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

Vinod Kumar Singh

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

ABSTRACT: *The study investigated the use of electronic resources by the students, research scholars and faculty members of IIM Bangalore. It examined the user's awareness of the different types of e-resources available in the IIM Bangalore 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 Bangalore Library, etc.*

KEYWORDS: *E-resources, IIM Bangalore 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), Lucknow (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) [2]. 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 BANGALORE AND ITS LIBRARY

Indian Institute of Management (IIM) Bangalore was established in 1973 by the Government of India as a national level school of excellence in management science. This institute has well known library. The library has a total collection of 2.35 lakh documents (books, back volumes of journals, government publications, technical reports, conference proceedings, non book materials, etc). The library subscribes 3 databases through IIM Consortium, 11 databases through INDEST-AICTE Consortium and approx 49 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. (iii) They mentioned that as information is scattered in too many sources (90%), due to the information explosion (87%) so they found it difficult to search their required information without assistance [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].

V. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study is limited to IIM Bangalore 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 Bangalore 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 Bangalore 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, 74 questionnaires (74%) were received.

Table I: Size of Sample

Categories of the Respondents	*Distribute*	*Response*
Student	50	41 (82)
Research Scholars	30	19 (63.33)
Faculty Members	20	14 (70)
Total	100	74 (74)

Note: Figures in parenthesis indicates percentage.

The *Table* I indicates that response rate of students are high (82%) whereas response rate of research scholars are low (63.33%).

Table II: Sex Wise Total of Questionnaires

Sex	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Male	27 (65.85)	13 (68.42)	09 (64.28)	49 (66.22)
Female	14 (34.15)	06 (31.58)	05 (35.71)	25 (33.78)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* II indicates that responded to questionnaire from male respondents are high in research scholars (68.42%) and low in faculty members (64.28%) whereas responded to questionnaire from female respondents are high in faculty members (35.71%) and low in research scholars (31.58%).

Table III: Library Membership

Membership	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Yes	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)
No	-	-	-	-
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (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=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Daily	08 (19.51)	-	-	08 (10.81)
2-3 times a week	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	05 (35.71)	28 (37.84)
Once a week	06 (14.63)	02 (10.53)	04 (28.57)	12 (16.22)
2-3 times a month	02 (4.88)	04 (21.05)	02 (14.28)	08 (10.81)
Once a month	04 (9.76)	02 (10.53)	-	06 (8.11)
Occasionally	04 (9.76)	05 (26.31)	03 (21.42)	12 (16.22)
Never	-	-	-	-
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* IV indicates that majority of the students (41.46%), research scholars (31.58%) and faculty members (35.71%) visit the library 2-3 times a week.

Table V: Reasons for do not Visit the Library Frequently

Reasons	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=38)
	Students (N=16)	Research Scholars (N=13)	Faculty Members (N=09)	
Library is far off from my work place	03 (18.75)	04 (30.77)	-	07 (18.42)
Library working hours is inconvenient	-	-	-	-
Library collection doesn't fulfill my information needs	-	-	-	-
Library collection is accessible from my work place through WiFi/LAN	16 (100)	11 (84.61)	09 (100)	36 (94.74)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table* V indicates that majority of the students (100%), research scholars (84.61%) 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=74)*
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
To borrow & return the books	37 (90.24)	16 (84.21)	12 (85.71)	65 (87.84)
For research work/project	37 (90.24)	18 (94.74)	04 (28.57)	59 (79.73)
To study	33 (80.49)	11 (57.89)	02 (14.28)	46 (62.16)
To consult print resources	36 (87.80)	15 (78.95)	09 (64.28)	50 (67.57)
To access e-resources	23 (56.10)	08 (42.10)	04 (28.57)	35 (47.30)
Any other	08 (19.51)	02 (10.53)	03 (21.42)	13 (17.57)

The *Table* VI indicates that the students visit the library to borrow & return the books (90.24%) and for research work/project (90.24%). Majority of the research scholars (94.74%) visit for research work/project whereas faculty members (85.71%) visit the library to borrow and return the books.

Table VII: Awareness about E-resources Services and Facilities

Awareness	*Categories of the Respondents*			*Total (N=74)*
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Yes	39 (95.12)	19 (100)	14 (100)	72 (97.30)
No	02 (4.88)	-	-	02 (2.70)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* VII indicates that the majority of the students (95.12%), research scholars (100%) and faculty members (100%) are well aware of e-resource services and facilities provided by the library.

Table VIII: Awareness about Library Consortiums

Awareness		*Categories of the Respondents*			*Total (N=74)*
		Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
IIM Consortium	Yes	29 (70.73)	17 (89.47)	11 (78.57)	57 (77.03)
	No	12 (29.27)	02 (10.53)	03 (21.42)	17 (22.97)
INDEST-AICTE Consortium	Yes	35 (85.36)	11 (57.89)	08 (57.14)	54 (72.97)
	No	06 (14.63)	08 (42.10)	06 (42.86)	20 (27.03)

Library is a member of both IIM Consortium and INDEST-AICTE Consortium. The *Table* VIII indicates that majority of the students (70.73%), research scholars (89.47%) and faculty members (78.57%) are well aware about library is a member of IIM Consortium. The table also indicates that students (85.36%) research scholars (57.89%) and faculty members (57.14%) 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=74)*
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Library orientation programmes	22 (53.66)	09 (47.37)	06 (42.86)	37 (50)
Library staff	17 (41.46)	04 (21.05)	03 (21.42)	24 (32.43)
Friends/colleagues	34 (82.93)	11 (57.89)	08 (57.14)	53 (74.65)
Teachers/research supervisors	28 (68.29)	15 (78.95)	03 (21.42)	46 (62.16)
Institution website	36 (87.80)	16 (84.21)	07 (50.00)	59 (79.73)
Printed sources	14 (34.15)	05 (26.31)	02 (14.28)	21 (28.38)
E-mail notification from Library	26 (63.41)	17 (89.47)	09 (64.28)	52 (70.27)
Self Awareness	13 (31.71)	08 (42.10)	04 (28.57)	25 (33.78)
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 institution website (87.80%) and friends/colleagues (82.93%). Research scholars stated e-mail notification from the library (89.47%) and institution website (84.21%). Faculty members also stated e-mail notification from the library (64.28%) and institution website (50%).

Table X: Place of Access E-resources

Place of Access	*Categories of the Respondents*			*Total (N=74)*
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Central Library	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	-	23 (31.08)
Computer Centre	08 (19.51)	03 (15.79)	-	11 (14.86)
Chamber/Hostel/Residential Flat	38 (92.68)	19 (100)	14 (100)	71 (95.94)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table* X indicates that students (92.68%), research scholars (100%) 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=74)*
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Daily	03 (7.32)	01 (5.26)	-	04 (5.40)
2-3 times a week	26 (63.41)	13 (68.42)	04 (28.57)	43 (58.11)
Once a week	02 (4.88)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	07 (9.46)
2-3 times a month	02 (4.88)	-	03 (21.42)	05 (6.76)
Once a month	-	-	02 (14.28)	02 (2.70)
Occasionally	8 (19.51)	2 (10.53)	03 (21.42)	13 (17.57)
Never	-	-	-	-
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XI indicates that the majority of the students (63.41%), research scholars (68.42%) and faculty members (28.57%) responded 2-3 times a week frequency of using e-resources.

Table XII: Method Used to Access E-resources

Methods	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Trial and error	06 (14.63)	08 (42.10)	04 (28.57)	18 (24.32)
Guidance by friends/colleagues	22 (53.66)	14 (73.68)	03 (21.42)	39 (52.70)
Guidance by library staff	14 (34.15)	06 (31.58)	02 (14.28)	22 (29.73)
Guidance by teachers/supervisors	36 (87.80)	16 (84.21)	03 (21.42)	55 (74.32)
Course offered by the institution	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	05 (35.71)	28 (37.84)
Library brochures/pamphlets	06 (14.63)	01 (5.26)	02 (14.28)	09 (12.16)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table* XII indicates that the majority of the students (87.80%) and research scholars (84.21%) guidance by teachers/supervisors to access e-resources whereas faculty members (35.71%) responded course offered by the institution to access e-resources.

Table XIII: Method Used to Locate E-resources

Methods	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Through institution website	36 (87.80)	16 (84.21)	12 (85.71)	64 (86.49)
Through publisher's website	16 (39.02)	09 (47.37)	07 (50)	32 (43.24)
Through search engines	19 (46.34)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	24 (32.43)

The *Table* XIII indicates that the majority of the students (87.80%), research scholars (84.21%) and faculty members (85.71%) 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=74)
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Simple search	27 (65.85)	16 (84.21)	08 (57.14)	51 (68.92)
Phrase search	18 (43.10)	13 (68.42)	12 (85.71)	43 (58.11)
Field search	34 (82.93)	15 (78.95)	14 (100)	63 (85.13)
Boolean search	03 (7.32)	08 (42.10)	03 (21.42)	14 (18.92)
Any other	02 (7.32)	06 (31.58)	04 (28.57)	12 (16.22)

The *Table* XIV indicates that the majority of the students (82.93%) prefer field search, research scholars (84.21%) prefer simple search whereas faculty members (100%) prefer field search to retrieve the information.

Table XV: Method Used for Reading Full Text Articles

Methods	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Read online	36 (87.80)	14 (73.68)	09 (64.28)	59 (79.73)
Take print out	28 (68.29)	09 (47.37)	11 (78.57)	48 (64.86)
Save in storage devices for further reference	39 (95.12)	12 (63.16)	08 (57.14)	59 (79.73)

The *Table* XV indicates that the majority of the students (95.12%) save full text articles in storage devices for further reference, research scholars (73.68%) read full text articles online whereas faculty members (78.57%) take print out of full text articles.

Table XVI: Participation in Orientation/Training Programmes

Participation	*Categories of the Respondents*			*Total (N=74)*
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Yes	22 (53.66)	09 (47.37)	06 (42.86)	37 (50)
No	19 (46.34)	10 (52.63)	08 (57.14)	37 (50)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XVI indicates that majority of the students (53.66%) have participated in orientation/training programmes whereas most of the research scholars (52.63%) and faculty members (57.14%) have 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=37)*
	Students (N=22)	*Research Scholars (N=09)*	*Faculty Members (N=06)*	
Yes	08 (36.36)	03 (33.33)	02 (33.33)	13 (35.13)
No	14 (63.64)	06 (66.67)	04 (66.67)	24 (64.86)
Total	22 (100)	09 (100)	06 (100)	37 (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 (63.64%), research scholars (66.67%) and faculty members (66.67%) are not faced any problem.

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

Problems	*Categories of the Respondents*			*Total (N=13)*
	Students (N=08)	*Research Scholars (N=03)*	*Faculty Members (N=02)*	
Participants were from different subject background	03 (37.50)	-	-	03 (23.08)
The period was too short	05 (62.50)	03 (100)	01 (50)	09 (69.23)
Programmes were lecture oriented	01 (12.50)	-	-	01 (7.69)
Too many participants	03 (37.50)	-	01 (50)	04 (30.77)
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 (62.50%) and research scholars (100%) stated that there were too many participants whereas faculty members (50%) stated that the period was too short and too many participants.

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

Reasons	*Categories of the Respondents*			*Total (N=37)*
	Students (N=19)	*Research Scholars (N=10)*	*Faculty Members (N=08)*	
Lack of information	06 (31.58)	03 (30)	02 (25)	11 (29.73)
Not required	05 (26.31)	-	02 (25)	07 (18.92)
Lack of time	08 (42.10)	07 (70)	04 (50)	19 (51.35)
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 (42.10%), research scholars (70%) and faculty members (50%) 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=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Yes	32 (78.05)	15 (78.95)	08 (57.14)	55 (74.32)
No	09 (21.95)	04 (21.05)	06 (42.86)	19 (25.67)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XX indicates that majority of the students (78.05%), research scholars (78.95%) and faculty members (57.14%) need a specialised orientation/training programmes.

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

Areas	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=55)
	Students (N=32)	Research Scholars (N=15)	Faculty Members (N=08)	
To know all the e-resources & its coverage	31 (96.87)	15 (100)	06 (75)	52 (94.54)
How to search & retrieve the content	28 (87.50)	13 (86.67)	05 (62.50)	46 (83.64)
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 (96.87%), research scholars (100%) and faculty members (75%) stated that to know all the e-resources & its coverage subscribed by the library.

Table XXII: Purpose of Using E-resources

Purposes	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
For studying course work	36 (87.80)	14 (73.68)	04 (28.57)	44 (59.46)
For research work/project	39 (95.12)	19 (100)	10 (71.43)	68 (91.89)
For teaching purposes	-	-	12 (85.71)	12 (16.22)
To update the subject knowledge	32 (78.05)	11 (57.89)	08 (57.14)	51 (68.92)
For writing articles/research papers	38 (92.68)	18 (94.74)	14 (100)	70 (94.59)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table* XXII indicates that the majority of the students (95.12%) and research scholars (100%) using e-resources for research work/project whereas most of the faculty members (100%) are using e-resources for writing articles/research papers.

Table XXIII: Option Which Motivate to Use E-resources

Options	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Archival access	16 (39.02)	07 (36.84)	02 (14.28)	25(33.78)
Core journals	38 (92.68)	16 (84.21)	08 (57.14)	62 (83.78)
Wide range of online databases/ Journals	41 (100)	15 (78.95)	14 (100)	70 (94.59)
Expert assistance by library staff	06 (14.63)	02 (10.53)	-	08 (10.81)
Abstract of the articles	09 (21.95)	03 (15.79)	05 (35.71)	17 (22.97)
Table of content	02 (4.88)	-	-	02 (2.70)
Any other	06 (14.63)	02 (10.53)	-	08 (10.81)

The *Table* XXIII indicates that the majority of the students (100%) and faculty members (100%) stated that the due to wide range of online databases/journals available, they have been using e-resources whereas research scholars (84.21%) stated core journals.

Table XXIV: Regularly Used E-resources

Types of E-resources		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
		Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
E-books	Frequently	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	03 (21.42)	26 (35.13)
	Occasionally	12 (29.27)	08 (42.10)	05 (35.71)	25 (33.78)
	Never	12 (29.27)	05 (26.31)	07 (50)	23 (31.08)
E-journals	Frequently	15 (36.58)	08 (42.10)	08 (57.14)	31 (41.89)
	Occasionally	26 (63.41)	11 (57.89)	06 (42.86)	43 (58.11)
	Never	-	-	-	-
Online Databases	Frequently	19 (46.34)	13 (68.42)	04 (28.57)	36 (48.65)
	Occasionally	22 (53.66)	06 (31.58)	10 (71.43)	38 (51.35)
	Never	-	-	-	-
CDs/DVDs	Frequently	17 (41.46)	04 (21.05)	03 (21.42)	24 (32.43)
	Occasionally	10 (24.39)	07 (36.84)	06 (42.86)	23 (31.08)
	Never	14 (34.15)	08 (42.10)	05 (35.71)	27 (36.49)
E-theses & Dissertations	Frequently	07 (17.07)	06 (31.58)	02 (14.28)	15 (20.27)
	Occasionally	14 (34.15)	09 (47.37)	07 (50)	30 (40.54)
	Never	20 (48.78)	04 (21.05)	05 (35.71)	29 (39.19)
Electronic Course-wares	Frequently	06 (14.63)	08 (42.10)	02 (14.28)	16 (21.62)
	Occasionally	12 (29.27)	06 (31.58)	05 (35.71)	23 (31.08)
	Never	23 (56.10)	05 (26.31)	07 (50)	35 (47.30)
E-reference sources	Frequently	16 (39.02)	07 (36.84)	05 (35.71)	28 (37.84)
	Occasionally	17 (41.46)	09 (47.37)	06 (42.86)	32 (43.24)
	Never	08 (19.51)	03 (15.79)	03 (21.42)	14 (18.92)
E-research reports/projects	Frequently	10 (24.39)	12 (63.16)	07 (50)	29 (39.19)
	Occasionally	14 (34.15)	04 (21.05)	05 (35.71)	23 (31.08)
	Never	17 (41.46)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	22 (29.73)

The *Table* XXIV indicates that the e-books (41.46%) and CD/DVDs (41.46%) are frequently used by students, online databases (68.42%), e-coursewares (42.10%) and e-research reports/projects (63.16%) are frequently used by research scholars whereas e-journals (57.14%) and e-research reports/projects (50%) are frequently used by faculty members. E-journals (63.41%), online databases (53.66%) and e-reference sources (41.46%) are occasionally used by students, e-books (42.10%), e-journals (57.89%), e-theses & dissertations (47.37%) and e-reference sources (47.37%) are occasionally used by research scholars whereas online databases (71.43%), CD/DVDs (42.86%), e-theses & dissertations (50%) and e-reference sources (42.86%) are occasionally used by faculty members.

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

Frequency of Using E-journal Databases		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
		Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Springer Link (Kluwer)	Frequently	12 (29.27)	04 (21.05)	02 (14.28)	18 (24.32)
	Occasionally	15 (36.58)	12 (63.16)	08 (57.14)	35 (47.30)
	Never	14 (34.15)	03 (15.79)	04 (28.57)	21 (28.38)
Taylor & Francis	Frequently	08 (19.51)	06 (31.58)	02 (14.28)	16 (21.62)
	Occasionally	26 (63.41)	08 (42.10)	09 (64.28)	43 (58.11)
	Never	07 (17.07)	05 (26.31)	03 (21.42)	15 (20.27)
Wiley Interscience (Blackwell)	Frequently	17 (41.46)	14 (73.68)	05 (35.71)	36 (48.65)
	Occasionally	10 (24.39)	03 (15.79)	07 (50)	20 (27.03)
	Never	14 (34.15)	02 (10.53)	02 (14.28)	18 (24.32)

The *Table* XXV indicates that Wiley Interscience is frequently used by students (41.46%) and research scholars (73.68%) but occasionally used by faculty members (50%). Springer Link and Taylor & Francis are

occasionally used by most of the students (36.58% & 63.41%), research scholars (63.16% & 42.10%) and faculty members (57.14% & 64.28%).

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

Frequency of Using E-journal Databases		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
		Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
ABI/Inform (Proquest)	Frequently	19 (46.34)	08 (42.10)	03 (21.42)	30 (40.54)
	Occasionally	14 (34.15)	05 (26.31)	06 (42.86)	25 (33.78)
	Never	08 (19.51)	06 (31.58)	05 (35.71)	19 (25.67)
ACM Digital Library	Frequently	13 (31.71)	03 (15.79)	05 (35.71)	21 (28.38)
	Occasionally	12 (29.27)	09 (47.37)	03 (21.42)	24 (32.43)
	Never	16 (39.02)	07 (36.84)	06 (42.86)	29 (39.19)
Business Source Complete (Ebsco)	Frequently	23 (56.10)	06 (31.58)	08 (57.14)	37 (50)
	Occasionally	11 (26.83)	10 (52.63)	04 (28.57)	25 (33.78)
	Never	07 (17.07)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	12 (16.22)
Science Direct (Elsevier)	Frequently	15 (36.58)	08 (42.10)	04 (28.57)	27 (36.49)
	Occasionally	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	07 (50)	30 (40.54)
	Never	09 (21.95)	05 (26.31)	03 (21.42)	17 (22.97)
Emerald Management Extra	Frequently	16 (39.02)	07 (36.84)	06 (42.86)	29 (39.19)
	Occasionally	11 (26.83)	03 (15.79)	03 (21.42)	17 (22.97)
	Never	14 (34.15)	09 (47.37)	05 (35.71)	28 (37.84)
IEL Online	Frequently	13 (31.71)	03 (15.79)	07 (50)	23 (31.08)
	Occasionally	18 (43.90)	09 (47.37)	03 (21.42)	30 (40.54)
	Never	10 (24.39)	07 (36.84)	04 (28.57)	21 (28.38)
Euromonitor (GMID)	Frequently	12 (29.27)	05 (26.31)	04 (28.57)	21 (28.38)
	Occasionally	22 (53.66)	11 (57.89)	08 (57.14)	41 (55.40)
	Never	07 (17.07)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	12 (16.22)
INSIGHT (AERC)	Frequently	09 (21.95)	06 (31.58)	05 (35.71)	20 (27.03)
	Occasionally	19 (46.34)	05 (26.31)	06 (42.86)	30 (40.54)
	Never	13 (31.71)	08 (42.10)	03 (21.42)	24 (32.43)
J-Gate Custom Content for Consortia	Frequently	07 (17.07)	02 (10.53)	02 (14.28)	11 (14.86)
	Occasionally	18 (43.90)	04 (21.05)	03 (21.42)	25 (33.78)
	Never	16 (39.02)	13 (68.42)	09 (64.28)	38 (51.35)
Capitaline Plus	Frequently	18 (43.90)	11 (57.89)	02 (14.28)	31 (41.89)
	Occasionally	12 (29.27)	06 (31.58)	11 (78.57)	29 (39.19)
	Never	11 (26.83)	02 (10.53)	01 (7.14)	14 (18.92)
CRIS INFAC (CRISIL Research)	Frequently	21 (51.22)	06 (31.58)	03 (21.42)	30 (40.54)
	Occasionally	17 (41.46)	08 (42.10)	06 (42.86)	31 (41.89)
	Never	03 (7.32)	05 (26.31)	05 (35.71)	13 (17.57)

The *Table* XXVI indicates that ABI/Inform (46.34%), Business Source Complete (56.10%), Emerald (39.02%), Capitaline Plus (43.90%) and CRIS INFAC (51.22%) are frequently used by most of the students but Science Direct (41.46%), TEL Online (43.90%), Euromonitor (53.66%), INSIGHT (46.34%) and J-gate (43.90%) are occasionally used by them. ABI/Inform (42.10%), Science Direct (42.10%) and Capitaline Plus (57.89%) are frequently used by most of the research scholars but ACM Digital Library (47.37%), Business Source Complete (52.63%), IEL Online (47.37%), Euromonitor (57.89%) and CRIS INFAC (42.10%) are occasionally used by them. Business Source Complete (57.14%), Emerald (42.86%) and IEL Online (50%) are frequently used by most of the faculty members but ABI/Inform (42.86%), Science Direct (50%), Euromonitor (57.14%), INSIGHT (42.86%), Capitaline Plus (78.57%) and CRIS INFAC (42.86%) are occasionally used by them.

Table XXVII: Frequency of Using E-journal Databases Subscribed Individually by IIM Bangalore

Frequency of Using E-journal Databases		Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
		Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
CMIE-Business Beacon	Frequently	14 (34.15)	05 (26.31)	02 (14.28)	21 (28.38)
	Occasionally	17 (41.46)	08 (42.10)	05 (35.71)	30 (40.54)
	Never	10 (24.39)	06 (31.58)	07 (50)	23 (31.08)
CMIE-CapEx (Online)	Frequently	09 (21.95)	03 (15.79)	03 (21.42)	15 (20.27)
	Occasionally	19 (46.34)	07 (36.84)	02 (14.28)	28 (37.84)
	Never	13 (31.71)	09 (47.37)	09 (64.28)	31 (41.89)
CMIE- Economic Intelligence	Frequently	14 (34.15)	03 (15.79)	03 (21.42)	20 (27.03)
	Occasionally	12 (29.27)	05 (26.31)	05 (35.71)	22 (29.73)
	Never	15 (36.58)	11 (57.89)	06 (42.86)	32 (43.24)
CMIE-Industry Analysis Service	Frequently	07 (17.07)	07 (36.84)	04 (28.57)	18 (24.32)
	Occasionally	13 (31.71)	08 (42.10)	06 (42.86)	27 (36.49)
	Never	21 (51.22)	04 (21.05)	04 (28.57)	29 (39.19)
Indiastat.com	Frequently	16 (39.02)	07 (36.84)	03 (21.42)	26 (35.13)
	Occasionally	08 (19.51)	10 (52.63)	07 (50)	25 (33.78)
	Never	17 (41.46)	02 (10.53)	04 (28.57)	23 (31.08)
ISI Emerging Markets	Frequently	08 (19.51)	10 (52.63)	04 (28.57)	22 (29.73)
	Occasionally	15 (36.58)	04 (21.05)	08 (57.14)	27 (36.49)
	Never	18 (43.90)	05 (26.31)	02 (14.28)	25 (33.78)
Jstor	Frequently	13 (31.71)	02 (10.53)	01 (7.14)	16 (21.62)
	Occasionally	11 (26.83)	12 (63.16)	04 (28.57)	27 (36.49)
	Never	17 (41.46)	05 (26.31)	09 (64.28)	31 (41.89)
MarketLine Advantage (Datamonitor 360)	Frequently	12 (29.27)	12 (63.16)	06 (42.86)	30 (40.54)
	Occasionally	20 (48.78)	04 (21.05)	05 (35.71)	29 (39.19)
	Never	09 (21.95)	03 (15.79)	03 (21.42)	15 (20.27)
Proquest Dissertations & Theses	Frequently	05 (12.19)	06 (31.58)	03 (21.42)	14 (18.92)
	Occasionally	08 (19.51)	08 (42.10)	04 (28.57)	20 (27.03)
	Never	28 (68.29)	05 (26.31)	07 (50)	40 (54.05)
PsycARTICLES	Frequently	16 (39.02)	09 (47.37)	04 (28.57)	29 (39.19)
	Occasionally	12 (29.27)	06 (31.58)	07 (50)	25 (33.78)
	Never	13 (31.71)	04 (21.05)	03 (21.42)	20 (27.03)
World Bank- eLibrary	Frequently	08 (19.51)	03 (15.79)	01 (7.14)	12 (16.22)
	Occasionally	10 (24.39)	09 (47.37)	04 (28.57)	23 (31.08)
	Never	23 (56.10)	07 (36.84)	09 (64.28)	39 (52.70)
Sage HSS Collection	Frequently	10 (24.39)	07 (36.84)	03 (21.42)	20 (27.03)
	Occasionally	19 (46.34)	10 (52.63)	04 (28.57)	33 (44.59)
	Never	12 (29.27)	02 (10.53)	07 (50)	21 (28.38)

The *Table* XXVII indicates that PsycARTICLES (39.02%) is frequently used by most of the students but CMIE-Business Beacon (41.46%), CMIE-CapEx (46.34%), MarketLine Advantage (48.78%) and Sage HSS Collection (46.34%) are occasionally used by most of them. ISI Emerging Markets (52.63%), MarketLine Advantage (63.16%) and PsycARTICLES (47.37%) are frequently used by most of the research scholars but CMIE-Business Beacon (42.10%), CMIE-Industry Analysis Service (42.10%), IndiaStat.com (52.63%), Jstor (63.16%), Proquest Dissertations & Theses (42.10%), World Bank-eLibrary (47.37%) and Sage HSS Collection (52.63%) are occasionally used by them. MarketLine Advantage (42.86%) is frequently used by most of the faculty members but CMIE-Industry Analysis Service (42.86%), IndiaStat.com (50%), ISI Emerging Markets (57.14%) and PsycARTICLES (50%) are occasionally used by most of them.

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

Way of Access Full Text Articles	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Through friends/ colleagues	36 (87.80)	16 (84.21)	11 (78.57)	63 (85.13)
Through library's document delivery services	23 (56.10)	13 (68.42)	08 (57.14)	44 (59.46)
From other libraries	08 (19.51)	03 (15.79)	05 (35.71)	16 (21.62)
Obtain reprints/soft copy directly from the authors	17 (41.46)	08 (42.10)	04 (28.57)	29 (39.19)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table* XXVIII indicates that majority of the students (87.80%), research scholars (84.21%) and faculty members (78.57%) access full text articles not subscribed by the library through friends/colleagues.

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

Time Spent	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Less than 1 hour	03 (7.32)	-	-	03 (4.05)
Less than 3 hours	06 (14.63)	02 (10.53)	01 (7.14)	09 (12.16)
Less than 5 hours	13 (31.71)	05 (26.31)	05 (35.71)	23 (31.08)
More than 5 hours	19 (46.34)	12 (63.16)	08 (57.14)	39 (52.70)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XXIX indicates that the majority of the students (46.34%), research scholars (63.16%) and faculty members (57.14%) spent time more than 5 hours for searching and downloading of e-resources.

Table XXX: Number of Full Text Articles Downloaded Per Month

Full Text Articles Downloaded	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
0 to 5	-	01 (5.26)	-	01 (1.35)
5 to 9	02 (4.88)	02 (10.53)	-	04 (5.40)
10 to 19	12 (29.27)	06 (31.58)	03 (21.42)	21 (28.38)
20 to 29	17 (41.46)	03 (15.79)	04 (28.57)	24 (32.43)
30 to 49	04 (9.76)	05 (26.31)	04 (28.57)	13 (17.57)
More than 50	06 (14.63)	02 (10.53)	03 (21.42)	11 (14.86)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XXX indicates that majority of the students (41.46%) downloaded 20 to 29 full text articles in a month. Majority of the research scholars (31.58%) downloaded 10 to 19 full text articles in a month. Majority of the faculty members (28.57%) downloaded 20 to 29 and 30 to 49 full text articles in a month.

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

Opinion	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Yes	32 (78.05)	14 (73.68)	12 (85.71)	58 (78.38)
No	09 (21.95)	05 (26.31)	02 (14.28)	16 (21.62)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XXXI indicates that majority of the students (78.05%), research scholars (73.68%) and faculty members (85.71%) stated that e-resources enhance the efficiency of their academic work.

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

Influence	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=58)
	Students (N=32)	Research Scholars (N=14)	Faculty Members (N=12)	
Expedited the research/project process	27 (84.37)	12 (85.71)	12 (100)	51 (87.93)
Improved profession competence	23 (71.87)	14 (100)	09 (75)	46 (79.31)
Expedited the teaching process	-	-	10 (83.33)	10 (17.24)
Access to wider range of information	29 (90.62)	14 (100)	12 (100)	55 (94.83)
Easier and faster access to information	30 (93.75)	11 (78.57)	12 (100)	53 (91.38)
Any other	-	-	01 (8.33)	01 (1.72)

The *Table* XXXII indicates that majority of the students (93.75%) stated e-resources help in easier and faster access to information and research scholars (100%) stated that e-resources help in improved profession competence and access to wider range of information. Majority of the faculty members (100%) stated that e-resources help in expedited the research/project process, access to wider range of information and easier and faster access to information.

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

Problems	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Non-friendly user Interface	13 (31.71)	04 (21.05)	04 (28.57)	21 (28.38)
Not enough coverage	03 (7.32)	02 (10.53)	01 (7.14)	06 (8.11)
Lack of training	08 (19.51)	06 (31.58)	03 (21.42)	17 (22.97)
No problem being faced	22 (53.66)	09 (47.37)	08 (57.14)	39 (52.70)
Any other	-	-	-	-

The *Table* XXXIII indicates that no problem being faced by most of the students (53.66%), research scholars (47.37%) and faculty members (57.14%) while accessing and using e-resources.

Table XXXIV: Satisfaction Towards Adequacy of E-resources

Satisfaction	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Yes	34 (82.93)	17 (89.47)	09 (64.28)	60 (81.08)
No	07 (17.07)	02 (10.53)	05 (35.71)	14 (18.92)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XXXIV indicates that the majority of the students (82.93%), research scholars (89.47%) and faculty members (64.28%) are satisfied with the adequacy of e-resources.

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

Expectation	Categories of the Respondents			Total (N=74)
	Students (N=41)	Research Scholars (N=19)	Faculty Members (N=14)	
Yes	36 (87.80)	16 (84.21)	12 (85.71)	64 (86.49)
No	05 (12.19)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	10 (13.51)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The *Table* XXXV indicates that the majority of the students (87.80%), research scholars (84.21%) and faculty members (85.71%) are expected more number of e-resources added in the collection.

Table XXXVI: Subscription of Print version of E-resources

| *Opinion* | *Categories of the Respondents* | | | *Total (N=74)* |
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Yes	09 (21.95)	02 (10.53)	-	11 (14.86)
No	32 (78.05)	17 (89.47)	14 (100)	63 (85.13)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The question asked to the respondents that library also subscribes the print version of e-resources. The *Table* XXXVI indicates that majority of the students (78.05%), research scholars (89.47%) and faculty members (100%) are not agreed.

Table XXXVII: Suggestion Regarding E-resources Subscription

| *Suggestion* | *Categories of the Respondents* | | | *Total (N=74)* |
	Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Yes	04 (9.76)	06 (31.58)	02 (14.28)	12 (16.22)
No	37 (90.24)	13 (68.42)	12 (85.71)	62 (83.78)
Total	41 (100)	19 (100)	14 (100)	74 (100)

The Table XXXVII indicates that the majority of the students (90.24%), research scholars (68.42%) and faculty members (85.71%) haven't suggested to librarian for subscribing the relevant e-resources.

Table XXXVIII: Consideration of Request Regarding E-resources Subscription

| *Consideration* | *Categories of the Respondents* | | | *Total (N=12)* |
	Students (N=04)	*Research Scholars (N=06)*	*Faculty Members (N=02)*	
Yes	01 (25)	04 (66.67)	02 (100)	07 (58.33)
No	03 (75)	02 (33.33)	-	05 (41.67)
Total	04 (100)	06 (100)	02 (100)	12 (100)

The *Table* XXXVIII indicates that the majority of the students (75%) stated that whatever they have suggested to purchase the relevant materials related to e-resources their request was not attended whereas most of the research scholars (66.67%) and faculty members (100%) stated that the request was attended.

Table XXXIX: Adequacy of Library Collection

| *Sources* | | *Categories of the Respondents* | | | *Total (N=74)* |
		Students (N=41)	*Research Scholars (N=19)*	*Faculty Members (N=14)*	
Books	Adequate	23 (56.10)	10 (52.63)	03 (21.42)	36 (48.65)
	Moderate	09 (21.95)	05 (26.31)	06 (42.86)	20 (27.03)
	Inadequate	06 (14.63)	03 (15.79)	05 (35.71)	14 (18.92)
	Can't say	03 (7.32)	01 (5.26)	-	04 (5.40)
Periodicals	Adequate	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	09 (64.28)	32 (43.24)
	Moderate	13 (31.71)	08 (42.10)	02 (14.28)	23 (31.08)
	Inadequate	10 (24.39)	05 (26.31)	03 (21.42)	18 (24.32)
	Can't say	01 (2.44)	-	-	01 (1.35)
Reference Sources	Adequate	08 (19.51)	04 (21.05)	05 (35.71)	17 (22.97)
	Moderate	21 (51.22)	12 (63.16)	07 (50)	40 (54.05)
	Inadequate	07 (17.07)	03 (15.79)	02 (14.28)	12 (16.22)
	Can't say	05 (12.19)	-	-	05 (6.76)
Theses & Dissertations	Adequate	12 (29.27)	10 (52.63)	03 (21.42)	25 (33.78)
	Moderate	14 (34.15)	07 (36.84)	06 (42.86)	27 (36.49)
	Inadequate	13 (31.71)	02 (10.53)	04 (28.57)	19 (25.67)
	Can't say	02 (4.88)	-	01 (7.14)	03 (4.05)
E-books	Adequate	26 (63.41)	13 (68.42)	07 (50)	46 (62.16)
	Moderate	06 (14.63)	05 (26.31)	05 (35.71)	16 (21.62)

	Inadequate	05 (12.19)	01 (5.26)	02 (14.28)	08 (10.81)
	Can't say	04 (9.76)	-	-	04 (5.40)
E-journals	Adequate	15 (36.58)	09 (47.37)	09 (64.28)	33 (44.59)
	Moderate	17 (41.46)	06 (31.58)	04 (28.57)	27 (36.49)
	Inadequate	08 (19.51)	04 (21.05)	01 (7.14)	13 (17.57)
	Can't say	01 (2.44)	-	-	01 (1.35)
Online Databases	Adequate	13 (31.71)	07 (36.84)	02 (14.28)	22 (29.73)
	Moderate	20 (48.78)	05 (26.31)	08 (57.14)	33 (44.59)
	Inadequate	05 (12.19)	04 (21.05)	04 (28.57)	13 (17.57)
	Can't say	03 (7.32)	03 (15.79)	-	06 (8.11)
CDs/DVDs	Adequate	19 (46.34)	04 (21.05)	02 (14.28)	25 (33.78)
	Moderate	10 (24.39)	08 (42.10)	05 (35.71)	23 (31.08)
	Inadequate	07 (17.07)	05 (26.31)	06 (42.86)	18 (24.32)
	Can't say	05 (12.19)	02 (10.53)	01 (7.14)	08 (10.81)

The *Table* XXXIX indicates the adequacy of library collection. Majority of the students stated that collection of books (56.10%), periodicals (41.46%), e-books (63.41%) and CD/DVDs (46.34%) are adequate whereas collection of reference sources (51.22%), theses & dissertations, e-journals (41.46%) and online databases (48.78%) are moderate. Majority of the research scholars stated that collection of books (52.63%), theses & dissertations (52.63%), e-books (68.42%), e-journals (47.37%) and online databases (36.84%) are adequate whereas collection of periodicals (42.10%), reference sources (63.16%) and CDs/DVDs (42.10%) are moderate. Majority of the faculty members stated that collection of periodicals (64.28%), e-books (50%) and e-journals (64.28%) are adequate whereas collection of books (42.86%), reference sources (50%), theses & dissertations (42.86%) and online databases (57.14%) are moderate. Majority of the faculty members stated that collection of CD/DVDs is inadequate.

IX. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Major findings of the study are:
[1]   Majority (37.84%) of the respondents visit the library 2-3 times a week.
[2]   Majority (94.74%) 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 to borrow and return the books (87.84%) and for research work/project (79.73%).
[4]   Majority of the respondents (97.30%) are well aware of e-resource services and facilities provided by the IIM Bangalore Library.
[5]   Majority of the respondents are well aware that library is a member of IIM Consortium (77.03%) and INDEST-AICTE Consortium (72.97%).
[6]   Institution website (79.73%) and friends/colleagues (74.65%) are the most popular sources of awareness about e-resource services and facilities among respondents.
[7]   Majority (58.11%) of the respondents using e-resources 2-3 times a week.
[8]   Majority (74.32%) of the respondents take the guidance by teachers/supervisors to access e-resources.
[9]   Majority of the respondents prefer field (85.13%) and simple search (68.92%) to retrieve the information.
[10] 50% 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 (94.54%) subscribed by the library as well as how to search and retrieve the content (83.64%).
[12] Majority of the respondents using e-resources for writing articles/research papers (94.59%) and research work/project (91.89%).
[13] Majority (94.59%) of the respondents indicate that due to wide range of online databases/journals available, they have been using e-resources.
[14] E-books and e-research reports/projects are frequently used by most of the respondents. E-journals, e-theses & dissertations and e-reference sources are occasionally used by the respondents. E-coursewares and CD/DVDs are less used by most of the respondents.
[15] Wiley Interscience is frequently used whereas Springer Link and Taylor & Francis are occasionally used by most of the respondents.
[16] ABI/Inform, Business Source Complete, Emerald and Capitaline Plus are frequently used by most of the respondents. Science Direct, IEL Online, INSIGHT, Euromonitor and CRIS INFAC are occasionally used by most of the respondents. ACM Digital Library and J-Gate are never used by most of the respondents.

[17]   IndiaStat.com, MarketLine Advantage and PsycARTICLES are frequently used by most of the respondents. CMIE-Business Beacon, , ISI Emerging Markets, Sage HSS Collection are occasionally used by most of the respondents. CMIE-CapEx, CMIE-Economic Intelligence, CMIE-Industry Analysis Service, Jstor, Proquest Dissertations & Theses and World Bank-eLibrary are never used by most of the respondents.

[18]   Majority (78.38%) of the respondents stated that e-resources enhance the efficiency of their academic work.

[19]   No problem being faced by most of the respondents (52.70%) while accessing and using e-resources.

[20]   Majority (81.08%) of the respondents are satisfied with the adequacy of e-resources.

[21]   Majority (86.49%) of the respondents are expected more number of e-resources included in the collection.

[22]   Majority of the students, research scholars and faculty members stated that collection of books, periodicals, e-books, e-journals and CD/DVDs are adequate whereas collection of reference sources, theses & dissertations and online databases are 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, and Meera, Use of E-resources and Services at Indian Institute of Management Indore: A Study, International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, 2(8), 2013, 40-55.

[2].   V. K. Singh, and Meera, Use of E-resources and Services at Indian Institute of Management Lucknow: A Study, International Journal of Scientific Research, 2(9), 2013, 40-49.

[3].   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.

[4].   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.

[5].   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.