Use of INDEST E-Resources: A Study

Dr. Harish H T
Librarian & Head
Sai Vidya Institute of Technology
Bengaluru- 560064
Email: drharishht19@gmail.com

Abstract - *This study examines the use of INDEST E-resources by age wise ('25 to 35 years', '36 to 45 years', '46 to 55 years' and '>56') by IIT faculty. It also highlights the testing of Analysis of Variance. Basic Advantages, Disadvantages, Augmented Purpose, Availability and Accessibility, Limitation of Accessing, Strength in Accessing, Expected Facilitation, Core Purpose, Value Addition, Satisfaction, Importance, Reading pattern with designation wise using INDEST E-Resources by faculty of top seven IITs. The F value is 1.855 and significant value is 0.137 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Basic Advantages' does not impact across the different age group. The analysis found that the age group between '36 to 45 years' is having a highest mean value 4.85. The age group ('36 to 45 years) use INDEST e-resources to do research activities.*

Keywords: INDEST Consortium; AICTE Consortium; IITs; E-Resources; IIT Faculty; INDEST E-Resources.

1. Introduction

Many libraries across the globe are the beneficiaries of unlimited electronic resources. The users of academic libraries are able to access electronic resources as easily as print information. The libraries of IITs are the pioneers in embracing this change. They are the first and foremost institutions to initiate INDEST library consortia. The INDEST library Consortia has tremendously expanded and has led to the provision of different kinds of services to the users. The issues of lack of funds and the struggle to cope with purchase of books and other resources and the budget cuts is very easy to solve due to the optimum utilization of consortia.

These days the service qualities of an institution are measured in terms of digital collections, e-resources, networking element, ICT tools, etc. Electronic information is the most recent development in information technology and is among the most powerful implement ever invented in human history. The library users' satisfaction plays a crucial role in the enlargement and provisions of the library services. The potential users' feedback regarding the library resources, services and facilities should be considered for providing necessary resources and amenities in the library. In particular, academic institutions need to measure the users' satisfaction to maintain the quality in all the activities. Computers and computer applications have been widely initiated, and an integrated library system has been installed. The Library provides remote access to e-resources. In fact, the dawn of a new era in library services and access to resources has risen in IIT-Guwahati in harmony with the worldwide information revolution in academia. Consortium is very important for the libraries for solving the today's burning problems like information explosion, diversity of users need, financial crunch and so on. Some of the examples of library consortia initiatives in India are INDEST-AICTE Consortium, UGC INFONET Consortium, FORSA Consortium and CSIR Consortium. The electronic journals are the sources of original and updated information mainly covering studies of science and technology.

2. Literature Review

Some of the similar studies carried out in this area of work are reported here. Tamrakar and Garg (2016). opined that Indian Institute of Technology-Guwahati made voluminous efforts to provide better e-resources services to its users. They measure the extent and use of e-resources, information alert services, awareness towards the e-resources, purpose of using the e-resources, attitude of library staff and overall quality of e-services offered by the library of Indian Institute of Technology-Guwahati. 394 survey based questionnaires were distributed and received from PG students, research scholars and faculty members of IIT-Guwahati which were analyzed in this study. The found that e-journals are more popular than print journals; the library regularly invites users views regarding the information constraint; and the library continuously puts forward information alert services to their users. Most of the users are aware about the e-journals/database offered by the library concerned to their subject and also are able to explore the e-resources allied to their area of interest. Khanchandani, V and Hasan, N (2016). Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi is one of the premier institutes of India and was established in 1961. To cater the research and the teaching needs of the institute, Central Library, IIT Delhi is providing different resources, services and products to the faculty and the students. To maximize the usage and for increasing the importance, libraries in the present era around the world are adopting the different marketing strategies. Marketing besides providing sustainability, also helps in realizing the goals of libraries. They provide a comprehensive overview on different marketing strategies adopted by libraries with special reference to Central Library, IIT Delhi for reaching to its users and to increase the outreach. The paper is intended to help professionals and the library users in knowing the various resources, services and products provided by the Central Library, IIT Delhi as a model to be explored and followed by other libraries and their administrators. Srivastava and Verma (2015) are of the view that consortium based library subscription to e-journals and electronic full-text databases are picking up good momentum in India. INDEST-AICTE consortium, CSIR consortium, IIM consortium, INFLIBNET's, UGC-INFONET consortium, DRDO consortium and so on are successful ones to name a few. Khan (2015) portray that users are the key component of a library. An attempt was made to study the use of e-resource by the users with specific reference to INFLIBNET N-LIST. Khaparde and Ambedkar (2014) discuss the developments in ICTs, the growth of ETDs, history of ETD in India. Further the paper presents an account of UGC Regulations 2005 and 2009, INDEST Consortium, ICSSR – NASSDOC and National Knowledge Commissions.

Present study is new compared to the previous studies and no such study has been conducted on the status of use of INDEST E-Resources by the faculty of IITs. Therefore, in this study an attempt is made to study the Age Wise Using of INDEST E-Resources by the Faculty of IITs.

3. Objectives of the study

The main objectives of the study are:
- To know the advantage and disadvantages of using INDEST E-Resources by Age.
- To know the core purpose and augmented purpose of using INDEST E-Resources by Age wise.
- To know the reading pattern and importance of INDEST E-Resources by Age wise.
- To know the level of satisfaction in using INDEST E-Resources by Age wise.

4. Scope and Limitation of the Study

The present study focuses on the designation wise use of INDEST e-resources by the faculty of top seven Indian Institute of Technology (IITs). This study is limited to top seven Indian Institute of Technology and all of them are governed by the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961 which has declared them as institutions of national importance and further lays down their powers, duties, and framework for governance. The top seven IITs are IIT Kharagpur (IIT Kgp), IIT Bombay (IITB), IIT Madras (IITM), IIT Kanpur (IITK), IIT Delhi (IITD), IIT Guwahati (IITG) and IIT Roorkee (IITR).

5. Methodologies

The survey method was considered most appropriate for this study because it can measure Faculty' background, experience and what they know about electronic information, and it was well suited to the research questions taken up for this study. The data has been obtained by using questionnaires; this data has been standardized for comparison. The questionnaire was designed, keeping in view the objectives of the study for collecting usage data from faculty of different departments of seven IITs. Along with averages, percentages, mean SD, several advanced statistical tools like Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), were used for the purpose of analysis and interpretation.

6. Hypothesis of the study

- **Ho:**   There is no significant difference on Perception on INDEST usage Vs Computer literacy.

- **Ha:**   There is significant difference on Perception on INDEST usage Vs Computer literacy.

Result and Discussion

6.1 Computer Literacy Vs Basic Advantage

To prove the above said hypothesis a mean based statistical test used for testing the significance of the Hypothesis, when there are one dependent variable and more than two levels or groups of Independent variable. In other words, to understand statistical significance differences between or among two or more groups or level of independent variables on dependent variables. In this case, the five attributes of 'Basic Advantages' that are the dependent variables such as 'User-friendly interface', 'Retrieval possibilities', 'Searchability/search capabilities', 'Currency (Up-to-date information)' and 'Convenience' are computed to understand the perception of respondents classified based on their computer literacy('Expert', 'Good', 'Average') which are Independent variables.

The table 6.1 shows the perception of the respondents categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score of 'User-friendly interface' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.25, 'Good' is 4.28 and 'Average' is 4.08. The F value is 0.818 and significant value is 0.442 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'User-friendly interface' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

To ascertain the impact of 'Retrieval possibilities' in the perception of the respondents' categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.18, 'Good' is 4.27 and 'Average' is 4.04. The F value is 1.172 and significant value is 0.311 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that respondents with different computer literacy perceive in similar ways with regard to 'Retrieval possibilities'.

The mean value for 'Searchability/search capabilities' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.4, 'Good' is 4.29 and 'Average' is 4.08. The F value is 2.037 and significant value is 0.132 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Searchability/search capabilities'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Currency (Up-to-date information)' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.19,'Good' is 4.32 and 'Average' is 4.2. The F value is 1.145 and significant value is 0.319 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that'Currency (Up-to-date information)' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

The mean value for 'Convenience' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.32, 'Good' is 4.33 and 'Average' is 4.11. The F value is 0.928 and significant value is 0.396 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Convenience'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Basic Advantages' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.27,'Good' is 4.3 and 'Average' is 4.08. The F value is 1.448 and significant value is 0.236 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Basic Advantages' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

Table 6.1 Computer Literacy Vs Basic Advantage

S/N			Computer Literacy			F value	P value
			Expert N=120	Good N=263	Average N=28		
1	User-friendly interface	Mean	4.25	4.28	4.08	0.82	0.442
		SD	0.84	0.75	0.84		
2	Retrieval possibilities	Mean	4.18	4.27	4.04	1.17	0.311
		SD	0.94	0.78	0.81		
3	Searchability/search capabilities	Mean	4.4	4.29	4.08	2.04	0.132
		SD	0.9	0.74	0.8		
4	Currency (Up-to-date information)	Mean	4.19	4.32	4.2	1.15	0.319
		SD	0.9	0.76	0.76		
5	Convenience	Mean	4.32	4.33	4.11	0.93	0.396
		SD	0.8	0.76	1.15		
	Basic Advantages	**Mean**	**4.27**	**4.3**	**4.08**	**1.45**	**0.236**
		SD	**0.75**	**0.59**	**0.79**		

*Significant at 5% level

6.2 Computer Literacy Vs Disadvantage

The table 6.2 shows the perception of the respondents categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score of 'Perishable citation' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 2.43, 'Good' is 2.31 and 'Average' is 2.2. The F value is 0.695 and significant value is 0.5 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Perishable citation' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

To ascertain the impact of 'Format that a large proportion of e-journal use' in the perception of the respondents' categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 2.39, 'Good' is 2.38 and 'Average' is 2.2. The F value is 0.382 and significant value is 0.683 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that respondents with different computer literacy perceive in similar ways with regard to 'Format that a large proportion of e-journal use'.

The mean value for 'Lack of standardized formats' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 2.58, 'Good' is 2.58 and 'Average' is 2.15. The F value is 1.592 and significant value is 0.205 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Lack of standardized formats'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Authenticity' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 2.21, 'Good' is 2.22 and 'Average' is 2.08. The F value is 0.216 and significant value is 0.806 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Authenticity' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

The mean value for 'Search engines ignores PDF files' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 2.08, 'Good' is 2.01 and 'Average' is 2.19. The F value is 0.429 and significant value is 0.652 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Search engine ignores PDF files'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Disadvantages' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 2.33,'Good' is 2.27 and 'Average' is 2.16. The F value is 0.419 and significant value is 0.658 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Disadvantages' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

Table 6.2 Computer Literacy Vs Disadvantage

S/N			Computer Literacy			F value	P value
			Expert N=120	Good N=263	Average N=28		
1	Perishable citation	Mean	2.43	2.31	2.2	0.7	0.5
		SD	1.15	0.98	1.32		
2	Format that a large proportion of e-journal use	Mean	2.39	2.38	2.2	0.38	0.683
		SD	1.18	0.92	1.22		
3	Lack of standardized formats	Mean	2.58	2.58	2.15	1.59	0.205
		SD	1.22	1.19	1.29		
4	Authenticity	Mean	2.21	2.22	2.08	0.22	0.806
		SD	1.11	1.1	1.26		
5	Search engines ignores PDF files	Mean	2.08	2.01	2.19	0.43	0.652
		SD	1.1	1.02	1.26		
	Disadvantages	Mean	2.33	2.27	2.16	0.42	0.658
		SD	1	0.85	1.2		

*Significant at 5% level

6.3 Computer Literacy Vs Augmented Purpose

The table 6.3 shows the perception of the respondents categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score of 'To be up-to-date in the subject' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.48, 'Good' is 4.45 and 'Average' is 3.85. The F value is 5.735 and significant value is 0.004 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'To be up-to-date in the subject' does impact across different level of computer literacy.

To ascertain the impact of 'Preparing for seminars, workshops etc' in the perception of the respondents' categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.23, 'Good' is 4.07 and 'Average' is 3.56. The F value is 5.058 and significant value is 0.007 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that respondents with different computer literacy seem to perceive in different ways with regard to 'Preparing for seminars, workshops etc'.

The mean value for 'To get latest facts and statistics' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.25, 'Good' is 4.07 and 'Average' is 3.85. The F value is 2.046 and significant value is 0.131 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'To get latest facts and statistics'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'To know the trends in Technical field' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.18,'Good' is 4.25 and 'Average' is 3.88. The F value is 1.374 and significant value is 0.254 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'To know the trends in Technical field' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

The mean value for 'To get comprehensive knowledge and be competitive in the field' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.29, 'Good' is 4.15 and 'Average' is 3.88. The F value is 1.872 and significant value is 0.155 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'To get comprehensive knowledge and be competitive in the field'.

The mean value for 'To write Articles' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.46, 'Good' is 4.41 and 'Average' is 3.89. The F value is 6.65 and significant value is 0.001 since it is <.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was evident on the targeted outcome based on 'To write Articles'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Augmented Purpose' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.32, 'Good' is 4.26 and 'Average' is 3.82. The F value is 5.137 and significant value is 0.006 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'Augmented Purpose' does impact across different level of computer literacy.

Table 6.3 Computer Literacy Vs Augmented Purpose

S/N			Computer Literacy			F Value	P Value
			Expert N=120	Good N=263	Average N=28		
1	To be up-to-date in the subject	Mean	4.48	4.45	3.85	5.74	0.004*
		SD	0.68	1	1.01		
2	Preparing for seminars, workshops etc	Mean	4.23	4.07	3.56	5.06	0.007*
		SD	0.88	0.99	1.04		
3	To get latest facts and statistics	Mean	4.25	4.07	3.85	2.05	0.131
		SD	1.08	0.98	0.92		
4	To know the trends in Technical field	Mean	4.18	4.25	3.88	1.37	0.254
		SD	0.93	1.13	1.24		
5	To get comprehensive knowledge and be competitive in the field	Mean	4.29	4.15	3.88	1.87	0.155
		SD	0.86	1.06	0.97		
6	To write Articles	Mean	4.46	4.41	3.89	6.65	0.001*
		SD	0.76	0.74	0.97		
	Augmented Purpose	**Mean**	**4.32**	**4.26**	**3.82**	**5.14**	**0.006***
		SD	**0.59**	**0.78**	**0.88**		

6.4 Computer Literacy Vs Availability and Accessibility

The table 6.4 shows the perception of the respondents categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score of 'Prompt accessibility (7/24 hours a day)' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.31, 'Good' is 4.23 and 'Average' is 4.28. The F value is 0.238 and significant value is 0.788 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Prompt accessibility (7/24 hours a day)' does not impact across different level of computer literacy.

To ascertain the impact of 'Desktop availability' in the perception of the respondents' categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.52, 'Good' is 4.17 and 'Average' is 4.52. The F value is 5.926 and significant value is 0.003 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that respondents with different computer literacy seem to perceive in different ways with regard to 'Desktop availability'.

The mean value for 'Free access' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.42, 'Good' is 3.86 and 'Average' is 4.48. The F value is 14.408 and significant value is 0.000 since it is <.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Free access'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Multiuser access' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 3.67, 'Good' is 3.51 and 'Average' is 2.6. The F value is 8.233 and significant value is 0.000 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'Multiuser access' does impact across different level of computer literacy.

The mean value for 'Availability and accessibility' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.24, 'Good' is 3.95 and 'Average' is 3.97. The F value is 4.4598 and significant value is 0.012 since it is <.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Availability and accessibility'.

Table 6.4 Computer Literacy Vs Availability and Accessibility

S/N			Computer Literacy			F value	P value
			Expert N=120	Good N=263	Average N=28		
1	Prompt accessibility (7/24 hours a day)	Mean	4.31	4.23	4.28	0.24	0.788
		SD	0.88	1.13	0.61		
2	Desktop availability	Mean	4.52	4.17	4.52	5.93	0.003*
		SD	0.8	1.06	0.65		
3	Free access	Mean	4.42	3.86	4.48	14.4	0.000*
		SD	0.86	1.09	0.71		
4	Multiuser access	Mean	3.67	3.51	2.6	8.23	0.000*
		SD	1.1	1.23	1.5		
	Availability and accessibility	Mean	4.24	3.95	3.97	4.46	0.012*
		SD	0.74	0.91	0.68		

*Significant at 5% level

6.5 Computer Literacy Vs Core Purpose

The table 6.5 shows the perception of the respondents categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score for 'Teaching' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.14, 'Good' is 3.81and 'Average' is 3.54. The F value is 6.456 and significant value is 0.002 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'Teaching' does impact by the level of their computer literacy.

To ascertain the impact of 'Research' in the perception of the respondents' categorized based on their Computer literacy. The average score given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.93, 'Good' is 4.74 and 'Average' is 4.42. The F value is 12.755 and significant value is 0.000 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that respondents with different computer literacy seem to perceive differently with regard to 'Research'.

The mean value for 'Core purpose' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.55, 'Good' is 4.3 and 'Average' is 3.98. The F value is 11.392 and significant value is 0.00 since it is <.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Core purpose'.

Table 6.5 Computer Literacy Vs Core Purpose

S/N			Computer Literacy			F value	P value
			Expert N=120	Good N=263	Average N=28		
1	Teaching	Mean	4.14	3.81	3.54	6.456	0.002*
		SD	0.84	0.96	1.3		
2	Research	Mean	4.93	4.74	4.42	12.755	0.000*
		SD	0.25	0.53	0.9		
3	Core purpose	Mean	4.55	4.3	3.98	11.392	0.000*
		SD	0.45	0.63	0.99		

*Significant at 5% level

6.6 Computer Literacy Vs Reading Pattern of INDEST E-Resources by IIT Faculty

The table 6.6 shows the perception of the respondents categorized based on their Computer literacy. The mean value for 'Read electronic(on monitor)' given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 4.28, 'Good' is 4.18 and 'Average' is 4.1. The F value is 0.726 and significant value is 0.484 since it is >.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically not significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was not evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Read electronic (on monitor)'.

The average score for the perception of respondents on 'Read print out' as given by the respondents whose computer literacy is 'Expert' is 3.16, 'Good' is 3.17 and 'Average' is 4. The F value is 6.407 and significant value is 0.002 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'Read print out' does impact across different level of computer literacy.

Table 6.6 Computer Literacy Vs Reading Pattern of INDEST E-Resources

S/N			Computer Literacy			F value	P value
			Expert N=120	Good N=263	Average N=28		
1	Read electronic (on monitor)	Mean	4.28	4.18	4.1	0.726	0.484
		SD	0.86	0.93	0.7		
2	Read print out	Mean	3.16	3.17	4	6.407	0.002*
		SD	1.33	1.09	0.91		

Significant at 5% level

Conclusion

The F value is 1.448 and significant value is 0.236 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Basic Advantages' does not impact across different level of computer literacy, The F value is 0.419 and significant value is 0.658 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Disadvantages' does not impact across different level of computer literacy, The F value is 5.137 and significant value is 0.006 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'Augmented Purpose' does impact across different level of computer literacy, The F value is 4.4598 and significant value is 0.012 since it is <.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Availability and accessibility', The F value is 6.713 and significant value is 0.001 since it is <.05 the mean difference is significant which implies that 'Limitation of accessing system' does impact across different level of computer literacy, The F value is 1.605 and significant value is 0.202 since it is >.05 the mean difference is not significant which implies that 'Strength in accessing network' does not impact across different level of computer literacy, The F value is 7.823 and significant value is 0.000 since it is <.05 the mean difference existing between respondents with different computer literacy is statistically significant at 5% level. This shows that a significant effect was evident on the targeted outcome based on 'Expected Facilitation'.

Reference

1. Tamrakar, A. K., & Garg, R. G. (2016). User Perception Towards E-resources and Services of IIT-Guwahati Library. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 36(1), 36-41.

2. Khanchandani, V and Hasan, N (2016). Marketing of Library Resources, Services and Products: A Case Study of IIT Delhi. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 36(3), 158-163.

3. Srivastava, J.P. & Verma, Vijay Kumar (2015).Library Consortia: Issues and Challenges with Special Reference to INDEST-AICTE Consortium.

4. Khan, M. A. (2015).Use Of E-Resources Through Inflibnet N-List By The Users Of Chandidas Mahavidyalaya, West Bengal: A Survey. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *3*(6).

5. Khaparde, V., & Ambedkar, B. (2014).Growth and Development of Electronic Theses and Dissertation (ETDs) in India.*Journal of Library and Information Sciences*, *2*(1), 99-116.

6. Chauhan, S. K., & Mahajan, P. (2014). Use of UGC-Infonet E-resources by social science academics in Indian universities: An evaluation study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3), 359-366.

7. Choudhury, U. (2015). Use of INDEST and other e-Resources by Engineering Students and Teachers of Assam.