7.69)	08 (9.88)
Less than 3 hours	07 (15.91)	03 (12.50)	06 (46.15)	16 (19.75)
Less than 5 hours	14 (31.82)	17 (70.83)	04 (30.77)	35 (43.21)
More than 5 hours	17 (38.64)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	22 (27.16)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXX indicates that the majority of the students (38.64%) spent time more than 5 hours, research scholars (70.83%) spent time less than 5 hours whereas majority of the faculty members (46.15%) spent time less than 3 hours for searching and downloading of e-resources.

Table XXXI: Number of Full Text Articles Downloaded Per Month

<i>Full Text Articles Downloaded</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
0 to 5	08 (18.18)	02 (8.33)	01 (7.69)	11 (13.58)
5 to 9	02 (4.54)	15 (62.50)	02 (15.38)	19 (23.46)
10 to 19	21 (47.73)	03 (12.50)	08 (61.54)	32 (39.51)
20 to 29	11 (25)	03 (12.50)	02 (15.38)	16 (19.75)
30 to 49	02 (4.54)	01 (4.17)	-	03 (3.70)
More than 50	-	-	-	-
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXXI indicates that majority of the students (47.73%) and faculty members (61.54%) downloaded 10 to 19 whereas majority of the research scholars downloaded 5 to 9 full text articles in a month.

Table XXXII: E-resources Enhance the Efficiency of Academic Work

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Yes	36 (81.82)	19 (79.17)	12 (92.31)	67 (82.71)
No	08 (18.18)	05 (20.83)	01 (7.69)	14 (17.28)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXXII indicates that majority of the students (81.82%), research scholars (79.17%) and faculty members (92.31%) stated that e-resources enhance the efficiency of their academic work.

Table XXXIII: Influence of E-resources on the Efficiency of Academic Work

<i>Influence</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=67)</i>
	<i>Students (N=36)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=19)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=12)</i>	
Expedited the research/ project process	33 (91.67)	16 (84.21)	08 (66.67)	57 (85.07)
Improved profession competence	17 (47.22)	13 (68.42)	09 (75)	39 (58.21)
Expedited the teaching process	-	-	10 (83.33)	10 (14.92)
Access to wider range of information	31 (86.11)	15 (78.95)	07 (58.33)	53 (79.10)
Easier and faster access to information	29 (80.55)	17 (89.47)	08 (66.67)	44 (65.67)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The Table XXXIII indicates that majority of the students (91.67%) stated that e-resources help in expedited the research/project process, majority of the research scholars (89.47%) stated that e-resources help in

easier and faster access to information whereas faculty members stated that e-resources help in expedited the teaching process (83.33%)

Table XXXIV: Problem Faced While Accessing and Using E-resources

<i>Problems</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Non-friendly user Interface	31 (70.45)	07 (29.17)	04 (30.77)	42 (51.85)
Not enough coverage	12 (27.27)	08 (33.33)	05 (38.46)	25 (30.86)
Lack of training	22 (50)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	26 (32.10)
No problem being faced	09 (20.45)	11 (45.83)	08 (61.54)	28 (34.57)
Any other	02 (4.54)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	09 (11.11)

The Table XXXIV indicates that majority of the students (70.45%) faced non friendly user interface problem while accessing and using e-resources whereas no problem being faced by most of the research scholars (45.83%) and faculty members (61.54%).

Table XXXV: Satisfaction Towards Adequacy of E-resources

<i>Satisfaction</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Yes	39 (88.67)	19 (79.17)	11 (84.61)	69 (85.18)
No	05 (11.36)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	12 (14.81)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXXV indicates that the majority of the students (88.67%), research scholars (79.17%) and faculty members (84.61%) are satisfied with the adequacy of e-resources.

Table XXXVI: Expectation Towards Included More Number of E-resources

<i>Expectation</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Yes	36 (81.82)	22 (91.67)	10 (76.92)	68 (83.95)
No	08 (18.18)	02 (8.33)	03 (23.08)	13 (16.05)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXXVI indicates that the majority of the students (81.82%), research scholars (91.67%) and faculty members (76.92%) are expected more number of e-resources added in the collection.

Table XXXVII: Subscription of Print version of E-resources

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Yes	11 (25)	05 (20.83)	04 (30.77)	20 (24.69)
No	33 (75)	19 (79.17)	09 (69.23)	61 (75.31)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The question asked to the respondents that library also subscribes the print version of e-resources. The Table XXXVII indicates that majority of the students (75%), research scholars (79.17%) and faculty members (69.23%) are not agreed.

Table XXXVIII: Suggestion Regarding E-resources Subscription

<i>Suggestion</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
	<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Yes	05 (11.36)	02 (8.33)	04 (30.77)	11 (13.68)
No	39 (88.67)	22 (91.67)	09 (69.23)	70 (86.42)
Total	44 (100)	24 (100)	13 (100)	81 (100)

The Table XXXVIII indicates that the majority of the students (88.67%), research scholars (91.67%) and faculty members (69.23%) haven't suggested to librarian for subscribing the relevant e-resources.

Table XXXIX: Consideration of Request Regarding E-resources Subscription

<i>Consideration</i>	<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=11)</i>
	<i>Students (N=05)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=02)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=04)</i>	
Yes	02 (40)	-	03 (75)	05 (45.45)
No	03 (60)	02 (100)	01 (25)	06 (54.54)
Total	05 (100)	02 (100)	04 (100)	11 (100)

The Table XXXIX indicates that the majority of the students (60%) and research scholars (100%) stated that whatever they have suggested to purchase the relevant materials related to e-resources their request was not attended whereas most of the faculty members (75%) stated that the request was attended.

Table XL: Adequacy of Library Collection

<i>Sources</i>		<i>Categories of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total (N=81)</i>
		<i>Students (N=44)</i>	<i>Research Scholars (N=24)</i>	<i>Faculty Members (N=13)</i>	
Books	Adequate	21 (47.73)	14 (58.33)	06 (46.15)	41 (50.62)
	Moderate	08 (18.18)	04 (16.67)	05 (38.46)	17 (20.99)
	Inadequate	08 (18.18)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	15 (18.52)
	Can't say	07 (15.91)	01 (4.17)	-	08 (9.88)
Periodicals	Adequate	27 (61.36)	13 (54.17)	02 (15.38)	42 (51.85)
	Moderate	10 (22.73)	08 (33.33)	09 (69.23)	27 (33.33)
	Inadequate	04 (9.09)	02 (8.33)	02 (15.38)	08 (9.88)
	Can't say	03 (6.82)	01 (4.17)	-	04 (4.94)
Reference Sources	Adequate	32 (72.73)	05 (20.83)	03 (23.08)	40 (49.38)
	Moderate	05 (11.36)	16 (66.67)	09 (69.23)	30 (37.04)
	Inadequate	05 (11.36)	03 (12.50)	01 (7.69)	09 (11.11)
	Can't say	02 (4.54)	-	-	02 (2.47)
Theses and Dissertations	Adequate	13 (29.54)	17 (70.83)	04 (30.77)	34 (41.97)
	Moderate	06 (13.64)	05 (20.83)	06 (46.15)	17 (20.99)
	Inadequate	04 (9.09)	02 (8.33)	01 (7.69)	07 (8.64)
	Can't say	21 (47.73)	-	02 (15.38)	23 (28.39)
E-books	Adequate	18 (40.91)	11 (45.83)	08 (61.54)	37 (45.68)
	Moderate	21 (47.73)	07 (29.17)	05 (38.46)	33 (40.74)
	Inadequate	03 (6.82)	03 (12.50)	-	06 (7.41)
	Can't say	02 (4.54)	03 (12.50)	-	05 (6.17)
E-journals	Adequate	32 (72.73)	17 (70.83)	07 (53.85)	56 (69.13)
	Moderate	11 (25)	05 (20.83)	05 (38.46)	21 (25.92)
	Inadequate	01 (2.72)	02 (8.33)	01 (7.69)	04 (4.94)
	Can't say	-	-	-	-
Online Databases	Adequate	35 (79.54)	09 (37.50)	05 (38.46)	49 (60.49)
	Moderate	04 (9.09)	08 (33.33)	06 (46.15)	18 (22.22)
	Inadequate	05 (11.36)	05 (20.83)	02 (15.38)	12 (14.81)
	Can't say	-	02 (8.33)	-	02 (2.47)
CDs/DVDs	Adequate	14 (31.82)	03 (12.50)	03 (23.08)	20 (24.69)
	Moderate	04 (9.09)	16 (66.67)	04 (30.77)	24 (29.63)
	Inadequate	08 (18.18)	02 (8.33)	02 (15.38)	12 (14.81)
	Can't say	18 (40.91)	03 (12.50)	04 (30.77)	25 (30.86)

The Table XL indicates the adequacy of library collection. Majority of the students stated that books, periodicals, reference sources, e-journals, online databases are adequate whereas e-books collection is moderate. Majority of the research scholars stated that books, periodicals, theses & dissertations, e-books, e-journals,

online databases are adequate whereas reference sources and CDs/DVDs collection are moderate. Majority of the faculty members stated that books, e-books and e-journals collection are adequate whereas periodicals, reference sources, theses & dissertations, online databases collection are moderate.

IX. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Major findings of the study are:

- [1] Majority (66.67%) of the respondents visit to the library 2-3 times a week.
- [2] Majority (87.50%) of the respondents indicate that they do not visit the library frequently because all the collection (e-resources) of library are accessible from their work place through WiFi/LAN.
- [3] Majority of the respondents visit the library for to borrow and return the books (88.89%) and for to consult print resources (76.54%).
- [4] Majority of the respondents (88.89%) are well aware of e-resource services and facilities provided by the IIM Indore Library.
- [5] Majority of the respondents are well aware that library is a member of IIM Consortium (88.89%) and INDEST-AICTE Consortium (81.48%).
- [6] Friends/colleagues (74.07%) and institution website (69.13%) are the most popular sources of awareness about e-resource services and facilities among respondents.
- [7] Majority (54.32%) of the respondents using e-resources 2-3 times a week.
- [8] Majority (62.96%) of the respondents take the guidance by friends/colleagues to access e-resources.
- [9] Majority of the respondents prefer field (61.73%) and phrase search (49.38%) to retrieve the information.
- [10] Majority (55.55%) of the respondents participated in orientation/training programmes.
- [11] Majority of the respondents point out that they need a specialized orientation training programmes to know all the resources and its coverage (87.32%) subscribed by the library as well as how to search and retrieve the content (85.91%).
- [12] Majority of the respondents using e-resources for research work/project (75.31%) and writing articles/research papers (64.20%).
- [13] Majority (92.59%) of the respondents indicate that due to wide range of online databases/journals available, they have been using e-resources.
- [14] E-journals, online databases are frequently used by the respondents. E-books, electronic coursewares, e-reference sources and e-research reports/projects are occasionally used by the respondents.
- [15] Majority (87.65%) of the respondents consult e-journal databases for their academic work.
- [16] Taylor and Francis is frequently used whereas Springer Link, Sage HSS Collection and Wiley Interscience are occasionally used by most of the respondents.
- [17] ACM Digital Library and CRIS INFAC are frequently used by most of the respondents whereas ABI/Inform, Business Source Complete, Science Direct, IEL Online, INSIGHT, Euromonitor, J-Gate and Capitaline Plus are occasionally used by most of the respondents. Emerald is never used by most of the respondents.
- [18] CMIE-Business Beacon, CMIE-India Trades, CMIE-Prowess, ISI Emerging Markets, Jstor, MarketLine Advantage and PsycARTICLES are occasionally used by most of the respondents. Proquest Dissertations & Theses is never used by most of the respondents.
- [19] Majority (82.71%) of the respondents stated that e-resources enhance the efficiency of their academic work.
- [20] Majority (51.85%) of the respondents faced non-friendly user interface problem while accessing and using e-resources.
- [21] Majority (85.18%) of the respondents are satisfied with the adequacy of e-resources.
- [22] Majority (83.95%) of the respondents are expected more number of e-resources included in the collection.
- [23] Majority of the students, research scholars and faculty members stated that library collection is adequate as well as moderate.

X. CONCLUSION

The present survey clearly indicates that electronic sources of information are highly useful for the research, teaching and learning processes. In order to make it successful and best use of the available e-resources, authorities of the Institution Library should conduct regular orientation/training programmes to maximize the use of electronic sources of information more effectively and efficiently.

REFERENCES

- [1]. V. K. Singh, Selection of e-resources for university libraries, *Proceedings of the National Conference on impact of E-resources in Education*, Ghaziabad: Himani Publications, 2011, 7-9.
- [2]. M. T. Dastforoush, and Y. Venkatesha, Dependency on electronic and print journals: A case study, *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 48(4), 2011, 441-448.
- [3]. M. Tahir, K. Mahmood, and F. Shafique, Use of electronic information resources and facilities by humanities scholars, *The Electronic Library*, 28(1), 2010, 122-136.
- [4]. H. Dilek-Kayaoglu, Use of electronic journals by faculty at Istanbul University, Turkey: The results of a survey, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(3), 2008, 239-247.